

"Ages of consent are useless. They are completely unrealistic, and they don't give children protection from exploitation in any case. The only lasting protection will be to remove the exploitation, and doing this will go a lot deeper than simply passing or repealing a law."

(Liz Holtom & Kathy Challis)

"The runaways reported daily in the papers are seen as at best confused, at worst gratuitously hurting their parents. Many seem unable to grasp that the act of running away may, to the child, be a way of escaping from an intolerably oppressive situation."

(Eric Presland)

"We all live in a comfortable fantasy that the world of the child is one of innocence, of good morality, of ignorance of sex, etc., and this stereotype can be very damaging because it can restrict the child's growth."

(Michael Ingram)

"Women and homosexuals, as well as children and child-lovers, are oppressed by the view that procreational sex is the only erotic activity that rates the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval."

(Beatrice Faust)

"In a fully democratic and egalitarian society, there can be no question of adults usurping the rights of young people by keeping them in a state of ignorance, fear and guilt, or by resort to arbitrary and autocratic laws which deny them responsibility for decisions affecting their lives."

(Peter Tatchell)

"'Investigators' who purport to show that adult/child sexual contacts... must produce damaged lives break the cardinal rule of scientific enquiry: they dispense with controls and they hammer out moralistic conclusions, using moralistic tools in an atmosphere of constraint and apprehension, if not downright hysteria."

(Roger Moody)

PRINTED IN U.K.

U.K. PRICE £7.99

CL PUBLICATIONS, London

THE BETRAYAL OF YOUTH • Middleton
CL

THE BETRAYAL OF YOUTH

Radical Perspectives
on Childhood Sexuality,
Intergenerational Sex,
and the Social Oppression
of Children and Young People

edited by

WARREN MIDDLETON

DEDICATION

To Children and Young People of the World

THE CHILD PROTECTORS

The growing moral panic surrounding calls for the 'protection' of youth is, in the main, an enormous red herring deliberately created to divert attention from the real issues raised by demands for children's rights. In truth, it has got precious little to do with protection, but everything to do with control: the control of childhood sexuality and, by extension, children and young people themselves. A vote in favour of this panic is therefore a vote for no change - to keep the young in exactly the same state of oppression as they are in now. It is a vote to keep the young forever powerless.

Warren Middleton

THE BETRAYAL OF YOUTH

**RADICAL PERSPECTIVES
ON CHILDHOOD SEXUALITY,
INTERGENERATIONAL SEX,
AND THE SOCIAL OPPRESSION
OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

EDITED BY WARREN MIDDLETON

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While this book was in preparation, I received substantial help, support and encouragement from a number of people, and these deserve at least some mention.

Firstly, my gratitude must go to Dr. Kenneth Plummer of Essex University, Dr. Brian Taylor of Sussex University, and Mr. John Hart of Sheffield City Polytechnic for their warm messages of support.

For displaying the qualities of patience and understanding, I would like to thank Chris and Jayne Hobbs, and all members of my own staff at work. For the use of various facilities and comforts, I am indebted to my mother and father who, likewise, showed great understanding.

Several people read the typescripts, made useful suggestions, and, where necessary, grammatical corrections. In this context, my thanks go to Steven Smith and other members of the now defunct PIE EC, Dr. Jeffrey Weeks, Nettie Pollard (former chairperson of the gay rights subcommittee of the NCCL), John Bradshaw, Frank Torey, Marsaili Cameron (the feminist writer), and Brian Price (an authority on the Victorian paedophile artist, Henry Scott Tuke).

As with every work of this nature, there are always contributions which, because of lack of space or other reasons, cannot be used. Where this has happened, I have tried to incorporate the best ideas within them into the book. In this respect, I am grateful to Peter Coell (an ex-director of the old GAY NEWS), John Auchincloss, David Joy, Tony Zalewski, Mike Williams and Dr. Peter Brenner (the last four ex-members of PIE's EC), Tim Brown (formerly of CAPM), Dr. Carl Berry, Keith

Spence, Steven Logan, John Bass, Alex McDonald, Alan Nash, and members of the old MINOR PROBLEMS collective, Edinburgh.

I am especially grateful to Tom O'Carroll for help with some source material; to Richard Green for his invaluable help with final preparations; and, of course, to the remaining contributors, all of whose articles are original material which has not been published elsewhere. Without their tireless efforts this book would never have seen the light of day.

Last, but by no means least, I would like to thank children and young people themselves; for it was they who inspired the present study.

Warren Middleton

A copy of THE BETRAYAL OF YOUTH is deposited at the British Library,
CL PUBLICATIONS, LONDON.

CONTENTS

PART ONE: FIVE CONTROVERSIAL AREAS

| | | |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------|----|
| CHAPTER 1 | 'Incest', by Clive Coliman, | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2 | 'Child Pornography and Erotica', by Richard Green, | 14 |
| CHAPTER 3 | 'Child Prostitution', by Warren Middleton, | 32 |
| CHAPTER 4 | 'Gender Differences', by Liz Holtom and Kathy Challis, | 55 |
| CHAPTER 5 | 'Power and Consent', by Eric Presland, | 62 |

PART TWO: MISCELLANEOUS CHAPTERS

| | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CHAPTER 6 | 'Love and Let Love', by Tuppy Owens and Tom O'Carroll, | 93 |
| CHAPTER 7 | 'Children and Sex: A Child Counsellor's View', by Michael Ingra, | 100 |
| CHAPTER 8 | 'The Pedophiles', by Beatrice Faust, | 106 |
| CHAPTER 9 | 'Questioning Ages of Majority and Ages of Consent', by Peter Tatchell, | 117 |
| CHAPTER 10 | 'Ends and Means: How to Make Pedophilia Acceptable...?', by Roger Moody, | 120 |
| CHAPTER 11 | 'Socialism, Class, and Children's Rights', by John Lindsay, | 134 |

PART THREE: PROTECTION OR OPPRESSION?

| | | |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CHAPTER 12 | 'Childhood Sexuality and Pedophilia: Some Questions Answered', by Warren Middleton, | 141 |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

PART FOUR: HOW YOUTH SEE THE ISSUES

| | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CHAPTER 13 | 'The Oppression of the Young: An Inside Perspective', by Jeff Vernon, | 189 |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX 1 'PIE, from 1980 Until its Demise in 1985',
by Steven A. Smith, 215
- APPENDIX 2 'The Uranians', by Timothy d'Arch Smith, 246

Each chapter in this collection is the copyright of its respective author, and the editor, Warren Middleton. No part of THE BETRAYAL OF YOUTH may be published or reproduced in any way whatsoever without the written permission of the editor. © Copyright 1986. All rights reserved.

CL PUBLICATIONS
LONDON

INTRODUCTION

In the late 1970s in the state of Nevada, USA, one Robert Butler was sentenced to *22 consecutive terms of life imprisonment*. The mind fairly boggles at the thought of spending a lifetime in jail, let alone twenty-two of them; so just what sort of heinous crimes did this man commit? How many people did he slowly and sadistically torture, before murdering them in cold blood?

None. This unfortunate man had done nothing more than become involved in a love affair with a 14 year old pal which, because of sexual intimacies with him, had caused him to run afoul of a statute of the state which prescribes life imprisonment for each occasion. If he had, in fact, *murdered* his friend, perhaps he would have got away with only one life sentence.

In Salt Lake City, Utah, one Arthur Bishop, once a pillar of the Mormon Church, was sentenced to death for killing five boys with whom he had had sexual relationships. He killed them, he said, *because he was afraid they would expose their sexual activities with him*.

Meanwhile, in Denver, Colorado, a black teacher, Jerry Hall, was sentenced to 56 years in prison for consensual sex with five boys. Some of his 'victims' regularly visit him in prison because they regard him as their friend.

In Austin, Texas, a former Kinsey sex researcher was recently sentenced to 10 years in jail plus a \$5000 fine for *photocopying a photograph* of a child in an old porno magazine.

In Riverside, California, another teacher, Albert Guindon, lost his job and faces a maximum 3 years jail and \$3000 fine for taking photos of five boys *with their shirts off*. No sex was involved.

Need I go on? In England, the sentencing has not yet become quite as barbaric as these examples from America, but we don't have far to go.

The hysteria which invariably accompanies reports of childhood sexuality and the witchhunt against those who show a sexual interest in children or young people, reached and washed over these shores in a huge tidal wave from across the Atlantic in the late '70s.

Just what is this witchhunt, and why all the hysteria? Why does the Establishment condemn with such vigour any attempt to examine the issues dispassionately, not only of childhood sexual self-expression and its cross-generational manifestation, but of the other, more general yet equally important issues of the rights and freedoms of youth? Why does society put down children, and try to crucify any adult who dares to meet them on their own terms? These are the types of questions we set about answering in this anthology.

The dynamics of the witchhunt are clear. Adults who love children and express it sexually (the term 'paedophile' has gained currency - even notoriety - in recent years) are promptly replacing gays and blacks as society's newest scapegoats. Under the guise of 'child protection' many opportunists have found a ready-made way to fame and fortune, extra political clout and/or fast-lane promotion. They are able to train their guns and shoot at will, while their opponents are not even allowed the basic right of reply. The Establishment, the Church, and some parents, fearful of losing authority over the young, are reasserting their 'rights' over them. Controlling children's sexuality is the trump card they hold and wave in the maintenance of this oppression.

But do these head hunters *really* believe they are helping children, and if so why, if that is the case, do they confine their attacks so thoroughly to the singular area of sexual activity, while totally ignoring other abuses such as so-called corporal punishment, and parental beatings? Why, also, do they so vociferously defend children's right to say no to sex, whilst conveniently overlooking their equivalent right to say yes? None of the contributors to this book would defend an adult who forces a child into sex, but we ask, 'What is the difference between such a person and others who 'force' a child to say no?' As both examples exclude any other option, each are equally abuses of

Introduction

power. People who *claim* to be standing for the rights of children must be asked the question: "How much are you prepared to give up your socially-sanctioned power as adults over young people?" Their replies will tell us if they are truly genuine.

Contributing the chapters of this book are people from various walks of life - some of them well-known names - who do not happen to share the traditional Establishment views. They include both men and women, paedophiles and non-paedophiles, and the young and the not-so-young. Since radical views such as theirs cannot be aired in the controlled media of this great 'democracy' of ours, the present book provides the medium for their ideas.

The first five chapters deal with current controversial areas of concern regarding young people, namely, incest, child pornography, prostitution, gender differences, and power and consent, while the chapters that follow concern themselves with other aspects of children's rights, both sexual and social, since the sexual and social oppression of children are inextricably linked.

In 1977, the Paedophile Information Exchange hit the headlines of every popular British newspaper. Since the aims and objectives of the organisation were so grossly misrepresented by the media, and since paedophilia is an important aspect in the study of childhood rights, it was felt that a contribution by the ex-chairperson of the group would be of value, and has thus been included as an appendix.

A second appendix has been incorporated which describes another group of people, known in their time as the Uranians, who might be considered as forerunners to PIE, and who clandestinely produced and printed their thoughts and feelings of puerile eroticism in poetry and prose.

Though the contributors to this book feel that many of the attitudes and laws of this country are in obvious need of revision, and although all would allow that children and young people should be able

to enjoy responsible self-expression, it must be pointed out that we are in no way suggesting that people should break the law, but rather that we should all be working towards a society where oppression of the young, including their sexual oppression, is recognised and condemned.

It is hoped that through this collection of articles, readers will, in future, be more willing to open their eyes to the fact that society and the law do deny children their basic rights; that there are, indeed, important views other than Establishment views; that up to now rational discussion and free thinking on the above issues has been barred by those adults in power over children and over us; and that all of us, knowingly or unknowingly, are repressed children.

PART ONE

Five
Controversial
Areas

Chapter 1

INCEST

by CLIVE COLIMAN

Definition

Incest has been defined differently by each country, and even state. Great Britain, for example, tolerates sexual activity and marriage between first cousins, whereas this is not permitted in the United States, except in Rhode Island, and there only amongst Jews. For present purposes, incest will be used to mean sexual activity between closely related members of one family. We will be concentrating on inter-generational incest where there is a child participant.

Background and History

A child has many needs which differ according to the stage of development reached, and these have to be satisfied if the child is to receive the best chance of thriving in society. Some of the more obvious requirements would include food, shelter, warmth and clothing. These needs are so fundamental that if they are lacking, the child may die. Other, less easily definable, assets would include self-esteem, friendship and affection. These are also necessary for the healthy development of the child, and though there is no direct risk of death if, say, a mother finds no time to play with her little boy, or feels unable to show affection towards him, the lack of human warmth will, inevitably, affect his development. Young children feel a strong need for the affection of their parents and often want to be picked up, embraced, hugged and kissed. Climbing into bed with his/her parents on a Sunday morning and being told a story is sheer delight for a four year old. Instinctively, the parents are trusted and looked on as the

Incest

providers of warmth, help, safety, love and friendship.

What, then, if a mother fondles her eight year old son's genitals, or if a father caresses his twelve year old daughter's breasts whilst in bed with her?

One child recalls with fond affection the strength of her father's body next to hers, whilst another remembers with disgust the unwanted intimacies. The line between innocent love and unwanted intrusion can be disturbingly difficult to draw.

Looking back through history, one discovers very few societies in which incest was permitted. There were sound reasons for insisting that all new relationships extend beyond the family. In earliest times, a marriage might well offer out the benefits of new skills that might be acquired from the other family. Perhaps an envied water hole would be shared. An admired pot maker would be prevailed on to share his art. When each community was, in effect, a small production unit these considerations would have been of great importance. Any new knowledge that could be gained was valuable. Two families would now ward off the attacks of a marauding foe, or even wield sufficient power to become the aggressors themselves.

There were exceptions to the general rule. In ancient Egypt, brother/sister marriages were sanctioned for thousands of years within the royal family, thereby ensuring a pure line for the throne. In India the Sakta sect believed that incestuous intercourse led to religious perfection. And in recent times, the Mormons in the United States practised incest in order to avoid marriages outside the church. It was not until 1892 that Congress outlawed this tradition.

Superstition has played an important part in the maintenance of the taboo. Crop failures in Ireland, sterility of women and cattle, even the occurrence of solar eclipses were held to be caused by the existence of incestuous relationships. The Bible (Leviticus 18:6-18) provided a long list of sexual unions which were deemed disgraceful. However,

Moses was the son of his nephew and aunt, Abraham married his half-sister, and Ham lay with his father, while Noah was drunk.

Incest in Literature

There were references to the 'abominable' nature of incest in the annals of literature going back to the origins of the written word. The horror, and at once, the fascination that the subject holds and has held was reflected in Sophocles' great tragedy OEDIPUS REX. The tale, simple but gripping, involved a mother and son, separated when the boy was a baby, who were driven together once more by fate, and having fallen in love, learned of their common blood. Oedipus tore out his eyes, his mother merely committed suicide. This theme of the unspeakable nature of incest, and its evil and utterly destructive effect on any who were enmeshed by it, no matter how innocent the circumstances, has been used by writers throughout time to depict individuals and families who were doomed.

In 1626 John Ford presented the first serious treatment of the subject on the English stage: 'TIS PITY SHE'S A WHORE. Brother and sister, as helplessly as mother and son two thousand years before, were fated from the outset. It is interesting to note that in these earlier examples of incest in literature the circumstances were of two innocent adults who fell in love, completely ignorant that they were closely related. Wilful and conspiratorial sin would not have been a proper subject to portray at the time, any more than would homosexuality or masochism.

Later authors such as Somerset Maugham, Herman Melville and the Marquis de Sade included this element of lascivious intent, but the result was always an inevitability; utter doom.

Given this literary background, and in the present day the publishing of articles in the popular press with titles such as: 'Raped, By Yhe Monster Who Lived At Home' and 'Girls Who Live In Fear Of Father's Footsteps',⁽¹⁾ there is little wonder that rational discussion

Incest

of this topic is usually precluded.

INCEST IN TODAY'S WORLD

Father/Daughter Incest

Since the family is no longer a producing economic unit dependent on its skills to survive, what is the purpose of perpetuating the taboo? Why should we continue to prohibit incest? Masters maintains that the taboo causes condemnation of innocent people, arouses guilt, and punishes non-victims and non-aggressors. As far as participating adults are concerned, he finds no justification for state or judicial involvement⁽²⁾. One type of response from a parent involved in an incestuous relationship runs: 'What I do in my own house with my own children is my affair and no-one else's'. There are many cases of incest reported where no ill effects are discernible, and where the child grows up into a well-adjusted adult, seemingly unscathed by the events of her childhood, even where, as is frequently the case, the relationship has continued over a period of years.

There is evidence that incest, for various reasons, can run against the interests of the child, both in the short and long term. As has been previously detailed, there are certain needs that the child has, and for which she looks to her parents for fulfilment. If a girl goes to her father, hoping for a hug and kiss, and instead encounters a man inflamed with passion, who masturbates her and requests that she does likewise in return, she may be confused, and still need the affection which she originally sought. In such cases, the girl may develop guilt feelings. She perceives that the situation is somehow odd and irregular, and perhaps not understanding the cause, could well begin to blame herself. Exactly for what, she is uncertain, but she is likely to feel guilty about herself and her father.

When this type of incest is of several years' duration, there may be some degree of role exchange within the family. The daughter may begin to take on some of the duties more frequently associated with the

woman of the family. She may devise menus, allot tasks, give instructions as to the general running of the family, whilst her mother, who may be frequently absent from the home, is more and more relegated to playing the part of a child, freed from the 'responsibilities' of satisfying her husband sexually and emotionally, and of making the daily decisions of running the home. In many cases, the mother, either tacitly or more actively, encourages the daughter to assume her role. She may be unable, for any of a number of reasons, to fulfil her sexual 'function' with her husband. In some cases, she may be scared of him, especially when he has been drinking (a high proportion of incestuous fathers have a drink problem). She may have some emotional problem associated with sex, maybe relating to her own childhood (incest tends to run through the generations in a family), or she may be absent due to work, spending time with her own friends, or perhaps sickness.

Of all types of incest, it is the relationships between fathers and daughters, by far, that come to light most frequently, and is assumed to be the most common form. It may be that brother/sister incest is as widespread, but given its very nature, ie; a relationship between people of the same age or generation, who may have sworn secrecy, it is not so frequently revealed.

The Environment

Each case of incest is unique. Nevertheless, certain common features have been noted in examples that have come to the attention of researchers.

1. The parents stop having sex. There is an emotional and sexual drifting apart.
2. The mother is absent or incapacitated.
3. The father may have suffered a crisis, such as losing his job.
4. The daughter is approaching puberty, though in some cases, sex may have started at an early age, perhaps seven or eight.

Characteristics of the Daughter

The traits often found in the girl may be summarised as follows:

1. She has a poor relationship with her mother. Sometimes she and her father may tacitly or openly agree on the mother's failings, and the girl begins to develop maternal or wifely feelings, believing that she must develop the characteristics of a good wife and mother, if there are younger children to care for. She may have good reason for feeling that the family structure might be at risk if she did not adopt this role. If she does not satisfy the father's emotional and sexual needs, and keep an eye on the household generally, the resultant stress could mean the eventual breakup of the family.
2. She displays low self-esteem. Initially the girl may perceive her father's behaviour as his own way of showing affection, love and need for his daughter, as indeed it is, but eventually, whether through the relationship being discovered, or hearing incest being discussed in a negative light, or through reading a dismal account of the effects of incest, the girl is likely to acquire feelings of guilt. These may last for many years, inhibiting healthy development, though cases are known where few, if any, bad effects have been noted.
3. She feels a great need for affection, and may be prepared to go to great lengths in her attempts to obtain it. There may be a serious conflict here; On the one hand she needs love and reaches out for it; on the other hand, what is offered to her may not be the kind of love she wants. This situation is likely to confuse the child, at least until puberty when the position may clarify in her mind. It is as if she is trying to warm her cold body by the fire, but always seems to burn herself. Where, however, the sexual contact is not distasteful to her, she may develop a seductive manner, the

better to further the relationship. The father may become extremely possessive about his daughter, wanting her to spend most of her free time with him, and mistrustful of any interest shown to her by boys of her own age. He may rationalise, saying that he is the best teacher she could ask for, or say that no boy could be good enough for her.

Mother/Son Incest

According to Justice and Justice, "Mother/son incest is less common, and it is fortunate that such is the case for the consequences to the participants may be devastating."⁽³⁾ There have been some spectacular cases reported over the years where an incestuous relationship between mother and son has ended very violently; in at least one case the boy committed matricide. More commonly the son may be 'effeminate' in his behaviour, lacking an adult male with whom to identify. Again there may be a severe inner conflict; On the one hand, the boy is overly involved, 'stuck' on his mother; on the other hand, the sexual aspect, whether or not intercourse is part of the relationship, may appear inappropriate, wrong or even sickening, and he may feel he is being used. He may become unwilling to mix with girls, saying or thinking that he may be fooled, deceived or defiled.

However, Symonds, Mendoza and Harrell, writing in CHILDREN AND SEX, found no negative effects in the three males who each reported an incestuous relationship with their mother or stepmother.⁽⁴⁾

Father/Son Incest

This type of incest is infrequently reported. Pansexuals - those who are highly sexed and motivated to attempt a relationship with almost any person that happens to be around - are one type who may desire sex with their sons. Married men who have paedophilic tendencies may also involve themselves in this way, and there are cases reported where a man who was involved sexually with his father when a child, looked in turn to his own son for sexual satisfaction later in life.

Incest

A relationship of this nature can be enormously stressful for the boy. Two taboos have to be overcome in his mind, and as he reaches adolescence he may feel uniquely trapped, either by his father's continued attentions or by the very nature of the situation.

Justice and Justice report the case of Tim, a six year old, who was referred to a Houston clinic because of a delayed speech development.⁽⁵⁾ In the last few months he had tried to set the house on fire, drank insecticide and was vicious to animals. The mother reported that Tim had told of two occasions of buggery on him by his stepfather. The clinic recommended medical and psychiatric care, but the family did not follow this through. Eighteen months later, Tim was admitted to hospital for recurrent bleeding ulcers. His speech had deteriorated to the point where he was almost impossible to understand.

It must be remembered that force and coercion were clearly an important factor in Tim's case, but where these are not present, there may well be dangers still. An unusually high proportion of boys involved in prostitution report a former sexual involvement with their fathers. When considering the effects of incest on the children involved, it is important to try to estimate whether any ill-effects are the result of the incest itself, or perhaps more due to other related or unrelated factors. In practice, however, it is often difficult to differentiate between them.

Personal and Familial Consequences of Discovery

The discovery by the authorities of incest within a family usually spells disaster. Whether the child or children have suffered or not will make little difference to the outcome. From here on, all attention is focussed on the adult, and apart from the probable medical investigation of the child and the possibility of his or her being called upon to denounce the parent in court, it is customary for the child to be quietly forgotten by the authorities. The important thing is for the parent to be severely punished and there is rarely any mistake made in this area. Whatever the effects of the relationship on

the child whilst in its duration, what will now ensue once the matter has come to light could, without exaggeration, be described as a living nightmare, certainly for the child and the adult involved, and very probably for the rest of the family.

We give now a description of the likely sequence of events once the police have been informed that a man may have committed incest with his daughter.

The police will visit the man, either at work or at home, and briefly inform him why they have come. He will be taken to the police station and interrogated. Since, in this country, incest is considered so serious a crime, they will almost certainly keep him in custody overnight, or over the weekend, during which time he will be charged either with the full crime of incest, if intercourse is believed to have taken place, or perhaps a lesser charge of indecent assault or indecency. Bail will probably be withheld because the charge is so serious, or because the man cannot be returned to his home for obvious reasons and has no other place to stay. A further possible reason for withholding bail might be that the police will claim that he needs to be in custody for his own protection since there may be reason for thinking that members of the family or community may seek him out in order to take the law into their own hands.

Once committed to prison, there is a strong likelihood that the other prisoners will attempt to attack him, and he may have to apply to be segregated for his own safety. If he is charged with incest, he will have to wait to be tried at a Crown Court, and this could mean a delay of many months, especially in the London area where the backlog of cases is particularly long.

During this time, his daughter will be interrogated at length, and on many occasions, and will be subjected to an intimate physical examination. She will be asked to denounce and betray her father, and be questioned on the most personal of issues. It may well be that this will be the first time in her life that she will have discussed sex, and

Incest

will be made to do so with frightening strangers, knowing that they are bent on destroying her father. A more exquisite form of mental torture could not be devised. However, this aspect of incest has traditionally been ignored in Britain, since it has been an unquestioned tenet that the man must be punished, and that everything else takes second place, or no place at all.

Finally the case comes to court, the public are admitted, and if the defendant pleads not guilty, the ultimate horror is enacted. The girl, perhaps scarcely tall enough to look out from the witness box, is invited in open court to say what she knows will put her father in prison for many years. She is asked to go through the details she gave to the police, details sometimes known to have been uttered out of malice by an unscrupulous youngster. She will be questioned in a hostile way by her father's barrister, who is working hard to gain an acquittal. Whatever the outcome of the case, however, the damage will have been done, and the innocent will feel guilty.

Time for Change

This system in which the punitive aspect takes precedence over all else is in obvious need of reform. The time is overdue when we should be thinking more about the welfare and happiness of the child than the assuaging of our outrage. We need to make a start by following the example of Israel where children do not attend court in cases where adults are alleged to have involved themselves sexually with them. In some cases, especially where the child's honesty is in doubt, it may be important to reserve the right to challenge in open court evidence given by the child, but we must be mindful of the suffering and harm done by exposing children to the ordeal of being interrogated in this way. The questioning by lawyers or the police should be conducted in as tactful a way as possible, and only where it is absolutely unavoidable.

In Holland and Scandinavia, prosecution is not inevitable, and where it does take place, a period measured in months, rather than years, is often thought sufficient in those cases where a custodial

sentence is felt to be necessary.

There seems to be something in the British tradition that makes it strangely resistant to reforming the penal and judicial systems. Apparently mindless of the fact that our sentencing tariff is the most Draconian in Europe, we are presently contemplating a change which will restrict the power of the parole board to recommend early release in a proportion of cases where a long sentence has been given. Every committee that looks into our penal system reports that it is extremely expensive and succeeds only in removing people from society for the duration of their sentence.

The problems that confront a man being released after a long sentence with nowhere to go are daunting, and would tax the resourcefulness of a person at the peak of his powers; but we allow men, sapped of all self-confidence, bereft of friends, to leave prison, and then wonder when they do not march into a job and make a success of their lives. Sadly, in the current social climate, little may change for the foreseeable future. Incestuous fathers are not top priority for many Members of Parliament or even organisations for social change.

Incest is commonplace, involves all types of people from all social strata, and has the power to affect their lives radically.⁶ In some cases the results can be quite unfortunate, whilst others recall fondly their intrafamilial relationships, saying that the experience was a positive one. The dangers are real, however, and children should be encouraged to look beyond their own households when seeking new ties and friendships.

Nevertheless, let us hope that in the not-too-distant future, we may begin to escape from the unspeakability and hysteria the subject creates. This would be a start, for only then can the issue be raised with a little less passion and a lot more common sense than has been the case for the last twenty-five centuries. We remain ensnared by the fear of magic and the unknown, and have not come very far from the old beliefs that incest causes disasters and the breakdown of society.

There is no evidence whatsoever for this kind of superstition. Furthermore, incestuous mothers and fathers are not intrinsically 'evil' and do not indulge in this type of behaviour through any conscious wish to harm their children.

In truth, it is not too difficult to see why some parents should find their offspring sexually attractive, and why some children would be attracted by the thought of having sex with their guardians, for the parents are closest to the child and his/her first love objects. However, when incest is problematic it is because the parents are the ultimate authority figures over the children who are dependent upon them; because many parents are frequently very possessive; and because there is no easy exit for the child who wants out.

Parents should be encouraged to appreciate these things, and if the overall situation is to be improved, they must work for the type of social changes which would entail a real improvement in the status of children. Ultimately, this will mean, amongst other things, the right of children to choose their own guardians, and the right to institute legal proceedings, both civil and criminal, against adults.

In the meantime, a change from the punitive to the caring - especially towards the younger person - and the ill effects of incest might well be drastically reduced. The time is certainly ripe for a more humane approach.⁽⁷⁾

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Both these headlines were used in an article on incest by Barbara Jeffery (*SUNDAY PEOPLE*, London, February 20th, 1983).
2. *PATTERNS OF INCEST*, by R. E. L. Masters (Julian Press, New York, 1963).

3. *THE BROKEN TABOO*, by Blair and Rita Justice (Human Sciences Press, New York, 1979).
4. 'Forbidden Sexual Behaviour Among Kin: A study of self-selected respondents', by Carolyn L. Symonds, Maureen J. Mendoza, and William C. Harrell (*CHILDREN AND SEX; NEW FINDINGS, NEW PERSPECTIVES*, edited by Larry L. Constantine and Floyd M. Martinson, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1981).
5. *THE BROKEN TABOO* (As above).
6. Many researchers insist that incest must be considered separate from the issue of paedophilia. I entirely endorse this view.
7. Some other books and articles consulted for this study:
INCEST AND HUMAN LOVE, by Robert Stein (The Third Press, Joseph Ojkaku Publishing Co., New York, 1973). *THE INVASION OF COMPULSORY SEX MORALITY*, by Wilhelm Reich (Souvenir Press, 1972). *THE EROTIC MINORITIES: A SWEDISH VIEW*, by Lars Ullerstam (Calder and Boyars, London, 1967). *THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND THE STATE*, by Frederick Engels (Pathfinder Press, New York, 1972). *RELATED TO SEX*, by Claire Rayner (Paddington Press, 1979/Haaly Paperbacks, Middlesex, 1980). *PORKY*, by Deborah Moggach (Jonathan Cape, 1983). *SIGMUND FREUD ON SEXUALITY* (Pelican Books, 1977). *SEX WITHOUT SHAME*, by Alayne Yates (Maurice Temple Smith, London, 1979). *ADULT SEXUAL INTEREST IN CHILDREN*, edited by Mark Cook and Kevin Howells (Academic Press, London, 1981). *PATTERNS OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR*, by Clellan S. Ford and Frank A. Beach (Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1952). *PERSPECTIVES ON PAEDOPHILIA*, edited by Brian Taylor (Batsford Academic and Educational, London, 1981). *INCEST: FACT AND MYTH*, by Sarah Nelson (Stramullion Co-operative Ltd., Edinburgh, 1982). 'Understanding Incest', by W. B. Pomeroy (*FORUM* magazine, vol.10, no.6). 'Incest '78', by Ann Hooper (*FORUM* magazine, no.15, June, 1977). 'When Your Father Is Your Lover', by Kay Carmichael (*THE GUARDIAN*, London, May 11th, 1983).

Chapter 2

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY & EROTICA

by RICHARD GREEN ('DOMINIK')

As I sit at a window of my flat in an obscure town in central Africa, three pubescent boys appear outside and proceed to do something a bit 'naughty'. After a moment, one of them looks up and sees me watching. The others then look up laughing, smile and wave to me. I reply in kind, smiling and waving. I have instantly become a part of their conspiracy, their secret. As they walk away, they keep looking back, perhaps hoping to be invited in. Had the same thing happened in England, I hardly think they would have waved at me, a complete stranger. The reaction would have been quite different, the alienation between children and adults being almost total.

I had the misfortune to be born in England, through no fault of my own, and I would never, by choice, return to live there any more than I would choose a penal institution as my domicile. Also, through no fault of my own, I am an enthusiastic boylover and have been since I myself was in the throes of puberty with no-one to teach me about love and sex, as I so desperately wanted. Since lovers and nurturers of young people are so despised and unwelcome by officialdom and much of the populace of that sceptered isle, this explains my anglophobia. It also partly explains my interest in pictures of youngsters. With a real relationship being so dangerous, at least pictures are better than nothing at all. Since the great scare of 1977, however, even plain pictures of naked youngsters in non-erotic situations have become dynamite likely to explode in one's face if one doesn't take the most fastidious care with them.

Of course, it isn't a fault to be born in England, England could be a delightful place, and can be within certain limitations. Likewise it is no fault to be a boylover. It is part of the natural variety of life. Boylovers, girl-lovers, gays, gerontophiles, etc., should all be welcome as part of the intrinsic fabric of society. There are always some areas of life where our particular interests and attributes can be usefully channelled for the benefit of society at large. I have witnessed, for example, many positive man/boy relationships over the years and recent research into this aspect of paedophilia is beginning to bear witness to this truth.⁽¹⁾

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for child pornography. No empirical evidence is available from 'scientific' research into the effects of child pornography on the children participating, or upon children as viewers of porn. Research has been conducted into the effects of adult porn on adult viewers and, to some extent, its effects on these adults' prior childhood experiences; but researchers are loath to employ young people (minors) in scientific study from both a moral and legal standpoint. As with paedophilia generally, most 'statistics' emanate from case histories of children with other problems, or of dissatisfied adults who have concluded - or their psychiatrists have - that their present unhappy state was brought about in part by childhood promiscuity or involvement in porn (no doubt by an exploitive adult). These statistics, while having some validity, are wholly unrepresentative of the overall situation.

In this chapter, then, I have attempted to give arguments both for and against child pornography. Despite being a consumer - or ex-consumer - of child porn, being a boylover - or paedophile - means that I am more concerned for the welfare, freedoms and happiness of the child than I am for mere personal pleasure and titillation - probably far more so than many of the self-styled 'child protectors' - who are often more interested in popularity and money.

Child pornography means different things to different people, as does beauty, sexual attraction, and morality. It is all rather

subjective, in stark contrast to the objectivity of the material itself. When laws are created to control it, however, they should be definitive. The etymological definition of pornography ('depiction of whores') has long been cast through the window. Definitions of that word in British law today tend to hinge upon other words, notably 'indecenty' and 'obscenity', which are themselves open to interpretation.

During the crash of '77, when all the white Caucasian English-speaking legislatures of the world were falling over each other to be the first to outlaw child pornography - and thus prove that they were concerned to 'protect' the children of their particular domain - the difficulties they found in trying to decide exactly what it was they were wanting to outlaw, and the amazing suppositions they made to justify the legislation, have to be seen to be believed.⁽²⁾

Taking Australia as an example; the government of New South Wales which, by an Act of Parliament, has grouped all publications into one of four categories, defines category (d) Child Pornography Publications (added by a 1977 amendment to the Act) as; material which "depicts children - those who are, or appear to be, under the age of 16 - engaged in an activity of a sexual nature, or in the presence of another person so engaged." Notice that by this definition, the 'child' could be over sixteen and clothed.

Tasmania defines a 'Child Abuse Publication' as one which "contains a depiction of (a) a child who is engaged in an activity or pose of a sexual nature or is in the presence of a person who is so engaged; or (b) cruelty, violence, or revolting or abhorrent phenomena involving a child, whether or not the child's involvement is active or passive." A child here is defined as a person under sixteen years of age. In this instance, simple sexual expression, innocuous as it may be, is lumped together with cruelty and violence.⁽³⁾

1977 was a very good year for anti-child porn buffs. The state of Victoria jumped on the band-wagon by introducing The Police Offences (Child Pornography) Act, 1977 which created a new offence of producing,

publishing, or selling any 'obscene' article which portrays, describes, or represents a child. Presumably, this would also include written fantasy. A child is defined, again, as a person who 'appears to the court' to be under the age of sixteen, or who is expressly or by implication represented to be under sixteen.

In Western Australia, it is an offence under the Indecent Publications Act to publish, distribute, or sell, any 'indecent' or 'obscene' book, paper, or picture. Once more, no statutory definitions of indecent or obscene are provided. Instead, a State Advisory Committee on publications has been instituted which reviews publications and decides whether or not they make undesirable reading for persons under eighteen and should be classified as restricted publications, or whether they should be subject to criminal proceedings. The committee in their deliberations work to a set of guidelines of which item (v) states: "Where articles, photographs and cartoon drawings depict explicit sexual activity, the Committee have usually recommended restriction, unless the activity is perverted, involves children, involves incest, or has overtones of sadism or brutality (whether sexual or not), where they have recommended prosecution." Clearly, sex and violence are once again lumped together indiscriminately. Interestingly though, it would appear that a description of a school caning could also be prosecuted using these criteria.

The Crash: Its History and Effects

Like all good things, the scare over child porn came to England from the USA. Its immediate precursor was the child sex scare and its attendant and still running GAPW (Great American Pedophile Witchhunt), the hysteria of which was also exported to the English-speaking peoples of the world, with knock-on effects in other, more sexually sober countries. It was, on reflection, not *too* difficult to purchase child pornography over the counter back in its heyday of 1975/6. The prices of good quality films were also coming down due to increased competition and an expanding market; but there was never anywhere near the enormous

variety of magazines, etc., that 'expert' witnesses to congressional hearings had us believe. If there were, I certainly never saw them. Unfortunately, child porn and paedophilia are always equated in the minds of the public, press, police and politicians in a way that adult porn and heterosexuality are not; i.e. all paedophiles use child porn, and all child porn producers are paedophiles, both of which are false premises.

Many of these ideas and beliefs have been fostered by the press who are great creators of public opinion. The NEWS OF THE WORLD, for example, used juxtaposition to subtly brainwash the public into believing that PIE (the Paedophile Information Exchange) produced child porn by writing about the two unrelated topics and interweaving the paragraphs so that a relationship between the two was 'assumed' by the readership. The press also used, without justification, such loaded expressions as 'this evil organisation' to fuel the fires of hate and hysteria in the public, whereas many PIE members that I knew were people of high moral and ethical standards, unlike many journalists.

In their same self-righteous way, the media have described unnamed and unknown producers of child porn. They, and other publicity seekers, have also produced unsubstantiated facts and figures relating to the amount of child porn that is (or was) being produced and the numbers of minors involved, then doubled and quadrupled them for good measure.

Robin Lloyd⁽⁴⁾ informed us that there were two hundred and sixty-four kiddie porn magazines circulating in the USA, but didn't name them; Judianne 'Jingle Bells' Densen-Gerber⁽⁵⁾ said that she had counted four hundred different children who "had been affected by abuse and pornography," but added that Robin Lloyd had counted three hundred thousand boys. She assumed that there were as many girls as boys, bringing the total to six hundred thousand which she then doubled because "Lloyd felt the number was twice what he could statistically validate." Inspector Lloyd Martin of the LAPD Pornography Unit claimed an estimate of thirty to fifty producers of child porn in Los Angeles alone, but then admitted that he had only been able to bring one to court. The CHICAGO TRIBUNE (which was the paper that really kicked off

the child sex scare in 1977) also had reporters testify⁽⁶⁾ that "We believe we have established conclusively that child pornography and child prostitution, which are inextricably tied to each other, are multi-million dollar industries exploiting thousands of children as young as three years old." Such fairy stories and blatant exaggerations were all swallowed by a gullible public and their elected representatives, egged on by the force of the media. We were caught up in a tide of irreversible magnitude, and anyone who dared to step out of line was swept away by the current.

The press/police also used child porn as a vehicle from which to attack pedophiles as, for instance, during the arrest of Martin Swithinbank and friends in the US.⁽⁷⁾ During the raid, police did considerable damage to his house and seized all his possessions, including three hundred and fifty video tapes and several 8mm films. DA Dillon told reporters from New York City newspapers that all the video tapes depicted hard-core sex involving minor males. New York papers headlined their stories on the arrests with phrases such as 'Man/Boy Sex Ring Smashed' and 'Child Porno Ring Cracked'. No porn or prostitution charges were filed against any of the men arrested. It was later revealed that none of the videos was porn; they were tapes of such things as 'I Love Lucy' and 'Bambi'. On July 20th, however, Dillon and detective Doddato appeared on NBC's 'Eyewitness News' and said they had uncovered massive amounts of child pornography.

Judianne Densen-Gerber carried her tirade to Australia, then, as the hysteria over PIE began developing towards the end of '77, she teamed up with Mary Whitehouse and the British press to bamboozle people in the UK. On December 16th, the EVENING NEWS had a leader, 'How Children Are Lured Into Porn' and claimed that the "growing market for child porn" was "bringing vast profits running into thousands of pounds each week for some of its operators," unsubstantiated, of course. The other slant the paper took was that the youngsters were 'assaulted' after the photo session was over, and gave us an insight into police tactics when it told us of 'Jimmy from Enfield' who started off modelling tracksuits. This progressed to naked wrestling in the bedroom

with other boys. When questioned (interrogated?) by police he broke down (the police are quite capable of breaking down young boys) and admitted that his 'uncle' had sexually assaulted him. The article went on to admit that many of the youngsters "are at the age of being sexually stimulated by such pranks, and one thing leads to another. They are invariably later assaulted by the photographer, but getting them to talk about it is a very painstaking job. They have an overwhelming feeling of shame and guilt." They probably didn't have this feeling during the photo session or sex play, but it was certainly brought about after hours of police interrogation.

In January '78, the Festival of Light⁽⁹⁾ declared that it wanted it to be an offence to sell or display pornographic material to children, including sex education publications. The DAILY MIRROR exploited the situation to its advantage by 'exposing' certain people who had taken some rather mundane pictures of naked lads, thereby exposing the boys to public humiliation as well.

In more recent times,⁽⁹⁾ a Minister of Education under the Conservative government made an outburst in parliament about certain sex education books which were recommended by the Health Education Council, because they did not toe the party line but told the facts instead. For example, Bent Claësson says⁽¹⁰⁾ that "pædophiles are generally kindly people who treat children tenderly and affectionately."

However, the outcome of all the hysteria and lying was that legislation of various sorts was enacted hurriedly in many countries and states. In the USA, following the sham Congressional Hearing, Bill HR4572 was introduced to "amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to prohibit the sexual exploitation of children and the transportation and dissemination of photos or films depicting such exploitation." Robin Lloyd did get one thing right, though, at the hearing when he said that "Children are way down at the bottom of the list of America's priorities. They (children) care about love and in this they have a great advantage over adults because if a child is loved, that child knows it is loved for itself, not its money. They are

too young to vote; too young to have consumer spending power; too young to have lobbyists speak for them. But they are old enough to understand when they are not wanted, and in their little world, there's nothing so finally perceived and so finally felt as injustice."

But what injustice? Who says they are too young to vote or to have consumer spending power; and why are they too young to have lobbyists speak for them? I think this is one thing they vitally need to break out of, this oppressive protectionism.

Interestingly enough, an official body, the Illinois Legislative Investigation Committee⁽¹¹⁾ said that there was no organised attempt at creating or distributing child pornography, and it condemned publicity seekers like Robin Lloyd, Densen-Gerber, and Father Bruce Ritter for not documenting their charges.

Also, as far back as 1960, the US Congress established a 'Commission on noxious printed or pictured material dealing with acts or suggestive acts of sexuality, and sexual deviations or perversions, and the commission by readers or viewers thereby of criminal, delinquent, or other anti-social acts.' One major conclusion was that Congress should encourage "unprejudiced factual research performed by qualified scientists." The Congressional Hearing of 1977 was blatantly quite oblivious to this recommendation and listened only to unqualified or prejudiced exponents.

Britain, of course, followed America with Cyril Townsend's misnamed Protection of Children Bill, which passed onto the statute book with hardly an eyebrow raised in objection. The effect of this Act has been to squelch virtually all publications depicting youngsters. Even magazines depicting simple nudity have now been rendered unobtainable in the UK through legitimate retail outlets. The saug SUN newspaper still displays buxom sixteen and seventeen year old females on page three, praising their sexual stimulative power in euphenistic ways while roundly condemning anyone who shows an interest in someone younger.

Children's Reaction to Porn

In his book, *TO DEPRAVE AND CORRUPT*, Alan Burns gives us some idea of the effect on minors of 'guided' exposure to pornography using information from people now older, or teenagers on an anecdotal basis. The information from these sources indicates that "Young people are as capable of putting pornography into a sane perspective in their lives as are their elders." He also describes the effect of exposure to pornography on a family:

"In one case it was possible to make an actual test on the effect of pornography in the home by allowing pornographic slides to be seen, with appropriate discussion by all six members of a family group. The youngest, a girl of nine, put them in the category of rude or vulgar, but considered it her rightful privilege as a member of the family not to have been excluded from seeing them. Her next oldest sister, thirteen, responded by subsequently being more confiding in sexual discussions with her parents, whereas previously they had been seriously concerned at losing contact and not being able to reach her as an adolescent having troubles of teenage adjustment.

"Visiting with the family at the time was a nephew of eleven. He believed that he was old enough and responsible enough for this new step in his always broad sex education; but he took the step when he returned home of getting his parents' confirmation that they approved of it. His uncle and aunt who had taken what was for them an essentially experimental step in the dark, were pleased to have contributed something to the advancement of sexological science, and to have added yet another increment of confidence and trust in their relationship with their children. Their gain had been to learn a point of view on pornography with which to approach their children. They had rescued their children from the need to adopt a behind-the-scenes, smutty attitude towards pornography and helped them to view it scientifically and morally instead. In so doing,

they had spared their children from being forced into the traditional point of view that to see pictorial representations of the normal sex act is dirty - surely a ridiculous corner, if ever there was one, for the adult generation to have painted itself into."⁽¹²⁾

The emphasis here, then, is on guided exposure. Psychiatrist, Dr. Benjamin Karpaan⁽¹³⁾ suggested that a young boy reaching adolescence is "hungry for information about sex." Without more appropriate and legitimate sources of such information, however, he ultimately looks in the gutter where "he comes across pornographic materials and literature that draws him into all sorts of gang life, which discharges itself as juvenile delinquency." Looking back, I was certainly hungry for sex information when I was twelve, but couldn't find any. Undoubtedly, I would have enjoyed looking at porno magazines had anyone provided me with them - some kindly paedophile perhaps!

Mr. Justice Cobb, in a case at Winchester Crown Court⁽¹⁴⁾ commented: "Those who say that pornographic magazines do no harm should come and sit in my court to see what actually happens." As he jailed a man for five years on ten charges of 'sexually assaulting' young boys, he continued: "This is the third case in eight days where pornographic magazines have been used to excite and arouse young boys of eleven and twelve." At least the good judge is admitting that boys of that age are aroused by sexual stimuli, yet still presumes they must not be 'allowed' to enjoy such arousal, or to learn from it. But could these not have been cases of 'guided exposure'?

Children are exposed to a lot of violence on TV these days. If this violence is gratuitous, and not presented to them in proper context, then these attitudes could well implant themselves into the youngsters' own make-up. This is one area in which I am in accord with Mrs. Whitehouse. Pornography, which I have to admit is also an undesirable element in our society, can be introduced to children in an understanding way. They are quite capable of putting it into context. Burns gives a splendid analogy in the Crucifixion, where children at

Sunday School are told the story, which is probably illustrated by 30 models of Christ on the cross. When the children come home, however, they don't start playing crucifixion games, nailing up their playmates, because the story was told in context, with all its various moral lessons and dogma.

"The moral standard we teach today's children regarding pornography is that it is dirty and forbidden (to them). By default we teach them that if they learn about it, they must do it in secret and then protect us adults from knowing what they know. The standard that we impart is that visual or narrative portrayal of all eroticism is bad and forbidden - even the portrayal of what they will one day be required to accept as normal."

So what of children's involvement in pornography itself? As mentioned earlier, there are few, if any, scientific studies available; but if 'guided exposure' to pornography clearly does a child no harm, then there is no reason to suppose that a child's active involvement in porn in a guided or enlightened way should in any way be detrimental. Children generally enjoy being photographed and, if they are extrovert, will be happy for other people to see pictures of them, perhaps even naked pictures. From personal experience as a boy, when I was fourteen or so, I managed to borrow my father's old Kodak camera; having saved enough pocket money to buy a roll of film, I proceeded to try to take sexy pictures of myself. I would have done the same at an earlier age if I had had access to a camera. It was unfortunate that I couldn't process the film myself for some years, by which time the film, which I had hidden, had disappeared.

No, the mere taking of erotic pictures of a youngster will not generally cause harm. The damage and trauma will occur when the pictures are discovered by some authority (the police or disapproving parents) who then instil into that child a sense of guilt and shame; or when the child itself has grown up into an adult world where the aforementioned senses have been inculcated into him/her. The only other likely cause of distress would be where the child has these feelings and

is posing, therefore, unwillingly. If any sort of force or coercion is used, there will naturally be a high likelihood of trauma. This is where exploitation becomes a problem and is an area worth careful consideration. All public verbalising about child porn has, of course, revolved around this aspect of exploitation by unscrupulous people bent on making a fortune out of children. But most child 'porn' that was ever available was of pictures taken by paedophiles of their young friends having a good time. These people did not make any money. The publishers of the magazines that contained the pictures were the ones more likely to profit.

Feminists believe, with some justification, that many men tend to regard women and children as objects or chattels,^{'15'} and that pornography is a manifestation of this objectivity; also that the adult male is always the 'aggressor' in any relationship, even in adult homosexual relationships where one partner assumes a subservient or 'feminine' role.^{'16'} Indeed, much pornography does reflect this attitude of mind which is prevalent among western societies. However, most men do not think of children as 'sexual' objects, and anyway, objectivity of this kind often emanates from sexual repression itself. While we should encourage role exchanges, we must remember that, in the sexual sphere, children do need to learn, and while they are doing so they expect adults to teach them. This implies taking some initiative, though this needn't be a one way affair.

There is, however, one overwhelming difference in the legal situation which would have a bearing on the content of 'pornographic' materials; men can legally have sex with women; men can legally have sex with other men; women can legally have sex with men or women; but men cannot legally have sex with 'minors', and children are forbidden to have sex with anyone. Therefore, for a boylover for instance, the mere pictorial viewing of the naked young body can be sufficiently stimulating to provide a release; and it can be seen that by far the majority of child 'porn' pictures are of youngsters romping naked without direct sexual involvement with an adult. This, in my opinion,

Child Pornography & Erotica

can hardly be thought of as pornography, and only 'indecent' if one considers the naked human body or sexual excitement to be so.

What Should Be Done About It?

As I have already indicated, I personally feel that pornography is an undesirable phenomenon of present society; and I distinguish here between erotica and pornography, since erotica is a perfectly valid form of expression. I say 'undesirable' in the sense that in a healthy, happy society where its members are tolerant, responsible, free from prejudice, and free to explore interpersonal relationships without any sense of guilt or shame, then pornography would not have the same impact.⁽¹⁰⁾ Its very presence today indicates the failure of society to provide for a fullness of life for all its members. This is largely the fault of organised religions and their narrow, myopic, prohibitive views on sexuality.

What constitutes child pornography is determined, as shown earlier, most often by ages of consent laws. If ages of consent were to be abolished as a criterion for sexual experience, then child porn as a separate issue would disappear. PIE believed that child porn should not be considered in isolation.⁽¹¹⁾ This is what they had to say:

"Insofar as our society denies children the rights and freedoms which it accords to adults; insofar as children are kept in calculated ignorance, and are actively deceived in matters relating to sexuality in general and their own in particular; insofar as children are conditioned to accept a subservient role to adults by this society, the special vulnerability of children to exploitation in the production of pornography is an artificially separate issue. PIE directs its policymaking to the reform of contemporary society, with the express intention that these indefensible inequalities inflicted by society upon children be eradicated. Any argument which is constructed upon the injustices of the status quo (e.g: the way that children are taught to react to homosexuality) is a specious and complacent one. PIE does not dignify the status quo

by arguing within its constraints. A concerted, universal programme of re-education, making the general population, adult and child, aware of the true diversity and complexity of human sexual behaviour; a systematic and comprehensive restructuring of society's concept of male and female; a thorough purging of all our institutions of every vestige of sexual prejudice; and above all, a fundamental revision of the law in relation to sexual behaviour; these are the measures that must be taken. They do not represent a neat and simple solution, a placebo for the electorate; but then the problems are not neat and simple either."

This is all very well on paper, of course, but is it at all practical in the foreseeable future? One can't change society overnight without a bloody revolution. Perhaps there should be some sort of regulation of the pornography 'business'?

One commentator⁽²⁰⁾ agrees with PIE that the best way to regulate the production and sale of child porn is to work to end the sexual repression that makes such items profitable. As an interim measure, Tom O'Carroll⁽²¹⁾ favours a monitored, legitimate erotica (does he mean pornography?) industry in which all participants - like stage actors - whether they be adult or child, should be able to claim a minimum wage and other working standards. A legitimate child porn industry would not be possible, however, until the laws against children expressing their sexuality are repealed.

Does child porn stimulate crimes against children? Dr. Kutchinsky reporting on the Danish experience of abolition of censorship observed that there was a reduction of two-thirds in the number of sex offences against children during 1967-69. During 1973, the last year of significant increase in the availability of child porn, the figures levelled off.⁽²²⁾ So this would give the impression that child porn magazines did serve a useful purpose in acting as an outlet, or surrogate, for those people whose desire was for sexual relationships with children, and who might have got themselves and their young friends

into trouble had they sought out genuine relationships. Again, child porn is a poor substitute for the 'real thing', but is better than nothing for some people.

There is little evidence to show that child porn incites people to have sex with children or to violently assault them. My fear is that with child porn now unavailable, and with penalties for adult/child sex so horrendously severe, the more unprincipled and unscrupulous will be driven still further towards kidnapping and forcing children into sex against their will. This is a definite possibility. Also clear is that child porn production will be driven underground and will attract the criminal element and non-pædophile.

Constantine⁽²³⁾ also, observes that: "Few commentators have considered whether erotica portraying minors may represent the only acceptable outlet for the sexual preferences of pædophiles and as such may be a substitute for actual molestation." He adds: "Were the sexual rights of children vigorously defended, pornography would undoubtedly continue, but its production could be made more accessible to policing."

Of course, erotica portraying children is illegal under the Protection of Children Act if the pictures are construed by a court as indecent. The indecisiveness of the word 'indecent' frightens people away from producing or selling child erotica. But perhaps that is what society wants these days. As a boy, I used to wear shorts to school, and I was aware of how 'sexy' my legs must have appeared to some people. Nowadays, most English boys cover their legs. It would be interesting to hear the psychological arguments as to why. Perhaps we shall soon see English schoolboys draped in black, like Saudi women, not allowed to expose an inch of their sensuous bodies.

When I have lived in countries where the boys' sexuality is given relatively free rein, and the lads discover I am a boylover, it is often the boys who come looking for me, rather than vice versa. I have also found that when I am in a situation where I know I can have a sexual and emotional relationship at almost any time, my need for pictorial

stimulation diminishes to next to nothing. In addition, my sexual urges are not so frequent or imminent. I have my satisfaction, the boys have theirs and all are happy. However, in sexually repressive countries, I find I need to resort to boy pictures very frequently, in order that I don't have the urge to strike up a friendship with a lad.

Pornographic pictures are not so desperately sought as they once were; I am usually content with just plain pictures of happy children. I would imagine, through my contacts with other boylovers, that I am not uncommon in this respect. However, many years ago, when I was yearning for sexual contact with boys and never had any, the availability of pornographic pictures was one of the most important requirements of my life. I imagine that child erotica can still serve a useful purpose for repressed pedophiles who must not allow themselves to enjoy a full and rewarding relationship, and who have never done so. Perhaps the law could be revised to allow old child erotica that was produced before all this new legislation was introduced, to recirculate, and become available again to those who could benefit from it. Though unlikely, this is the only solution that I can see in the short term.⁽²⁴⁾

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. See for example, Drs. Theo Sandfort's *THE SEXUAL ASPECTS OF PÉDOPHILE RELATIONS* (Pan/Spartacus, Amsterdam, 1982), and *BOYS SPEAK OUT ON MAN/BOY LOVE* (NAMBLA, USA, 1981).
2. 'Report of the Committee on Obscenity and Film Censorship', Prof. Bernard Williams et al (HMSO, London, 1979).
3. Few would question that we should have laws to protect children from violence and cruelty and the depiction of such in porno magazines. It is this constant blurring of sex with violence which is dangerous.
4. *FOR MONEY OR LOVE/PLAYLAND* (Vanguard Press, USA, 1976/Blond & Briggs, London & Essex, 1977).
5. *Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee of the Judiciary of the*

- United States House of Representatives, 95th Congress, hearings on the 'Sexual Exploitation of Children',*
6. *Miss Sneed, journalist, CHICAGO HERALD TRIBUNE,*
 7. *GAY COMMUNITY NEWS (USA, August 1st, 1981),*
 8. *Source: EVENING NEWS (London, January 18th, 1978),*
 9. *Source: DAILY TELEGRAPH (London, January 10th, 1983),*
 10. *Revised edition of Bent H. Claësson's BOY, GIRL/MAN, WOMAN (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1980). Other sex education books that were criticised included: Dr. Miriam Stoppard's TALKING SEX; A BOOK ABOUT GROWING UP (Pan Books, London, 1982), and Jane Cousin's MAKE IT HAPPY (first pub. by Virago Books, 1978, and reprinted by Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1980),*
 11. *Illinois Legislative Investigation Committee report on 'Sexual Exploitation of Children',*
 12. *TO DEPRAVE AND CORRUPT; TECHNICAL REPORTS OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY, edited by Alan Burns (Davis-Poynter, London, 1972),*
 13. *Quoted in the Burns study (above),*
 14. *Source: WOMAN'S OWN magazine (London, April 16th, 1977),*
 15. *PORNOGRAPHY; MEN POSSESSING WOMEN, by Andrea Dworkin (The Women's Press, London, 1981),*
 16. *PORNOGRAPHY AND SILENCE; CULTURE'S REVENGE AGAINST NATURE, by Susan Griffin (The Women's Press, London, 1981),*
 17. *Regarding the feminist criticism that men are always the sexual 'aggressors', we should find Ford & Beach's analysis of the situation extremely interesting. On pp285/6 of their study PATTERNS OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR (Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1952) they say: "The societies that severely restrict adolescent and preadolescent sex play, those that enjoin girls to be modest, retiring and submissive, appear to produce adult women that are incapable or at least unwilling to be sexually aggressive. The feminine products of such cultural training are likely to remain relatively inactive even during marital intercourse. And, quite often, they do not experience clear-cut sexual orgasm. In contrast, the societies which permit or encourage early sex play usually allow females a greater degree of freedom in seeking sexual*

- contacts. Under such circumstances the sexual performance of the mature woman seems to be characterised by a certain degree of aggression, to include definite and vigorous activity, and to result regularly in complete and satisfactory orgasm."
18. Although we must work towards the type of society where the need for pornography is drastically reduced, we will never eliminate either erotica or pornography, since it will always have an educational and therapeutic value.
 19. PIE unpublished discussion paper, attempting to reach a concise position on pornography (September, 1980).
 20. In *THE AGE TABOO: GAY MALE SEXUALITY, POWER AND CONSENT*, edited by Daniel Tsang (Alyson Publications, USA/Gay Men's Press, London, 1981).
 21. *PÆDOPHILIA: THE RADICAL CASE*, by Tom O'Carroll (Peter Owen, London, 1980).
 22. Dr. Berl Kutchinsky in 'Pornography: Does it cut down on Sexual Crimes?' (*WOMAN'S OWN*, April 16th, 1977).
 23. *CHILDREN AND SEX: NEW FINDINGS, NEW PERSPECTIVES*, edited by Larry Constantine and Floyd Martinson (Little, Brown & Co., USA, 1981).
 24. Some other books and articles consulted for this study: *WOMEN, SEX AND PORNOGRAPHY*, by Beatrice Faust (first pub. by Melbourne House, 1980/reprinted by Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1981). *OBSCENITY*, by Geoffrey Robertson (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1979). *PORNOGRAPHY: THE LONGFORD REPORT*, edited by Lord Longford (Coronet, London, 1972). *THE FAILURE OF THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION*, by George Frankl (Nel Mentor Books, New English Library, London, 1975). *WHATEVER HAPPENED TO SEX?* by Mary Whitehouse (Wayland, Sussex, 1977). 'Looking at Pornography', by G. Blachford (*GAY LEFT* journal, No.6, summer 1978). *PORNOGRAPHY*, by M. Goldstein & H. Kant (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1973). *SEX, VIOLENCE, AND THE MEDIA*, by H. J. Eysenck & D. K. B. Nias (Temple Smith, London, 1978). 'Porn, Rape, and Justice', by David Ramsay Steele (*FREE LIFE: THE JOURNAL OF THE LIBERTARIAN ALLIANCE*, Vol.3, No.2). 'Porn' (*TIME OUT* magazine, No.653, May 6th-12th, 1983). 'Gay Porn: Men's Images of Men' (*THE LEVELLER*, October 30th-November 12th, 1981). 'Pornography: Fantasy, Reality' (old *GAY NEWS*, No.262).

Chapter 3

CHILD PROSTITUTION

by WARREN MIDDLETON

Defining Prostitution

The Oxford English Dictionary defines prostitution as "The offering of the body to indiscriminate lewdness for hire (especially as a practice or institution); whoredom, harlotry."

At first glance the above would seem perfectly logical. But as Eustace Chesser has shown, defining prostitution is not as simple as it sounds,

"What can be said of the woman (or man for that matter - *ed*) who marries for money? She differs from the street-walker in that she keeps to the same client, not because she loves him, but because marriage is easier and more profitable than promiscuity. Morally, there is little to choose between the two. The gold-digger is lucky enough to be spared the trouble of touting her favours. She may be more highly paid than the less fortunate professional, and the possession of a wedding ring gives her the appearance of respectability. The fact remains that except in name such a marriage is legalised prostitution."⁽¹⁾

Seen in this light, it becomes clear that the possibilities are virtually endless. Some, indeed, would venture even further by claiming that because the very act of marriage implies the promise of rewards, that marriage is, in itself, little short of a variation of the same theme.

I mention this, not merely to demonstrate the difficulties of

definition, but to show that opponents of adult/child sex who accuse paedophiles of encouraging childhood prostitution by giving children money or other material rewards are on extremely perilous ground themselves as measured by their own yardstick.

The exchange of gifts between parties is a custom which has been practised from time immemorial. It is universally regarded as a token of love, affection and gratitude. The problem comes when such gifts are viewed as ends in themselves, or overshadow the giver in their degree of importance.

So where do we draw the line? For the purpose of this study, I will confine my meaning to that which entails the expectation, by both participants, of repeated financial or material payments made, either to the child, or to someone claiming to act on his/her behalf; where, in other words, sex is regarded, first and foremost, as a business transaction.

An Historical Synopsis

Prostitution has often been called 'the oldest profession', a distinction which, strictly speaking, should be reserved for the priesthood. But as Craig Scott points out, primitive priesthoods often enjoyed a symbiotic relationship with prostitution. "By offering gratification to man's urge towards the exotic, early religions not only served as benefactors to their faithful but reaped large revenues from the fees paid for the services of well trained temple harlots."⁽²⁾

In the world of the ancient Hebrews, before the period known as the Babylonian Captivity of the sixth century BC, the Jewish people were not especially sex negative in their attitudes, as some mistakenly aver. Both homosexuality and paedophilia flourished, as did the ritualised temple prostitution of boys and girls, known as 'qadesh' and 'qedheshah' respectively, which translated literally means 'holy ones'.

Beyond this period, with the dawning realisation that they were the

Child Prostitution

chosen people, the Jews were gripped by a strong nationalistic fervour which manifested itself in attempts to distinguish themselves from the Assyrians, Egyptians,⁽³⁾ Babylonians, and Canaanites, and from their eroticised religious rituals. With the coming of King Josiah (640-609 BC), the resident prostitutes in the Temple of Jerusalem were expelled, and a purge was instigated on the sensual elements of their religion. The anti-life concept of sex negativism, with all its attendant miseries, had begun.

The classical Greek term for prostitution was 'porneia', and we know from various documents and literary works passed onto us, including the GREEK ANTHOLOGY, that the prostitution of youths was reasonably common in ancient Greece, at least until the time of Solon. Indeed, it was even the object of a particular tax which was ratified annually by the senate of the five hundred. For the ordinary non-Athenian citizen there appeared to have been no special laws against it, though it was generally deemed degrading and treated as non-legitimate eros - something which is not surprising since mutual respect and responsibility were important concomitants of the ideal Greek love situation.

Prostitution was, however, probably illegal for Athenian citizens. It was certainly an offence for Athenians who had prostituted themselves in their youth to claim certain civic rights, including the right to address the Assembly. It was under this rule that the government official, Timarkhos, was successfully prosecuted by Eschines in 346 BC. The ostensible motivation for this particular law was to safeguard the interests of the general community, since internal security was considered at risk.⁽⁴⁾

In ancient Persia, various sexual practices were winked at, including prostitution. Unlike the Greeks, however, Persian boylove was of the adventurous 'Sport of Kings' variety often associated with heterosexuals looking for new kicks. According to Herodotus, the Persians were thought to have picked up boylove from the Greeks, and it was then transmitted to the Romans.

The pre-Christian Roman empire was a veritable hotbed for every conceivable form of sexual taste imaginable. Thus it is hardly surprising that, as with the slave trade, there was a ready and eager market for boys and girls of all ages. But the Romans were a notoriously cruel, loveless people whose purely hedonistic sexual philosophy - devoid of any semblance of responsibility - was as far removed as anything from the ideal Greek love ethic. Indeed, Roman excesses were at least partly responsible for the severity of the anti-sex codes which were such a prominent feature of the later Christian era.

Brothels were commonplace throughout the empire and children were transported from many parts of the globe to serve the Roman sexual appetites. Particularly favoured were Greek, Germanic and Eastern children. Places of entertainment, such as the Coliseum, doubled as hunting grounds for young hustlers and their clients, as did areas like the Via Suburrana. There were even special establishments which trained youngsters, from the age of four onwards, how to give maximum sexual pleasure, and Antinous, Hadrian's favourite, was himself thought to have come from such stock.

Male prostitution was particularly rampant, and as de Becker points out, it "overwhelmed everything else". Since Romans were frequently on the move and away from their families for long periods at a time, prostitution was especially suited to their way of life, and it was often the practice for soldiers and businessmen to bring boys along with them on their travels to serve as escorts and bed companions. The buying and selling of sex invaded every walk of life; even the noble Emperor Augustus was said to have prostituted himself in his youth to Aulus Hirtius for three hundred thousand sesterces.

But after the death of Heliogabalus, both male and female prostitution were heavily restricted. When his cousin, Severus (208-235 AD), became emperor he deported homosexuals and imposed a tax on prostitutes. A little later, the Emperor Philip attempted to outlaw them altogether. In the early fourth century AD, several church councils passed judgements on homosexuals, and when the Emperor

Child Prostitution

Constantine was converted to Christianity in 323, the doom of the old order was finally sealed.

As the Roman empire began to disintegrate, so the witchhunt against homosexuals and prostitutes intensified. The later Christian Emperors, Valentinian and Theodosius, issued edicts making homosexuality punishable by death, and in the sixth century, the superstitious Justinian produced two 'novellæ' blaming sodomites for famines, earthquakes and pestilences.⁽⁶⁾

When the Roman empire fell, child prostitution was already well established in many Eastern cultures, nurtured once again, by the existence of a flourishing slave traffic. As in the West, it assumed many forms and disguises, though rarely did it attract the same degree of opprobrium. In many areas, in fact, its practitioners were often revered, and in some parts, this still holds true even to today.

The prostitution of boys was especially common in the mediæval Turkish empire and children were frequently transported great distances to attend the needs of Turkish nobles and their rulers in the ninth and tenth centuries. But whereas the ancient Greeks encouraged 'masculine' attributes, the Turks preferred heavily perfumed 'feminised' boys, a trait which was not uncommon in the East.

Conquering Turkish armies were followed by slave traders who rounded up victims destined for the notorious city slave markets. Some of these youngsters were 'tribute children' kidnapped from various corners of the empire in lieu of taxes. And after the slave markets came brothels, and establishments were quickly set up which taught children, from the earliest ages onwards, how to combine sex with entertainment. It was in this way that dancing/singing boys became particular favourites, as they were in numerous other Eastern countries.

Islamic poetry and literature of the Middle Ages confirms that child prostitution was common in the Moslem East. De Becker points out that among the Arabs, in contrast to the ancient Hebrews, "The tendency

was towards a greater indulgence and adaptation to the life actually led by peoples who had been converted to the Moslem faith." Indeed, parts of the Koran were seen by the faithful as 'invitations' to homosexuality, for Islam was "never obsessed with the sins of the flesh and was always sensitive to the most varied forms of love and beauty."⁽⁷⁾ As literary documents, the RUBAIYAT of Qamar Khayyám and the book of THE THOUSAND AND ONE NIGHTS prove this unequivocally.

In India and Far Eastern countries such as China and Japan, both pædophilia and prostitution have ancient roots. Ritualised temple prostitution was especially widespread throughout these cultures in the mediæval period, and temple sculptures still exist which show that adult/child sex was accepted and commonplace. Child brothels did not spring up until much later, however, in the Moslem era.

In the history of ancient China, there was no shortage of emperors who had paid homage to the charms of young boys. The principal reason for this tolerance was, of course, the Eastern religious beliefs were - and still are - far more accepting of sexual pleasure than Judæo-Christianity. Boy prostitutes called 'Siang Kong' were cherished and instructed in the arts of singing, diction and bearing; while in Japan, according to Saikakou Ebara's *SPLENDID STORIES OF HOMOSEXUALITY*, the Samurai elevated boylove to a cultural ethic on a par with Greek love.

Though prostitution will always be with us, some of its worst excesses were, however, contained by the abolition of slavery. Excluding Italy, Renaissance Europe around the time of the Council of Trent (sixteenth century) saw practices like homosexuality, pædophilia and child prostitution go underground, only to reappear briefly before hastily retreating once more with the emergence of the Puritan régime. As a general rule, though, Western laws against homosexuality and prostitution remained in force until eased with the influence of the Encyclopædists and other philosophers of the Enlightenment. Later still, they were further relaxed by the early nineteenth century Napoleonic Code. But while the above laws affected the West, we should remember that Eastern cultures were, by contrast, relatively untouched.

Child Prostitution

In nineteenth century Victorian England, when the double standard prevailed, the prostitution of young girls reached near epidemic proportions. Indeed, prostitution was so rife that as early as 1857 the influential medical journal, the LANCET, felt prompted to report that one house in every sixty in the capital was a brothel, and that one female in every sixteen was a prostitute. The anonymous 'Walter', author of the voluminous MY SECRET LIFE, vividly described what Victorian London was actually like. "A gentleman had better fuck them for money than a butcher boy for nothing," he wrote of young working-class girls.⁽⁸⁾

According to Michael Pearson, virginity acquired "an enormous market premium", with the pure or nearly pure, "often preferred to the expert."⁽⁹⁾ But such a state of affairs was bound to create a backlash and the result was the famous Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885 which raised the female age of consent to sixteen, the age it remains to this day.⁽¹⁰⁾

Soon after, in 1889, a homosexual scandal involving telegraph boys went to the very heart of the English establishment. A brothel was uncovered in London's Cleveland Street which was patronised by some in the highest echelons of society, among them, Lord Arthur Somerset, an Assistant Equerry to the Prince of Wales, and no less a person than Prince Albert Victor, who as the Duke of Clarence, was Queen Victoria's grandson and an heir presumptive to the throne. A cover-up was immediately instigated and these facts might have been relegated to obscurity had it not been for the recent opening up of public records for inspection.⁽¹¹⁾

An upturn in child prostitution always accompanies times of war or great deprivation on account of the special circumstances that prevail. This was particularly true of the periods up to, around, and just after the two World Wars. The film GERMANY YEAR ZERO was about a twelve year old boy who helped to support his family by peddling himself on the streets of Berlin. The Nazis were known to delight in forcing Jewish boys into prostitution, and in more recent times, American troops have

often been blamed for introducing children to prostitution during the years of the Vietnam war.

Child Prostitution Today

Since locating and naming contemporary centres of prostitution would seriously undermine the object of this study, I propose instead to confine my comments in this section to a more general appraisal of the scene as it has existed from the seventies onwards right up until today.

The first point one notices is that child prostitution has changed little since antiquity. True, practices such as the sadistic castration of boys, once so prevalent in the East, may now have virtually ceased, but the 'peg-houses' or brothels are still very much alive, albeit more heavily disguised. Some masquerade as 'coffee houses', 'model agencies', 'singing/dancing schools' - whatever - but they are still, by definition, brothels. Likewise, child hustlers may sport a variety of badges from 'basket boys' to 'lift attendants', but the fact remains that if they use their jobs as veneers for selling sexual services, then they are still essentially prostitutes.

Today, faster more efficient travel means that child prostitution is largely the preserve of tourists and globe-trotting businessmen. Modern technology has ensured that it has also become more sophisticated, and undercover callboy/girl services now exist, some with quite ingenious modes of operation, like Boy Scout Troop 137 of New Orleans which, if we can believe Robin Lloyd, was "chartered specifically to provide a steady stream of boys"; or the Dallas callboy agency which offered its members a catalogue of boys seeking 'sponsors'. "The sponsors paid an annual membership fee for the catalogue, which listed the names of 'thousands' of young males."⁽¹²⁾

The above raises another important point. In any study of prostitution, a distinction must be made between the organised side of the trade, and all it entails - pimps, ponces, etc. - and the freelance.

Child Prostitution

Though child hustlers often come from well-to-do or privileged families, most case records confirm that the majority are from deprived or problem families.^{'13'} Thus, alienation is a decisive factor. Some of these children, and especially the ever increasing number of runaways, will go 'on the game' full time, or once in a while, for the kick and/or extra pocket money, as with some Nottingham schoolgirls who, according to recent press reports, prostituted themselves for fifty pence a time on the roof of the city shopping precinct.

But the dangers are real enough, however, especially on the organised side of the trade. There are customers who want children to engage in all kinds of weird sexual rites, some of which include acts of extreme cruelty. The client - known in the business as a punter, john or trick - may reason that because he is paying for it, he is entitled to have what he wants. The problem comes when what *he* wants doesn't tally with what *the child* wants.

And there are other dangers, too, including the risks of police busts, pregnancy in girls, and sexually transmitted diseases. Then there are the pimps and ponces, many of whom, as we know from various studies, are themselves only young;^{'14'} some children appear to have reasonably compatible relationships with these people, but others are regularly subjected to some pretty brutal treatment. Indeed, reports of children being beaten, illegally imprisoned, chained to beds, and burned with cigarettes are not infrequent. A ponce usually keeps a small 'stable' of boys or girls, and once they are initiated, it is difficult for them to leave. Often, to keep his stable compliant, he may drug them, though some children, because of the pressures of the lifestyle, may begin to experiment themselves. Either way, once hooked, the child's life from then on frequently becomes a downward spiral of degradation, interspersed with bouts of petty crime and stays in juvenile detention centres.

A revealing article in Canada's gay journal, the BODY POLITIC, described the most pressing needs of young runaway hustlers as food, clothing and shelter. This is just plain common sense. But later in

the same feature, youth worker, Tony Canes, who has often dealt with boy prostitutes, had this to say about the problem: "Hustling is a transitional stage for many youth who end up on the street. However, circumstances get them locked into it as a means of survival. It's easier to hustle than to get a legitimate job. But life becomes increasingly difficult for such youth. They begin to hate themselves and take it out on whom they think are the cause. For the straight hustlers this means - besides alcohol or drug abuse - rolling or beating up a trick. For the gay hustlers, the reaction is usually different. Their hatred gets turned inward and can lead to depression and eventual suicide."⁽¹⁵⁾

The consequences for girls can be equally disturbing. In an interview with the DAILY MAIL, Angela Butler, a welfare worker specialising in the problems surrounding 'under age' female prostitutes, told columnist Jane McLoughlin: "They may start with the image of the happy hooker, in it for the big money; but these girls become despairing. They feel that their only value is in the cash they get for sex, and feel that no-one could ever want or need them."⁽¹⁶⁾

It would be a mistake, of course, to assume that prostitution always has such dire consequences, for case records show that most young hustlers adjust well in later life. However, there will still be some who, because they know of no other life, will take to adult prostitution, while others will become the pimps and ponces to another generation of child prostitutes. In addition to this, many are likely to become cold and unresponsive. Sex may become mechanical, and they may experience considerable difficulty in forming genuine loving relationships.

One of the more startling aspects of the Anglo/American child sex scare of the late seventies was its repercussions in unexpected quarters. Fanned by adverse reports in the Western media, the shock waves even reached countries like Sri Lanka, the Philippines and Thailand which have always maintained a traditionally tolerant stance to man/boy sex. Now, goaded by such criticisms, a closer surveillance was

Child Prostitution

ordered to be kept on the movements of local children and foreign tourists. In the crackdown, new regulations came into force, and in one or two cases, laws were enacted against the corruption of children by prostitution.⁽¹⁷⁾

It seems that, through the grapevine and various other sources, an unscrupulous and/or unthinking element of paedophiles had heard that children were readily available in such countries - for a price - and that the locals would turn a blind eye. Thus, an almighty flood of rich, globetrotting paedophiles descended on these lands paying youngsters for sex and lavishing expensive gifts on them, seemingly mindless of the fact that they were now in underprivileged countries. To make matters worse, many appeared to be insensitive to native customs and regulations, while others encouraged children to smoke and drink, and in rarer cases, to take harder drugs.

As early as 1980, two reports by John Stamford in 'Spartacus' publications warned gays and paedophiles about the likely outcome of this unthinking behaviour. The articles also highlighted some of the practices that were taking place and showed how children were reacting exploitively in return. In one case Stamford cited, we learned of twenty-six year old Leopoldo, a modern day Filipino Fagin who taught his boys to rob paedophile tourists of anything they could lay their hands on. In another, we were told of Hans who went to the Philippines and promised many of the boys that he would eventually bring them back to Europe. "Nothing, of course, has been heard from Hans since," wrote Stamford rebukingly.⁽¹⁸⁾

The situation became further aggravated by interfering Western journalists, and by one Tim Bond of the Swiss based children's welfare organisation, 'Terre des Hommes'. Bond paid numerous visits to countries such as Sri Lanka and the Philippines, finding out what was happening and submitting his findings to their respective governments and to the UN. He concluded that once the tourist season was over, or they became too old for paedophiles, many local children were taking to

crime to finance the way of life they had come to expect while in the company of their high spending tourist friends.

Pædophile tourists who act irresponsibly are probably in the minority; but we tend to hear more about them because they make better news stories. When thinking of this, I am often reminded of football hooligans. They too are in a minority but it would be foolish to give in to demands to ban football itself simply because of the bad behaviour of the mindless few. The corollary is this; if we don't want the innocent to suffer along with the guilty, we shouldn't penalise the majority for the behaviour of a minority. As pædophiles know to their cost, however, this is all too often precisely what happens, and it is a great pity.

Like Bond, Richard Green (see Chap. 2) has also been privileged to observe the situation at first hand in such countries. He knows and admits that there is a bad side to tourism, but is equally adamant about the need to stress its good effects. In an unpublished manuscript referring to Sri Lanka, Green cites just three examples which are typical of many. They prove that genuine concern and kindness are still very much alive;

"A boy called Nimal was suffering from a bad case of rheumatic fever until his American tourist friend spent a lot of time and money taking him to doctors and buying medication to get him cured. He would probably be suffering today if it were not for this boylover. An Englishman who stays in Mt. Lavinia befriended a boy called Lyle who was kicked out of his home. He gave him a place to stay, gave him work to do, and responded to the boy's need for physical love and affection. The boy is no longer an outcast, but a responsible member of Sri Lankan society. A friend of mine receives one hundred marks from a German professor each month. He showed me the letter which accompanied the latest payment. The professor pointed out that it was increasingly difficult to earn money in Germany these days but that he would continue to send him the hundred marks

in the hope that he would spend it wisely and regularly attend his classes in electrical technology."⁽¹⁹⁾

In the conclusion to his article, Green says: "These boys are now at an age where they have lost their boyish beauty and chara and are no longer going with tourists. Have these boys suffered? According to Tim Bond and others, they should now be well into the drug scene and burglary. On the contrary, the boys have benefitted enormously from their associations with tourists. In fact, the country should be thankful to these people for a job well done."

When discussing that special genus known as the globetrotting pedophile, we should never forget why many of them feel the need to go abroad in the first place. Often, it is to escape - if only for two weeks in a year - the oppressive sexual climates and Draconian laws which exist in their own countries; laws which, moreover, strictly forbid them from forming any meaningful relationships with youngsters in their homelands. Seen from this angle, it is hardly surprising that some tend to go a little wild when released from their shackles, especially when it is for the first time.

Nonetheless, the writing may well be on the wall for pedophile visitors to such countries, and since responsibility is the keyword, I can think of nothing more fitting to close this section than to quote a few words from *SOME BOYS*, the Michael Davidson travelogue. As we will see, Davidson made some extremely pertinent remarks about the topics we have just discussed, and although the book was written some years ago, the part I quote is just as relevant today, if not more so. It is true that Davidson was a boylover but his words are equally applicable to girl-lovers. I trust that some will heed his message:

"It is a truth of modern globetrotting society that where tourists abound (and their abundance everywhere is increasing at such a rate that before long, like the automobile to its owner, they'll become more of a bane than a benefit to the countries who receive them) the boys quickly learn that they're the proprietors of a commodity

which fetches a high price; and the market, of course, becomes irresistible.... To be fair to the tourist, one should say that his corruptive action is generally involuntary; it's the awareness of the money in his pocket that turns the decent citizens he comes amongst into cunning extortionists,...

"It's the money that corrupts, not the sex; the money which combining with sex in a kind of psycho-chemical way, produces in the growing mind a condition in which sex becomes inseparable from money. Sex by itself, unfused with any of the agents in combination with which it generates power (and sex is one), is merely a useful thing to have. But money acting upon sex can destroy the capacity for happiness; it adulterates and sophisticates the emotions that make sex a principal vehicle of happiness, so that the mind that ought to be a young lover's becomes the equivalent of a shyster-shopkeeper's,... It's when money becomes more important than the sex, when the purpose of sex becomes money and the notion of the one evokes the image of the other that corruption of the emotions sets in,"⁽²⁰⁾

What Makes the Children Do It?

When considering the etiology of child prostitution, we find that special 'push' factors may be involved in individual cases, some of them being conscious, others unconscious. One child may take to hustling as a deliberate rebellion against adult mores and conventions, while another may see it as a means of attaining independence. Yet another might be searching for a degree of security, though he or she is unlikely to find it under such conditions. In general terms, though, we invariably discover a common pattern emerging with several distinct factors being paramount.

Financial deprivation and sexual oppression are two of the root causes of prostitution everywhere. Money equals power and most adults take their right of economic independence for granted. Yet this same

right is still withheld from children who, as a group, are just about the only class in society not accorded this freedom. This is a situation *imposed* on children by adults - whether they like it or not - and is an extremely effective way of ensuring that they are kept subservient and powerless; the more so, since without this right, the way to many other freedoms is also barred.

Children soon learn about the power of money and the things it can acquire. They see adults with spending power and it is quite natural that they should desire this too. So when they discover that this is forbidden to them, to any appreciable degree, it should not surprise us if they react with resentment. Given such limited alternatives and means of acquiring money, it is inevitable that some children will turn to prostitution. For runaways below the age of sixteen, apart from occasional low paid part-time jobs, begging or crime, hustling represents just about the *only* other option available.

The search for love, affection and friendship is another important causative factor, and it is no coincidence, as Rossman says,⁽²¹⁾ "that youngsters seek physical reassurance and affection in young adolescence when they are at a stage of life when no-one else is hugging them anymore." We mentioned earlier that a large number of child prostitutes came from deprived or problem families where there was a shortage of love and affection. In girls, for instance, a faulty relationship with the father resulting in displaced hostility to men later on in life has often been noticed. In consequence, many such children go in search of love from other adults. But some react differently, as Eustace Chesser has shown, and instead of sex being used as an expression of love, it is exploited for gain. Then, the gifts and extra luxuries this brings become "substitutes for a love that is scorned because it has always been out of reach."⁽²²⁾

In his book, *INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY*,⁽²³⁾ Alfred Adler suggested a deeper reason why young people resort to prostitution. He viewed it as an attempt to cast off unconscious feelings of inferiority. The way in which modern youngsters experience childhood may be an obvious cause of

this, but lack of love would certainly account for a child's sense of inadequacy. It generates a basic lack of self-confidence which can be compensated for, to some extent, in a situation like prostitution where there is at least some feeling of power.

Various case histories have proved that a number of youngsters discover prostitution through age-mates or slightly older children and first go on the game out of curiosity.⁽²⁴⁾ However, they soon find that meeting different people, going to new places, avoiding the law, and generally being in situations they had never previously encountered, keeps the adrenalin flowing and rekindles within them a thirst for adventure, excitement, and yes, even danger. These, therefore, must also be seen as determining factors, since through them the child often experiences a sense of freedom and independence that he/she had not known before.

Underlying all these motivations is the undisputed lure of sexual pleasure and the thrill of new, forbidden erotic experiences. A great many youngsters obtain satisfaction from going with adults - when given the chance - not just for sexual reasons, but because of adults' greater experience of life in general, which is educational. Forgiving his unfortunate terminology, it was Freud who postulated that children were "polymorphously perverse" and would respond to any number of sexual stimuli. Such stimuli can include adults, of course, and through them, a child may learn the art of lovenaking and a whole variety of erotic techniques that can prove to be extremely rewarding in later life.

As we know, children have a particularly strong homosexual component, and since their total sexual impulse has not yet had the chance to fully absorb the negative conditioning process, they are naturally inclined to be more accepting and responsive to sexual pleasure than adults. It must surely give a child a certain sense of pride and power to realise that he or she is sexually attractive and desirable to others. But this as we have seen, is often not enough.

Societies which encourage a ruthless competitiveness; which overemphasise the value of money and property as opposed to people, while still erecting barriers to sexual happiness, are bound to have a prostitution problem. Since hustling will always be with us, we can, at best, only hope to minimise its necessity. One way to achieve this, to quote the words of FPS magazine, is to "provide young people with concrete alternatives."⁽²⁵⁾ There will still be those who will choose to hustle, whatever the options. This is beside the point, however. The important thing is to create ways to reduce the number who, because of circumstances largely beyond their control, often feel forced to resort to prostitution, whether they like it or not. But our society appears unwilling to do this.

Why Do the Adults Do It?

There are many who would seek to mount their high horses and sit in judgement on the men and women - usually men - who pay youngsters for sex. We should be wary of such people, for by targetting others as scapegoats they may be unconsciously trying to assuage their own guilt feelings. No-one is perfect and this is something we should always bear in mind before attempting to judge the behaviour of others. For one thing, condemnation won't solve the problem, and for another, as I showed at the beginning, the issue is by no means as straightforward as it seems.

There is a frequent tendency to see things only in terms of black or white. Thus, when there are shades in-between, we are often blinkered to them. What, for instance, about the lonely old man who gives children money because he views himself as too old to get sex any other way? He probably needs to love and be loved just like any of us; so to make up the deficiency, he foolishly attempts to buy it. A similar story could be told about many of the physically handicapped and ugly. And what about the legions of clients who make payments as a form of 'hush' money? It is crucial to realise that, but for the law, many adults would feel no need to pay children for sex in the first place.

They turn to the hustler believing that he/she is street-wise, knows the score, and is therefore much safer than the ordinary youngster. By keeping the child happy and helping to buy his/her silence, the punter takes comfort from the thought that his own security is better guaranteed. In such cases, then - and they are extremely common - the adults turn to hustlers, rather than other children, *precisely because of* oppressive laws that they know could put them away for many years.

In the course of preparing this dissertation, I spoke to many men who regularly consorted with young prostitutes, and one of the points which struck home most was the divisions of attitudes among them. Some felt deeply ashamed about their activities and saw them as wrong. The cash they gave to children therefore represented a form of conscience money. Of these men, however, a number, while still agreeing it was bad, tended to view hustling more in terms of a necessary evil; an inevitable product of modern society. Others were indifferent, or did not see the prostitution aspect as wholly bad. As one man put it: "You're paying for what you want and the child's getting what he needs, so where's the problem?" Another said: "You have to pay for everything in this life anyway. What difference does it make if I pay my boyfriend or spend it on an evening with the wife? Whichever way you look at it, you still have to pay in the long run." Only a small minority, however, attempted to justify it outright.

Of the men who went abroad for sex, several perceived themselves in a sort of Catch 22 situation due to the stupidity of other tourists. As one explained: "When you don't offer money, the kids frequently ask, If you *do* pay, *society* says you're 'exploiting' them, but if you *don't* pay, *the kids* often think you're trying to exploit them. You simply can't win."

Again, while speaking to these men, I formed a strong impression that many of them craved to have genuine relationships with youngsters, but couldn't because they felt too trapped by their own oppression and the harshness of the laws. Thus to them, payments for sex obviated the

risk of becoming too emotionally involved - something which might 'blow their cover' and lead to unmitigated disaster all round.

Another thing which was immediately noticeable was the belief many of them shared that somehow their payments to children were a 'duty' since the child was performing a 'service'. Such thinking is erroneous. Sex is, or should be, an area of *mutual* enjoyment, and if there is a service it goes both ways. Children who perform sex acts for money or reward are doing so for the wrong reason, and adults should not encourage or confirm this mercenary attitude.

Conclusion and Recommendations

As I have shown in this article, prostitution - as defined at the beginning - is undesirable for a number of reasons. However, the problem will not go away merely for the asking. On the contrary, there is reason to suppose that hustling may well escalate due to, among other factors, the continuing economic recession. Its very incidence is a measure of just how much children and youth feel alienated and 'sold out' by a society that doesn't understand them; which still stubbornly refuses to acknowledge that they have *real* sexual needs; and which, at the same time, wilfully conspires to deny them the self respect of financial self-sufficiency.

Clearly, then, the long term solution would be, as I have said, to eliminate the need for prostitution as far as possible. But are there any steps which can be taken in the short term?

In Western cultures, we already know that many youngsters who end up on the streets are, by and large, teenagers of sixteen and over. Strictly speaking, therefore, the people who consort with them are not, for the most part, paedophiles, but gays, or even heterosexuals searching for new areas of excitement.

Obviously, something needs to be done for such youth. Funding for decent youth hostels and youth advisory bureaux in all large cities must be a priority - and by youth hostels, I do not mean glorified 'doss houses', but clean and pleasant accommodation which provides food and lodging free if necessary, though this last should be for a limited period only. More day centres with various facilities would also help tremendously. Finally, all young runaways, of no matter what age, should be entitled to automatic social security payments which could be paid either direct to them or to someone chosen to act on their behalf.

A little more thought, understanding and responsibility would go at least some way towards solving the worst excesses of the problem.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *THE HUMAN ASPECTS OF SEXUAL DEVIATION*, by Dr. Eustace Chesser (Arrow Books, London, 1971).
2. *SAVAGE SEX*, by Craig Scott (Brandon House, North Hollywood, California, USA, 1966/K. & G. Publications, Hemel Hempstead, England, 1968).
3. In his book, *SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT GREECE*, (first pub. in Britain by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1932/reprinted by Panther Books, London, 1969) author, Hans Licht refers to a 4,500 year old Egyptian papyrus which is said to be the earliest known testimony to paedophilia, specifically boylove.
4. *SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT GREECE* (as above) and *GREEK HOMOSEXUALITY*, by Dr. Kenneth J. Dover (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1978/Vintage Books, New York, 1980).
5. *THE OTHER FACE OF LOVE; THE DEFINITIVE STUDY OF HOMOSEXUALITY*, by Raymond de Becker. Trans. from the French by Margaret Crosland & Alan Daventry (Neville Spearman, London, 1967).

6. *Novella 77, 538 AD, and Novella 144, 544 AD, 'A history of homophobia, phase 3: The Dark Ages', by Dr. Rictor Norton (GAY NEWS, London, No.73). The first date is slightly altered in de Becker's study (above) where it becomes 536 AD.*
7. *THE OTHER FACE OF LOVE (as above).*
8. *Information from Eberhard & Phyllis Kronhausen. WALTER - MY SECRET LIFE (1967).*
9. *THE AGE OF CONSENT; VICTORIAN PROSTITUTION AND ITS ENEMIES, by Michael Pearson (David & Charles, Devon, 1972).*
10. *Before 1885, the female age of consent was 13.*
11. *Information from THE CLEVELAND STREET SCANDAL, by H. Montgomery Hyde (W. H. Allen, London, 1976); LOVE IN EARNEST; SOME NOTES ON THE LIVES AND WRITINGS OF ENGLISH 'URANIAN' POETS FROM 1889 TO 1930, by Timothy d'Arch Smith (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1970); 'The Cleveland Street Scandal', by Roy M. Busby (GAY NEWS, London, No.740; and 'Royalty in the Brothel, by von Whiteman (FORUM magazine, London, Vol.13, No.7, September 1980).*
12. *PLAYLAND; A STUDY OF BOY PROSTITUTION (first pub. in the USA under title of FOR MONEY OR LOVE, Vanguard Press, New York, 1976/British edition pub. by Blond & Briggs, London & Colchester, 1977).*
13. *See for instance, PLAYLAND (as above); THE HUMAN ASPECTS OF SEXUAL DEVIATION (as above); SEXUAL EXPERIENCE BETWEEN MEN AND BOYS, by Dr. George Parker Rossman (Maurice Temple Smith, London, 1979); and BOYS FOR SALE; A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF BOY PROSTITUTION, by Dennis Drew & Jonathan Drake (Brown Book Co., New York, 1969).*
14. *See for instance, Lloyd's PLAYLAND, (as above) and Drew & Drake's BOYS FOR SALE (as above).*
15. *'Street Kids: Nobody's Priority', by Ed Jackson (BODY POLITIC, Canada, December 1981).*
16. *'Child Sexploitation', by Jane McLoughlin (DAILY MAIL, London, November 10th, 1977).*
17. *For information, see various issues of PEDO-ALERT-NEWS (The Coltsfoot Press, Amsterdam, Holland).*
18. *'Rape of the Third World-II', by John D. Stamford (SPARTACUS MAGAZINE, No.1, October 1980).*

19. 'Tourists, Boys, and Sri Lanka; The Other Side of the Coin', by Richard Green, (Unpublished typescript, 1980.)
20. *SOME BOYS; A HOMOSEXUAL ODYSSEY*, by Michael Davidson (David Bruce & Watson, London).
21. *SEXUAL EXPERIENCE BETWEEN MEN AND BOYS*, by Dr. George Parker Rossman (as above).
22. *THE HUMAN ASPECTS OF SEXUAL DEVIATION*, by Dr. Eustace Chessier (as above).
23. *INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY*, by Dr. Alfred Adler (Kegan Paul, London, 1932).
24. See for instance, Lloyd's *PLAYLAND* (as above); Rossman's *SEXUAL EXPERIENCE BETWEEN MEN AND BOYS* (as above); and Drew & Drake's *BOYS FOR SALE* (as above).
25. 'FPS: A Magazine of Young People's Liberation' (Spring, 1978, Youth Liberation, New York, USA).
26. Some other books and article consulted for this study: *THE EROTIC TRAVELLER; SIR RICHARD BURTON*, edited by Edward Leigh (the Ortolan Press, London, 1966). *THE GLORY OF THE PERFUMED GARDEN; THE MISSING FLOWERS*; an English translation from the Arabic of the second and hitherto unpublished part of Shaykh Nafzawi's *PERFUMED GARDEN* (Neville Spearman, London, 1975). *THE JEWEL IN THE LOTUS; A HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE SEXUAL CULTURE OF THE EAST*, by Allen Edwardes (Julian Press, USA, 1959/Bantam Books edition, USA, 1976). *THE CHRYSANTHEMUM AND THE SWORD; PATTERNS OF JAPANESE CULTURE*, by Ruth Benedict (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1967). *JOHNNY GO HOME*, by Michael Deakin & John Willis - based on the Yorkshire TV documentary (Futura Publications/Quartet Books, London, 1976). 'Sexual Offences: Evidence to the Criminal Law Revision Committee' (NCCL report, No.13, 1976). *AGAINST OUR WILL; MEN, WOMEN AND RAPE*, by Susan Brownmiller (Martin Secker & Warburg, London, 1975/reprinted by Penguin Books, Middlesex, England, 1976). *SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT ROME*, by Otto Kiefer (George Routledge, London, 1938). *A PROBLEM IN GREEK ETHICS*, by John Addington Symonds (Leonard Smithers, 1896/originally pub. in 1883 by Ballantyne & Hanson, Bristol). *THE GREEK EXPERIENCE*, by Maurice Bowra (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1957/Cardinal, Sphere Books,

London, 1973). *LOVE IN ANCIENT GREECE*, by Robert Flacelière - trans. from the French by James Cleugh (Frederick Muller, London, 1962). *GREEK LOVE*, by J. Z. Eglinton (Neville Spearman, London, 1971). *WOMEN WORKING: PROSTITUTION NOW*, by Eileen McLeod (Croom Helm, London, 1982). *PHALLOS: A SYMBOL AND ITS HISTORY IN THE MALE WORLD*, by Thorkil Vanggaard (Jonathan Cape, London, 1972). 'Boys for Sale in New York: All Prices, All Ages' (*GAY NEWS*, London, No.18). 'The Jeremy Sandford Dossier on the Age of Consent' (*SUN* newspaper, London, February 15th-18th, 1977). 'A History of Homophobia: Stages 1-4', by Dr. Rictor Norton (*GAY NEWS*, Nos.64, 68, 73 & 87). 'Special Children's Issue, No.76' (*NEW INTERNATIONALIST* magazine, June 1979). 'The Boys in the Sand: Tunisia, a not-so-Gay Holiday Guide' (*GAY NEWS*, London, No.29). 'Boylove in the Far East', by Jameson Donald (*GAY SUNSHINE* journal, USA, winter 1979). 'Kalos: On Greek Love', edited by J. Z. Eglinton (No.1, spring 1976). *KEVIN*, by Wallace Hamilton (St. Martin's Press, New York, 1980). *A BOY'S OWN STORY*, by Edaund White (E. P. Dutton, USA, 1982/Picador-Pan, London, 1983). *SOCIAL WORK AND SEXUAL CONDUCT*, by John Hart (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1979). *THE INVISIBLE CHILDREN: CHILD PROSTITUTION IN AMERICA, GERMANY AND BRITAIN*, by Gitta Sereny (André Deutsch, 1984). *THE SIN OF SODOM: THE GREATEST SCANDAL IN CHRISTENDOM*, by Don Smith (Quantum Jump, London, 1978).

Chapter 4

GENDER DIFFERENCES

by LIZ HOLTOM and KATHY CHALLIS

Due to objections raised prior to distribution of this book, we were obliged to remove the edited version of this chapter and substitute the original text as submitted. We apologise to our readers for the interrupted consistency, and the loss of quality incurred by this change.

The accompanying notes and references were not supplied by the authors.
-ed

Clarity of communication is of vital importance in any relationship, and the messages and signals we give out and receive help us to understand one another and each other's wants and needs. All too often misunderstandings take place - in *any* relationship - when signals are misread or ignored. Discussions of sexual relationships between adults and children often fail to look at this crucial issue.

Part of the paedophile case is that it is often children who initiate a sexual relationship with an adult. This is an assumption I am very very wary of. Children do, yes, initiate physical contact. All of us need physical contact and kids have less inhibitions about expressing that need. But I'd like to draw a parallel to make my point; as a woman, I have several times been in the situation where I have wanted to show physical warmth to a male friend; my cuddle gets interpreted as a sexual advance, and I find myself under quite a lot of pressure to accept a *sexual* relationship when that's not at all what I wanted. It happens more often the other way, of course - I repress my

Gender Differences

want for physical affection because I know it'll probably be taken sexually.

What I'm trying to say is that we have to be very, very careful when we say that children make sexual advances to adults. It is all too easy for an adult to choose to believe a child wants sex, to choose to interpret a cuddle as a sexual advance, when it suits him/her (usually him). And to do this is to exploit in the most serious way our position of authority as adults. And to exploit the trust that child has in us, for most children if they trust us will be willing to go along with what we suggest, because they trust our judgement and that we have their best interests at heart.

At this point in an adult/child relationship, the differences of gender play, I feel, an important role. In our culture, women are 'allowed' to show affection in physical ways, particularly towards children. So, for women, a cuddle is more likely to be a cuddle, full stop. Whereas for men, cuddling is often only 'allowed' as part of sex; it's something you only do with a wife, girlfriend, or someone you're hassling in a pub. So for men it can be quite difficult to have a cuddle without all the sexual associations.

This same difference applies to children too; children model themselves on the adults around them, and so naturally a girl child will see that cuddling and hugging is all right for girls and women to do, while the boy child will learn the same inhibitions over physical expressiveness as he sees in the men he knows. This leads to the situation where a boy child will wrestle or play sex when he really wants a cuddle but feels it's cissy; and a girl child will be more openly expressive of her affection, but the hugs she gives may be responded to sexually by the men she knows.

Girls learn that other people are more likely to be right than they are. Lack of self confidence is almost universal in girls and women, and is very important in understanding how women are kept in their place. Thus a girl is likely to be much more easily persuaded (that

touching 'there' is OK, that if I do this, you'll like it, etc) than a boy. Both have the conditioned lack of confidence of children towards adults, and the girl has it doubled by the fact of being a girl. Thus most paedophile relationships, and certainly almost all incestuous paedophile relationships, are between men and girls,

How can this not be damaging, when it is reinforcing the very worst of the gender-conditioning we all oppose so self-righteously? And persuasion is the 'best' situation - at worst there are threats and/or coercion; this is very common, particularly when it comes to swearing the child to secrecy about what's happened. How can anyone claim that this is not oppressive to kids? How can anyone call this Children's Liberation?

Exploitation of children, in many different forms, takes place all the time. So it is not surprising society is so ready to condemn people who admit to having a sexual relationships with children. The Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE) has been the target for a great deal of hysterical verbal abuse from press and public. It filled a convenient role for a guilt-ridden society. PIE gets the blame for all the violence done to children, while the rest of us absolve ourselves of all blame for children's oppressed position.

PIE is almost exclusively made up of men who have sexual relationships with boys. (*editor's note: This statement is incorrect, PIE membership was largely of men who declared a sexual interest in boys, but who were not necessarily involved in actual relationships.*) Why, then, is almost all the public horror at sexual abuse of children directed at PIE, when the overwhelming majority of sexual attacks on children are attacks on girls - and most take place mainly within the family?(')

I think that for the answer we have to look at the very heart of society - the family - and at the attitudes towards, and treatment of, women and children. Let's look at the model family - the 'ideal' we're all indoctrinated with from our earliest years.

The centre of the family is the all-powerful father. He is the active one who 'earns their bread'. He owns the house. He makes all major decisions and family rules. There is the mother. She takes her orders from her husband. She does the housework, but she has no economic power. Her job is to keep the house, look after the children, and keep herself pretty, and sexually submissive for her husband. But the power she does have is over the children. They take orders from both parents, and from teachers when they are at school. They are not to question anything, but be 'sweet' and submissive.

Here, we see great differences between growing up as a boy and growing up as a girl. Children have their parents as a model of human relationships; so, being a boy, in itself, must create lots of contradictions for them. On the one hand, he is a child and should be obedient and sweet. On the other hand he is a male, and must therefore be authoritative and powerful. But the messages a girl receives are much more consistent in a way. She takes her orders from adults when she is a child, and she is taught that when she becomes an adult she will be submissive to her husband. So according to this model, to be childlike is similar to being female, just as adult behaviour is supposedly like male behaviour.

And also according to this model, sexual relationships are based on a powerful male, and a submissive female. This could be why the vast majority of sexual attacks on children - heterosexual and incestuous - go unmentioned on. The powerful, mature, active man initiating (forcing?) sex on a submissive young female - this is the picture we are given from all directions of how a relationship should be. This is the pattern in children's fairy tales, just as it is in teenagers' magazines, in romantic novels, and also in pornography.

Of course another reason for the silence on the majority of sexual attacks on children, given that the majority of these are incestuous, are reasons connected with incest itself. Obviously there are great pressures on a family to keep father/daughter relationships secret, for fear of public shame. The mother is also in a uniquely horrible

position. She may not even admit to herself what is happening, because she is too hurt by it, and she may feel completely powerless to stop it - particularly if she is economically and/or emotionally dependent on her husband.

The child will also be likely to keep it a secret - for a variety of reasons. In many cases, the victim of incest, like the victim of rape, feels guilty and ashamed about it. She may be living in fear of violence from her father. And she probably quite simply does not know who she would go to for help.

The silence on incest makes the whole problem worse, by isolating victims. And by not admitting incest we fail to make any ways for children to escape from a situation they don't want.

Going back to our typical nuclear family, it becomes clear that it is responsible for many of the problems of human relationships - particularly relationships between children and adults, both sexual and non-sexual. In a society based on nuclear families, children are 'looked after' by their parents and teachers. Other adults generally feature very little in their lives. If they do, it is usually as aunts, uncles, grandparents, etc., and their roles are pretty clearly and formally defined. The restrictions of these roles cause particular problems - to the parents, to the children, and to other adults.

The problems to the parents are well known. Parents take the whole responsibility for the child's welfare. The mother in particular can become desperately unhappy because of the terrible isolation she suffers stuck at home with young children all day.

Children's relationships with adults tend to be unsatisfactory because they are always (*sic*) with an adult who is an authority figure. Of course it's well known how much children appreciate it on the occasions when they have an adult friend who treats them with interest and respect, and doesn't use their power against them.

Gender Differences

The nuclear family builds a sharp division between children and adults. Children are not encouraged, or even allowed, to take responsibilities for their actions, or to make decisions about their lives. (Just as it is not socially acceptable for adults to act in 'childlike' ways - you can't show your feelings, play 'silly' games, use your imagination too much, and so on.)

Childless adults don't figure in this set of stereotypes. Society is just not organised so that adults can have much meaningful contact with children, unless they are parents or teachers. But many adults want, and need, to have contact with children. It is refreshing and fun to let loose the 'childlike' parts of your character - and being with children makes it easier to do this. And of course children are interesting in their own right - as individuals, like all people - and also because they are so often more interested in new ideas, and questioning old ones, than more cynical and conditioned adults are.

But it can be very difficult for a childless adult to come into contact with children. In this respect, it is often a lot easier for the childless woman. Society expects women to take an interest in children, so most women are able to arrange to 'borrow' children from relatives and friends in the form of 'babysitting'. Though they may still feel isolated from older children.

For a childless man, however, it can be very hard. Parents are often extremely suspicious of a man who takes an interest in children. They see him as abnormal and perverted, and they may warn their children to keep away from him. And so both men and children lose out.

I remember one such friendship when I was a child. A man - the uncle of a friend - took an interest in me and several other kids in the neighbourhood. With him we went for drives, on picnics, and he showed us how to cook. But I can also remember gradually becoming aware of our parents' concern at the situation. I think my own parents recognised the friendship for what it was, and didn't interfere. But other kids'

parents were over-suspicious and did interfere, I think, for eventually the outings stopped.

But parents are in a terribly difficult position. Men who rape and attack children are not uncommon(*sic*). If this man had been awaiting an opportunity to rape or assault us after winning our trust, we'd have been immeasurably damaged. I wouldn't want to tell parents that they should trust any man who takes an interest in their children.

As an eight-year-old child I hadn't had the bad experiences of being assaulted and threatened by men that I've had now. So I had no reason to suspect violence or coercion from a man. I don't really know if my natural trust of a man I liked was very reliable when I didn't know about the extent of men's violence in our society.

How are we to go about giving children more freedom while we're all too aware of the dangers this will expose them to? The dilemma about giving children freedom to work out their own choices, yet not wanting to expose them to risks, is clearest in the case of very young children. For example, a two-year-old, given complete freedom of choice, may well walk into the road and get run over. Here, the definition of 'children' needs to be talked about, since there's a world of difference between that two-year-old and a fourteen or fifteen-year old (boy or girl). Teenagers are still children in the eyes of the law, but they will probably know perfectly well what they want, and be quite capable of saying so.

The legal ages of consent - sixteen for heterosexual sex, twenty-one for homosexual males - are by any standards arbitrary lines. People 'mature' at very different rates for a start. Physical/sexual maturity often comes a long time before the emotional maturity needed to cope with the problems sexual relationships bring. And some would say that girls 'mature' a lot earlier than boys, others would say the opposite, or that one simply can't generalise. Ages of consent are useless. They are completely unrealistic, and they don't give children protection from exploitation in any case. The only lasting protection will be to remove

Gender Differences

the exploitation, and doing this will go a lot deeper than simply passing or repealing a law. Legislation won't remove oppression. We need to listen to children and alter our oppressive behaviour. When we support children's moves towards autonomy, we must be sure we are supporting what *they* want, not something that *we* want. That's why it's particularly difficult for paedophiles to call for the sexual liberation of children and be taken seriously.

Here, we can draw a parallel with the women's movement - what women do *not* need is men speaking on their behalf, but rather that men recognise their own oppressive attitudes to women. And similarly, we as adults should not be trying to tell children how to liberate themselves, but looking honestly at the ways we contribute to children's oppression and working to eradicate violence and exploitation at all levels of society.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *When we speak of 'the family' we include in this respect not just parents, but grandparents, sisters and brothers, uncles and aunts, nephews and nieces, etc. In this context, see for instance, 'The State of California Sexual Deviation Research [Dept. of Mental Hygiene] Study' (CA., January 1953); SEXUAL OFFENCES, by L. Radzinowicz (Macmillan, London, 1957); and P. Gebhard's SEX OFFENDERS; AN ANALYSIS OF TYPES (Harper-Hoeber, New York, 1965).*
2. *Some other books and features referred to for this chapter, and recommended further reading on the areas discussed: 'Childhood', by Judy Greenaway (PEACE NEWS, Nottingham, November 18th, 1977), PEACE NEWS editorial (October 27th, 1983), THE GAY-LESBIAN ALMANAC (Jonathan Ned Katz, Harper & Row, New York, 1983), PSYCHOANALYSIS AND FEMINISM, by Juliet Mitchell (Penguin, Middlesex, 1975), 'The Making of the Feminine', by Ros Coward (CHANGING CHILDHOOD, ed. by Martin Hoyles, Writers & Readers Publishing Co-operative, London, 1979), SEXUAL SIGNATURES, by J. Money & P. Tucker (Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1975), THE DIALECTIC OF SEX, by Shulamith Firestone (Paladin, London, 1971), MALE AND FEMALE, by Margaret Mead (Penguin-Pelican, Middlesex, 1962 - orig. pub. in the USA, 1949), SEXUAL POLITICS, by Kate Millett (Abacus, 1972), THE AUTHORITARIAN FAMILY, by T. W. Adorno et al (Norton, New York, 1969), VOICES OF THE NEW FEMINISM, ed. by M. L. Thompson (Beacon Press, Boston, 1970), THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SEX DIFFERENCES, by E. E. Maccoby & C. N. Jacklin (Stanford University Press, 1974), THE POLITICS OF WOMEN'S LIBERATION, by J. Freeman (D. McKay, New York, 1975), GENDER AND CULTURE; KIBBUTZ WOMEN REVISITED, by Melford E. Spiro (Schocken Books, New York, 1980), JUST LIKE A GIRL; HOW GIRLS LEARN TO BE WOMEN, by Sue Sharp (Pelican-Penguin, Middlesex, 1978), GIRLS AND BOYS; THE LIMITS OF NON-SEXIST CHILD REARING, by Sara Stein (Chatto & Windus/The Hogarth Press, London, 1984).*

Chapter 5

POWER AND CONSENT

by ERIC PRESLAND

(Section I)

When I worked as a cinema manager a few years ago, we used to run children's matinees every Saturday. They were noisy, anarchic affairs and any sensible usher quickly retreated from the riot and spent most of the programme out in the foyer smoking cigarettes.

One Saturday, however, a fight broke out which rose above even the noise which four hundred children can make. Obviously, someone was beating shit out of somebody else. We intervened; it was two adult men. We separated them, with difficulty, and took them outside individually to talk to them.

The man I took to my office was wearing smart casuals and trousers neatly pressed. He was in his thirties; a good-looking, cocky man whose manner was undermined by a nosebleed and an obvious nervousness. I stopped the nosebleed.

A message came from the other pacifying party. They were talking to the father of an eight year old boy who had come back in tears from the toilet. All he would tell his dad was that a strange man had been bothering him.

So I was left alone again with the child molester. Had he been bothering the boy? "No, of course not." What had he done? "Nothing!" Had he any idea why the boy was in tears? "No!"

It was a long talk and difficult. After about fifteen minutes, he admitted he had stood next to the boy and tried to touch his cock. When the boy moved, he followed.

At this point, I told him; "There are other people like yourself - people who are attracted to children and adolescents."

"Oh no," he said, "I'm not like that; I'm not a fucking pervert!"

In my book, it's perverted to force your attentions on a child who isn't interested in you and is frightened by you. I told him so.

"What does it matter, squire?" he replied. "He's only black."

* * * * *

Sitting in the back garden of the Ship and Whale on a cool summer night, the conversation turns round to pædophilia. My friend Jane is passionately against it. "Of course it's exploitive," she explodes. "Children are trained to please adults. They let adults fiddle with them because it's what the adults want and they don't know how to say no. Little girls aren't taught how to say no. They're not taught about sexuality at all. How can you have equal relationships in that situation?"

It seemed very remote from my time with... well, let's call him Saleem. Saleem was thirteen when I met him, small for his age and thin, with the uncertain, ingratiating smile of someone who is used to being clobbered both physically and emotionally. His whole manner seemed to scream out, 'Like me, please,' and to expect the opposite.

I did like him; his gentleness, so unusual in my experience of thirteen year old boys; his hesitance; his flickering, dazzling smile; his underlying stubbornness for all his uncertainty; his freedom.

He came into my house in the wake of Aadam, who was living there, and Marilyn. The three of them had spent the summer doing the rounds of the free pop festivals which still flourish in Britain despite the climate and the harsh winds of monetarism. From these hippy institutions which refuse to die, he had filled his head with ideas about expanded consciousness, peace and love; ideas which he found hard to share with me because he thought I'd laugh at him. His contemporaries certainly did.

My house represented an escape from home - an overworked mother and four children in a three-bedroomed, crumbling council flat - and from school, which he hardly ever went to, though he read everything he could lay his hands on, slowly, painfully, and doggedly. It seemed logical he should come to live with us.

I went about it carefully. I talked to his mother, a caring woman but bowed with exhaustion. She came to tea to see the house, and approved. He was allowed to move in on condition that I made sure he went to school.

It was Marilyn who pushed us into a physical relationship. I had held back, scared witless by thoughts of under-age sex, and unsure of whether Saleem merely craved my approval.

"When are you going to get it together with Saleem?" Marilyn asked. "He fancies you something rotten. He keeps talking about you - of course, he'd never dare say."

And so, after a bottle of cider, I invited him with pounding heart to share my bed. It remains one of the most vivid experiences of my life.

At the time, I was working in a job which required a suit. In the mornings we'd both put on our drag; me, a moth-eaten old Burton's pinstripe; Saleem, his crumpled and stained school blazer several sizes too small (he'd started growing rapidly). On the bus we'd sit silently

hand-in-hand until my stop, when we'd kiss goodbye. I walked into the office on cloud nine wondering how to explain the love bites. I never thought that I was in a paedophilic relationship at the time.

* * * * *

The rain was dripping onto the tent; It was Sunday morning, the day we were allowed to lie in till eight thirty. I woke up soon after seven, but didn't want to get up as it would waste the 'privilege'. I could tell that Malcolm was awake too, but his face was turned away from me and he seemed to be tense, concentrated. I didn't like to interrupt him; in fact I was always a little frightened by him, with his being two years older and that much bigger.

I was a 'precocious' boy, articulate, stropky, and quite confident in outward appearance, which is why I was assistant troop leader at the age of fourteen and had the privilege of sharing a two-person tent with Malcolm Hodges, the troop leader.

"Here, look at this," he said suddenly, waking me as I was drifting off to sleep again. "It's ever so hard and hairy."

"What?" I pretended indifference, though my heart was pounding.

"This." He turned over in his ex-army sleeping bag, and the zip was undone. Through the fly of his flower-patterned pyjamas poked a rampant erection. I stared at it. I'd never realised the male penis could be so big, and was fascinated by the thick tufts of curly dark hair.

"Do you want to touch it?" he asked. "I don't mind if you do."

I was so excited I felt dizzy. It was a good thing I was lying down. But at the back of my mind the words were tolling like a bell, "queer, queer... are you some kind of pervert?" So I simply said, "Not really, thank you," and turned back towards the wall of the tent.

Power and Consent

The question never arose throughout the rest of the camp. I had turned my back on any kind of gay experience for the next seven years.

* * * * *

In our street there roams a gang of children. 'Gang' makes them sound rather more sinister than they are, because they are really quite small - eight to twelve year olds - and not very organised. However, they know we are a gay household (it says so on the door), and they follow us down the street with remarks like "You a bender, then?" and "She's a lezzie, she's a lezzie."

We reply with lines like, "Takes one to know one" and "Do your flies up, your brains might fall out!" Hardly the last word in wit, but a way of defusing the situation and making the gang laugh at its leaders.

Interestingly, the black youngsters are more disposed to friendliness; We share an interest in cats, and they are also gradually seeing the connections between the terms 'bender' and 'nig-nog'. It is the white kids who still sit in the wrecks of abandoned cars, flicking small stones and calling insults after us. Ironically, the word they most favour is the West Indian slang, 'battyman'. It's people like these who give paedophilia a bad name.

* * * * *

There's this policeman cycling along a country lane, and he comes across a car hidden among the trees.

"Hallo, hallo, hallo," he thinks, and gets off his bike, removes his torch and shines it into the car.

There are two young men sitting in the front, stark naked. One of them is reading the paper on his lap and the other is writing a letter.

"Good evening, officer," says one of the men, very coolly.

"I hope you're not up to any funny business?" says the fuzz, very suspiciously. "How old are you anyway?" he adds.

"Twenty-one."

"And how old is he?"

"Twenty."

"Aha!" says the policeman, sensing a chance to book them. "When's he twenty-one, then?" he asks.

"Oh, in about fifteen minutes time."

* * * * *

Erik was the most beautiful boy I'd ever seen. He was an American on a scholarship to my very minor public school. I was in my first term, a puffy, pasty, owlsh twelve year old who'd overshot his strength and whose arms shot out of his blue blazer like a sapling outgrowing its flower pot. Erik, by contrast, was always honey-brown from his vacations in Florida. He was fifteen, compact and wiry.

I learned quickly that the best way to avoid playing football was to take up some minor sport like Eton Fives. Fencing seemed to be the softest option; fencing was also the best way of seeing Erik.

Seeing and touching: for every Wednesday and Saturday afternoon before the fencing master arrived, we'd improvise a game which was a cross between Tag and British Bulldog. It involved a lot of throwing one's arms around one's prey and pushing him to the ground. If I was lucky, Erik would catch me, push me, and fall on top of me. It was in this manner that I had my first erection. I didn't know what it was, but I blushed with embarrassment.

Though there was no sign that Erik felt any kind of attraction, I quickly became obsessed with him. We were in different houses - he in Westgate, I in Queensgate - and changed before games with the rest of the houses at opposite ends of a long pavilion.

I would change quickly, hoping to go and catch a glimpse of that golden body before he encased it in canvas. Heart racing, knowing I was doing some kind of 'wrong' but not sure what, I nonchalantly wandered past all the other houses that separated us like the compartments in a corridor train. The babble was deafening, the smell of adolescent sweat heady.

He stood in the near corner, behind wire netting which reminded me of a monkey cage in a zoo. I froze, motionless, breathing shallow as if playing dead on a stage. Oh, that long, tapering unobtainable back!

He turned and saw me; our eyes locked. "What are you, some kind of queer or something?" he growled. I turned and fled.

The rest of my schooldays were filled with Brideshead dreams; Julian Stenhouse, Peter Morton, Nigel Law.... a litany of golden youths who were forever winning the match in the last over.

* * * * *

Dominic, when he rang Icebreakers was twelve, and knew exactly what he wanted. "I'm gay," he announced firmly, and he wanted to meet other gays.

Now, I fear I still have a residual caution which makes me ask, 'Are you sure?' Dominic was sure. The gay scene doesn't cater for twelve year olds yet; even most youth groups would flip at someone his age. I invited him along to an Icebreaker gathering. I feared some of the talk might be over his head, but it was the best alternative I could think of. But he couldn't make it; he didn't have much pocket money,

there were travel difficulties, and his parents would ask where he was going on a Sunday afternoon,

He'd decided he was gay, and was impatient. He wanted something to happen *now*; so I met him on Charing Cross station and he came to tea at my house,

I wanted to talk to him about gay liberation, about 'coming out' and being proud of what one is. He wanted to talk about his fantasies. He had never had sex with a man, but he'd always wanted to make love in a bath or under a shower. He told me about it in vivid, erotic detail.

I regret now that I refused him. I told him, rather prissily, that it was more important for him to find good gay friends who would give him strength. Actually, he was stronger than I, for I was frightened, both of his involvement and of the English moral climate.

"Would anyone else in the house have a bath with me then?" he asked. Somehow I doubted it and told him so. When he left, he never came back; I had failed him.

Shortly after, I left Icebreakers and moved house. I heard of him a little while ago; he'd managed to seduce a couple of masters at his school, and wears gay badges now.

* * * * *

I don't know why I liked Uncle George. Looking back on it, he would probably strike me now as pretty obnoxious. He had slicked brilliantined hair, a florid face, a handlebar moustache and a gung-ho laugh. He was one of those types who never leave the services; when they retire they buy country pubs so they can prop up the bar with the customers, reminiscing about shooting down Jerry and moaning about blacks. He'd probably continue to use his rank.

Actually, he wasn't a real uncle but a friend of my mother from her wartime days in the WRAF. He used to come over for coffee every Sunday morning.

The thing that fascinated me was his hair; so shiny, so straight. As he sat and talked, I'd sneak up behind him and play barbers, snipping with imaginary scissors.

"Stop bothering Uncle George," my mother would say. But he took it very well. Maybe he even liked it, but I don't remember. I don't think I really cared whether he was enjoying it or not; I never asked for his consent.

But Uncle George's greatest glory was his motorbike; a resplendent red Ariel on which he sometimes took me to church parade, when I couldn't get out of going. It was worth the hour of boredom for the five minutes of ecstasy.

I have no way of categorising my feelings on the back of that Ariel as we sped up the Great North Road to the church. If they were sexual, I didn't have the language to describe them then. What I do remember was a sense of surrendering to some mighty power as the bike roared underneath me. I remember an exhilarating terror as trees flashed past and thundering lorries dwarfed us. I remember a sense of exposure and the comforting feel of Uncle George's old flying jacket which still, after fifteen years, smelt of sheep. I remember laying my head against a warm, broad back, and thinking 'I want to stay here forever'.

* * * * *

I have no hesitation in saying that my feeling for David Morrell was sexual. We used to walk home every day from my pre-prep school, and he would come into my house for a glass of milk and great slabs of angel cake. My mother never got home from work till gone five, so we could do what we liked. Mostly we read comics and had pillow fights.

One day we were having just such a pillow fight on my bed, both almost hysterical with laughter, when David suddenly fell back and gave in, panting. I looked down on him, still hiccuping with laughter, and suddenly the blood rushed to my face; I felt dizzy. With a roaring pounding in my ears, I bent over and kissed him with little darting kisses all over his face and mouth,

His giggles stopped. He pushed me off as if I was stifling him. I rolled off the bed. He wiped his mouth as if he'd been fed neat mustard.

"Don't ever do that," he said. "That's filthy!"

We were just eight years old.

I don't know whom he told or how it got back to the school, but the next day I was summoned to see my form master, Mr. Balcon. (Mr. Balcon's favourite punishment was getting boys to strip naked after games and beating them with a ruler under the cold showers. He married a matron and they left to set up a sanitorium for elderly invalids.)

I was told that I mustn't see David again - I mustn't speak to him, even. We were 'a bad influence' on each other. Our desks were moved so that I was right up the front, while David remained at the back. For days I was followed round the playground by hawk-eyed staff. I kicked stones, watched David playing and felt miserable. Later, I decided to tunnel to Australia, but when other boys joined in this great task David wasn't among them. I knew it had something to do with those kisses.

* * * * *

Jason was six years old, the son of a lesbian friend of mine. He was an outgoing child, used to meeting strangers and talking to them as equals. He was loving, affectionate, and enjoyed reading, painting, making models, and being cuddled. He liked the company of gay men, but

disappeared like a cat into his favourite hidden corner when people came along that he didn't like. Mostly they were heavy-footed, abrupt straight men who talked in affected voices when speaking to children.

Sometimes I would babysit (insulting term!) so that his mother could go to a meeting or enjoy herself. I would read 'Fungus the Bogeyman' at least three times through. He wouldn't want me to go. He used to twine round me with a kind of desperation as if he needed someone to wrap him with their flesh to protect him from the dark. He used to worry about nuclear weapons and the impending destruction of the world. I would ignore the faint stirrings in my loins. At such moments they were irrelevant, inappropriate.

He would eventually fall asleep; but sometimes I'd be called away from the TV in the living room by Jason's cries. His dreams were infested with radioactive images of mutants, falling buildings, and heaps of skeletons.

I would tiptoe in and hold him. Sometimes he'd still twitch like a rabbit being given electric shocks in a laboratory. Gently, I'd prise his grip from my shoulders, push back the bedclothes, and caress him. (At such times I was reminded of an old Indian trick as practised by mothers in several American tribes.)⁽¹⁾ He'd smile, relax, and the nightmares would fade.

At school, he'd be picked on for being gentler than other boys. His teachers had told him of a child lying bleeding, crying on a roadside near Brighton, and they had warned him not to talk to strange men, however friendly.⁽²⁾

* * * * *

Edwin was eight when the police came for him. They arrived at two o'clock in the morning and bundled him, still half-asleep, into the waiting police car.

At the police station, he was given a forcible medical examination to which he objected so much that he had to be sedated. His parents weren't told of this because the local council had taken him into care under an emergency care order. A social worker who had not even met the child authorised the examination. By midday the next day, the boy had been interrogated four times, each time being woken up. The object of the questioning was to get him to admit that he had been used by his parents as a child prostitute, and that his father had bugged him. Eventually he signed a 'confession' to make them go away; a confession so obviously written by the police, so removed from Edwin's normal speech patterns, that it was dropped before the hearing, as was the charge of buggery against the father. The prostitution charges were later thrown out of court.

Nonetheless, Edwin is still in care, despite attempts to run away back to his parents twice, and despite being physically assaulted by other boys in the children's home for being a 'pouf'.

His crime? - to be the son of parents who ran a gay guest house, where gay films were shown and people sometimes had sex together.

I knew Edwin as a shy child, carefully mannered, and rather small for his age. He enjoyed the company of the guests, who brought him small gifts and gave him a lot of affection. He talked occasionally about wanting to be gay when he grew up, 'because they were such nice people'.

Section II

When I was asked to contribute to this anthology, I wrote down all the incidents and personal experiences which float around in my head when I start talking and arguing about paedophilia. Mostly, such arguments take place at one remove from reality. The proponents put a wide variety of experiences into this little pigeon-hole labelled 'paedophilia' and then try to decide whether it's right or wrong.

But behind most abstract arguments stalk ghosts; images from our experiences, from the media, from our dreams and nightmares; and to me, it is important to pin those images down before ascending into the academic stratosphere. Theories of gay and women's liberation have evolved through a dialectic based on different kinds of personal experiences, and our solidarity comes through mutual respect for those experiences and the feelings they have engendered.

Edmund White puts it this way: "In my own discussions with women about pedophilia, I've noticed that the picture they have in mind is usually of a boy, eyes streaming with tears and face buried in a pillow, being buggered by a cruel rapist. I have suggested that the 'actual' image may often be of a skinny fourteen year old standing above a balding man and ordering him to suck it. But women persist in seeing the boy as a stand-in for a girl and the older man as a counterpart of the heterosexual rapist."⁽³⁾

Looking at the vignettes that I've given above, I see that I am offering two further images; the first is one of yearning - wanting something that is never quite defined or expressed from someone impossibly remote and beautiful, standing the other side of a barbed wire fence labelled 'Trespassers will be Prosecuted'; the second is almost 'Babes in the Wood' - snatched moments of tenderness and peace before the beasts of the forest close in for the kill.

Both are romantic images, but true to my experience, such as it is. I grew up in a world quite different from White's world of teenage hustlers. These images are real, however. The world is far more inconveniently alive, varied, and wriggling than our arguments and our labels - such as pedophilia - would suggest.

Childhood Eroticism

One common thread is the pervasive, insistent presence of sexuality in children, crying out to be recognised and satisfied. One would think after thirty-odd years of post-Kinsey research that there would be no

need to argue this point. Study after study shows up experiences of male babies born with erections, three year old girls masturbating themselves to orgasm, and so on. And yet our society persists in ignoring the overwhelming evidence, preferring instead to project its myth of the 'innocence' of childhood onto young people, and to keep them in darkness.

In the face of this ubiquitous ostrich mentality, it becomes necessary to state repeatedly that child sexuality is real and near-universal. I experienced it; every person reading this book will have experienced it in various forms, even if it has been filed away somewhere in the back of one's head, repressed or forgotten. The debate over paedophilia, if it is to be anything other than arid intellectualism, must involve reclaiming that sexuality, rediscovering our own childhood selves, and remaining true to those selves.

Given that it exists, childhood sexuality can either be explored and expressed, or distorted and suppressed. The childhood distortions and repressions ("That's filthy," said David) create the loveless, uptight, body-hating, pleasure-starved adults we see thronging our streets.⁴ If it is explored and expressed, children's erotic curiosity can be satisfied either with contemporaries or older people.

Many who would deny the validity or usefulness of paedophilic relationships seem much happier with the idea of children 'innocently' exploring each other. I wish that corresponded with my experience. Innocence, if it ever existed, is corrupted very early on. Children pick up the prevailing prejudices of those around them, like burrs, not least from the things they read and see. Most often, these prejudices are raw - unmediated by any sense of comparison or possibility. I think of David or Erik, and instead of innocence I see confusion, bigotry and rejection. Already tainted, children often merely serve to police the values they have absorbed unthinkingly. It is a rare free-spirited contemporary who will guide an eight year old out of confusion; they are much more likely to reinforce each other's prejudices.

The adults I was drawn to came from outside the family. Within it, familiarity bred, if not contempt, a lack of illusion, and illusion was the essence of what I found attractive. Uncle George - the winged Mercury, a privileged free spirit on his bright red motorbike, who flashed across my drab sky lighting it up once a week - offered adventure and difference.

The Position of Children and Adolescents Within the Family

The nuclear family is a centripetal force, drawing attention, affection and energy into it. It demands loyalty, commitment of blood beyond mere like or love; it trains and expects its denizens to repeat its form. That is why it's such a convenient social cohesive force.

Sexuality, however, is centrifugal. Blake's chariot of fire whirls one off on journeys of discovery one would otherwise be too timid, too self-regarding to undertake. It is quick, curious, anarchic, 'irresponsible'. No wonder, then, that a money society, geared to rigid economic patterns of production and consumption, should find it so threatening. It can't be converted to an entry on a balance sheet.

It is important to appreciate the extent to which paedophiles touch an exposed nerve in our society before we can let the steam cool and begin to look at the underlying issues calmly. To do this, we have to ask the question: 'Why should society need this myth of 'protecting' childhood 'innocence', to the extent of flying in the face of all objective evidence so completely?'

The answer is partly economic, partly social, and partly political. The argument runs as follows: By creating this special protected category, we have a reason for the nuclear family to exist and propagate itself. We have a role for women as nurturers which effectively keeps them shackled to the home and in an inferior economic position. We have a role for men as breadwinners and providers which keeps them geared to treadmill jobs, yet reassures them that this is the 'manly' thing to do.

Sex roles are as much, if not more, geared to the rearing of children as to relationships between men and women as such.

As the women's movement makes more inroads into adult life, and women question their function within marriage, the position of children becomes more important. They are society's last prop and defence of its central social and economic institution. Since, if we listened to children, they would probably say something very different from what the mainstream of society wanted to hear, it is vital to keep them both powerless and silent.

There are those feminists who see the paedophile movement as an attempt to extend male power into one of the few spheres where women have influence and importance - as mothers shaping their children. It is important to stress that such power in this society is delegated by 'straight' men, and women as mothers are in much the same position as prefects at a school; set by their rulers in a position of limited authority over others similarly oppressed.

In the face of this, and the fact that the vast majority of *real* child abuse is committed by straight men who are known to the victims and who pass as entirely normal; and that this goes unreported to the police - often accepted, indeed, as part of family life - one can only conclude that this moral/legal system, supposedly designed to protect childhood innocence, is in fact designed to protect adult male privilege.

The issue on which most discussion of paedophilia centres - where people are prepared to discuss it at all - is that of 'consent': How, if at all, can a child give meaningful consent? I find this sudden concern with the child's right to say yes or no deeply suspicious, confined as it is so thoroughly to the narrow area of sexual activity. Few bother to ask children's consent to much else. Nobody asks them whether they want to go to school; if they want fifty pence or five pounds pocket money, or if they'd prefer to have a job to earn money; whether they want to go to bed at 8pm or get up at 7am.

Look around at the red-faced exhausted children being dragged around supermarkets and taken on day-trips to museums and galleries; look at the children being dragged away from the pigeons they are feeding in order to be shown round the stately home; look at the children being forced to finish their greens before they can have jelly and custard. What about the children being bought 'sensible' clothes at Marks and Spencers, in defiance of their obvious preference for striking colours? No, for much of the time, the consent of the child is the last thing on people's minds.

Why do parents have children? Partly because it's expected, and the pressures to do so are enormous. The childless couple reach a point in their thirties when people subtly make them feel there must be something wrong with them. The wife is 'unfulfilled' if she doesn't become a mother, the husband 'less than a man' if he can't give her children. However, the very notion of fulfilment is intensely selfish. To bring into existence a separate life in order to satisfy one's own, socially-constructed desire for completeness can lay the foundations for a relationship which is more exploitive than altruistic.

"You'll have all the things I never had." Parents use children as an exorcism of past failures, real or imagined. They treat children as extensions of themselves. They live through them and demand the carrying on of the family and its name. They push for an education they themselves missed; for a career they never had; for happier relationships. The mistakes they made must be avoided by their children. This may well be couched in the language of idealism or self-denial, but in reality, parents are moulding children according to their own fears and desires.

The child's fight for independence within the family is the bitterest of wars. This is both recognised and marginalised by the twentieth century Western concept of adolescence. This is an awkward phase which young people have to 'go through' and 'grow out of'; when they have 'chips on their shoulders' and feel that everyone is against them. What these terms fail to acknowledge is that people who are

legally and economically their parents' property have every right to have chips on their shoulders and to feel that everyone is against them. The runaways reported daily in the papers are seen as at best confused, at worst, gratuitously hurting their parents. Many seem unable to grasp that the act of running away may, to the child, be a way of escaping from an intolerably oppressive situation.

Parents, because of their autocratic power, their exclusive rights, and dubious motives of self-aggrandisement which lie behind the decision to have and rear children, are in many ways the group least fitted to be entrusted with the task of child-raising.

Power Stripping and Its Effects

Gay and women's liberation elements in opposition to these structures of dominance place, as the primary objective, the non-exploitive relationship of equals. But the relationship of equals must mean the relationship of equal individuals, not of classes. Otherwise, one would have to rule out all heterosexual relationships on theoretical grounds because of the socio-economic inequality of women to men. Likewise, relationships between members of different races; between the able-bodied and the disabled; between people of different classes or income brackets. The only tenable relationships would be between clones from precisely the same point in the scale of advantage. Even here there are problems, since at different times in any relationship, the participants will have different needs and feel varying levels of desire and commitment. Affection itself confers power, and power flickers backwards and forwards within a relationship like a charge of electricity. At what point, therefore, do we have the right, from a theoretical standpoint, to descend on the real, live, seesawing couple and say, 'This is unacceptable!'

No, the criterion by which any relationship should be judged - if judgement is appropriate - is the extent to which it transcends the inherent inequalities which arise from the backgrounds and circumstances of the people involved, and how hard the individuals are prepared to

work on themselves to change their conditioning. One does not further the achievement of equal relationships by denying the *possibility* of equal relationships between arbitrary groups of people.

In this connection, I am struck by the similarity between arguments put forward against 'intergenerational sexual relations and arguments I've heard put forward by more 'liberal' supporters of apartheid. Interracial marriages don't work, we hear, because the gaps in cultures are too wide, and because of the inherent inequality of the situation. In both cases, the existing social structure uses a circular argument to justify the perpetuation of the status quo, ignoring any other possibilities, and in both cases, one of the groups involved remains notably silent, unconsulted.

Cross-generational sexuality is different from other relationships in degree rather than kind. It is one of the extreme examples of inequality of class; so extreme as to make one wonder whether equal relationships are possible in anything other than a utopian sense between adults and children.

But if the starting point is the issue of greater inequality, that only means that the struggle to transcend differences becomes more important. This is where male paedophiles, especially, need to prove that they are prepared to give up their socially-sanctioned power, both as adults and as men.

One of the ways in which we do that is by defining ourselves as paedophiles. The labels which we put on ourselves have enormous importance, both as a political gesture and as an act of self-definition. I choose the label gay because my sexuality is a crucial part of my character and identity; because I believe it is politically important, and therefore I make an issue of my sexuality because I believe that gay implies more than the gender of my bed-partners. It is a strong and deliberate dissociation from its opposite, straight, with all that word's connotations of social approbation, rigid patterns of masculine behaviour, exploitation of women, and the accepted conventions

of marriage and family. By taking this despised term of social rejection and embracing it, I am turning it into a personal source of strength.

The notable thing about the child molester at the Rio was his refusal to think of himself as anything but straight. He wasn't a 'pervert'; he wasn't 'like that'. He was a heterosexual claiming what was his by right of simply wanting it.

I'm sure that when the assailants of the Brighton boy are caught (if they are), they too will say that they are straight; that they are not like that.⁽⁶⁾ My child molester clung to his label as an armour of privilege which justified his taking anything he wanted.

When the Brighton case first came to light, homosexuals were quick to point out that 'no gay could have done it'. More to the point, no *boylover* could have done it either.

Pædophiles who define themselves as such are giving up their power in an immediate and dramatic way. Those who put this label around their necks are not proclaiming 'their right to take children as they wish'. They are bringing their sexuality and that of the children they relate to into the forefront of debate, and they are placing themselves in the category of the most despised and powerless in our culture.

Look at the PIE members who were trailed by private detectives, who had their phones tapped by the police, whose addresses were listed and houses photographed in national newspapers so that their neighbours broke up their homes and formed lynch mobs; who were forced to change names, jobs and identities after show trials; who were jeered at and spat upon by passers-by; whose very existence was a provocation justifying assault in the eyes of the judiciary.⁽⁶⁾

The person who publicly embraces the label pædophile is laying himself/herself open to all this. It is a step in a terrifying chasm of loneliness and violence, so big and so dark that only the very strongest

feel able to make it. It is surely the greatest single imaginable act of power-stripping to voluntarily adopt a label when in the act of doing so one knows that one is, in all probability, denying oneself the chance of ever fulfilling one's closest emotional needs.

There are those, the lucky few, who do achieve something closer to those needs. Looking back, I'm amazed at my luck with Saleem. I ask the same question about that relationship that I would ask of all paedophilic relationships, or indeed *any other relationship*: How far did I succeed in eliminating my own power, and how much did he succeed in acquiring his?

It was never entirely absent; it never is. But at its best, it flowed merrily and energetically from one to the other. I gave him the power of his own space; he gained independent financial resources. I fought for him to free himself from the confines of the family; he discovered the power of being loved, respected, listened to; the power of knowing that he was good at things - cooking, D.I.Y., bargain hunting, sewing - and that those things were useful. He discovered the power of his own sexual attractiveness.

Ultimately, the relationship failed because I couldn't/didn't give up all power, and he wasn't entirely free. I got him away from home on condition that he went to school, even when he didn't want to go. I felt bound to try to fill the obligation I had undertaken. There were rows and I was suddenly seen as being on 'their' side. I am glad, though, that our sexual relationship arose out of a context of practical help, caring, common interests, and shared ideas. I am pleased, too, that our relationship overcame differences of race and class.

Questions of Class, Race and Gender

And this is another question that I would ask of any paedophilic relationship: Are the participants (particularly the older party) aware of differences in class background, race, or gender, and the implications of these? Awareness is half the battle towards overcoming.

In this respect, gay paedophiles tend to be different from straight paedophiles, in that their experience of the oppression of gays is more likely to open their eyes to the issues involved. Straight male paedophiles, however, might well be more prone to take the naïve view, 'I think little girls are wonderful, therefore I wouldn't harm them, so everything is all right.'

Gay paedophiles can also claim a special significance for gay children, in that it is possible for them to smooth the way for a young gay person by introducing him/her to the idea that 'Gay is good'; to gay experience and lifestyles, at an age when any meaningful information on the subject is systematically denied them.

Remembering Dominic and his hunger for gay contact, and comparing his resolution with my own woefully lacking experience at the same age, I cannot resist drawing the conclusion that what I really needed at the time was a nice paedophile.

The Confusion Over Sexuality and Its 'Meanings'

The context of a relationship not only includes matters of gender, race and class, it also involves the varied and contradictory mythologies attached to sexuality itself. One of the most pernicious social constructs within which we live is that which is built around the 'specialness' of sex. Logically, there is absolutely no reason why sex should not be a pleasure, an art of the order of conversation or gastronomy. But no, in this post-Christian culture we still retain the rags and tatters of a religious morality which insists that we invest it with meanings; except that there is no common agreement as to what the meanings are.

In general, the meanings lead in two different directions. On the one hand, they are an assertion of identity and personal worth. Most commonly, these notions cluster around the male experience of casual sex, and they are seen at their most blatant in the 'conquest'

mentality. Another encounter, another feeling of being 'good at it', reinforces such people's sense of desirability; they are more competent and more powerful the more people they sleep with. Thus, they can add another notch to their cocks.

In the opposite direction, the meanings lead towards permanence and coupling. We 'save ourselves', 'give ourselves', 'sacrifice ourselves', even. This is at least an improvement in that it starts from a basis of self-respect, however misplaced. But the meaning behind the words and the construct is one involving obligation, and therefore guilt. Sex becomes a kind of knot in the lasso with which one attempts to round up a life partner to bolster one against a sense of inadequacy and failure. Add the connotations of romance, and one has an idealisation of the other which blinds, not only to the intricacy of the individual, but also enables one to blame the other for failing to live up to one's fantasies.

In either direction, the social constructs are exploitive. They involve the living out of charades, playing parts for the benefit of each other. They diminish the potentiality and the reality of actual contact; they lead to patterns of imposition and guilt. The fact that two people may mutually enter into either kind of contract should not blind one to the difference between the hollow accents of exploitation, and the authentic notes of true equality.

Such constructs lead us into divided and disintegrated lives. "Sex is performed with strangers, romance is captured in brief affairs, friendship is assigned to friends," writes Edmund White of the modern New York lifestyle.⁽⁷⁾ It's equally true of single people in their twenties and thirties in many large urban centres; and it is especially true of gay men. Ultimately, this too is a denial of the possibilities and an assertion of power. (By giving you your pigeon-hole in life - friend, fuck or lover - I make sure that you literally 'know your place'. You do not, therefore, trespass into the other areas of my life which are forbidden to you, since such knowledge might lead to unwanted intimacy and show my greater weakness. You, of course, in your turn,

show me my allotted place in your life. This makes me feel belittled, so I reassert my power by showing someone else their place... and so the cycle continues.)

The separation of sexuality from the rest of life leads to general social hypocrisy. The Mr. Balcons of this world can beat little boys under showers - of course it's not sexual; it's punishment and he's a teacher - and yet still retire to seaside respectability. A special category is created of 'sex crimes' (in reality, crimes of violence) which has the effect of reinforcing the special mystique associating sex with guilt and dirt, and making most victims too thoroughly ashamed to report them. The separation shows in the Victorian schizophrenia, still prevalent, which idolised womankind and motherhood on the one hand, and exploited prostitutes, including child prostitutes, on the other. Both were and are ways of avoiding dealing with real women as equals. In the area of children's rights, it has led some paedophiles to assert a child's right to give sexual consent, while disregarding the child's other rights.

Take away the constructs which we have put on sex, and we are more likely to find a whole new perception of sex as an expression of friendship and a logical extension of the other pleasures of intimacy.

The differences in meanings associated with sexual acts are reflected in the arguments which rage about what is or what is not 'sexual' behaviour. Some paedophiles have claimed that the intense pleasure which mothers can derive from breast feeding is really 'sexual', ironically invoking Freud in their support. Feminists, uncomfortable with this male interpretation of female experience, reject this view in favour of a definition of sexual which is more exclusively directed at genital arousal and penetration. Yet other (and sometimes the same) feminists wish to expand ideas of what is sexual to include their own relationships with other women where sexuality operates in a more diffuse way. Yet others would claim that *all* friendships, alliances, or even dislikes are sexually based (the queer-basher is really gay).

Power and Consent

As usual, the meanings we ascribe to words are part of our strategies, whether they be strategies of politics or strategies of survival. Seeking as I do the incorporation of children's and paedophiles' liberation into the broad alliance of the sexual left, I prefer to use the word sexual in its widest sense. However, I recognise that words do not have absolute meanings. It is therefore important to be aware of the differences of meanings as a first step towards talking to one another in a language we can all accept.

For paedophiles, it is especially important to be aware of the 'meanings' of sexuality, since the potential for exploitation is high. So is the potential for simple misunderstandings. I wrote of the difficulty of labelling my feelings for Uncle George as sexual, and there is a real problem in the different meanings that children and adults ascribe to sexual acts.

It should by now be clear that I am extremely reluctant to generalise, preferring always to look at individual and personal experiences. Judging by my own experiences, I would say that most children I have met do not see sexual activity as different in kind from other physical activities until they have absorbed the social constructs around them. They are less likely to see it as projecting into the future or arising from a past. They are also much less likely to think of it purely in terms of genital sex, save where that involves the exploration of unencountered phenomena, preferring instead to associate it with warmth, physical contact, reassurance, and/or pure sensuality.

The adult, on the other hand, is much more likely to be conditioned to focussing on orgasm; also, to take physical contact to mean a certain kind of relationship which projects into the future.

It is this disparity between meanings which makes paedophilic erotica disturbing. The dichotomy is nowhere so complete as in the situation where an adult masturbates over a picture of a grinning child who may be totally unaware of the purpose to which his/her picture may be put. The very appeal of the image is in the lack of artifice or pose

in the child, and yet that appeal is totally undermined by the act of fantasy conquest implied in wanking over such material.

Since both kiddie porn and erotica are rigidly suppressed in this country, there is an acute shortage of erotic visual stimulus for paedophiles, already an emotionally and sexually starved group. As a result, virtually any family snapshot may be put to the purposes of arousal, and short of banning *all* images of children, the phenomenon will remain with us. I think of it as a kind of litmus which indicates the extent to which society isolates large numbers of people both from their own needs and from those of others.

Adults are gifted with both power and self-awareness. The onus must be on individual paedophiles to try to change themselves; to enter and accept a child's own language of sexuality. Paedophilic relationships differ only in the degree of difficulty. All relationships consist of deciphering each other's meanings and negotiating the space between them. For paedophiles, that means working harder, and preparing to go further to meet the other.

Sexual 'Consent'

When I think of Jason, I realise that 'consent' is not the central issue; it is recognising the child's 'meaning'. Indeed, the concept of consent is at best misleading, and at worst, irrelevant. The little girl who sits on her uncle's knee while he 'touches' her, in a strict sense consents to do so. She doesn't say no. As my friend Jane points out, she has been taught that the correct thing to do is to please adults, especially adult men. So she smiles her fixed party smile, perhaps is even pleased to have pleased, but inside she may well feel rather confused.

Consent is something given by the powerless to the powerful in order to placate. My Concise Oxford Dictionary defines consent as; 'to acquiesce, to agree'. To agree there must be a proposer (active) and an acceptor (passive); acquiesce is about the mark. You consent to 'have

something done to you'. As a model for human relations this is woefully inadequate.

Yet behind all the discussions of what constitutes 'meaningful consent' - which both paedophiles and others who are seriously concerned with sexual law reform are currently engaged in - stalks the same, though often erroneous image, of the adult as initiator and the child as follower.⁽⁸⁾ The image is embedded in the language.

I feel we could more usefully invent another, more adequate concept which I will call 'awareness of significance' (clumsy I know, but I can't think of anything more catchy). By this concept I mean an ability to put oneself in another's shoes; to know them well enough to judge likely reactions to and implications of any given act an individual performs, coupled with a desire for the other's respect, affection or love. As a concept, this has the advantage of switching the focus away from the child and towards the adult in a paedophilic relationship. It puts the onus on the adult to demonstrate a quality, rather than on the child to have performed a fine, legalistic, and often superficially misleading act.

Some Final Thoughts

The women's movement in the early 1970s took a very crucial step when it espoused the cause of lesbian liberation. It recognised that lesbians were not some kind of lunatic fringe, but represented a distillation of all women's struggles for autonomy; for their right to live independently of men. I believe that children's liberation represents a similar distillation, in that it represents the right of all of us to grow up free of the distortions, repressions, lies, and violence which we find we have to spend so many years to overcome. The voices that utter the demands of children's liberation are those of children themselves; of those who retain the clearest images of their childhood.

Pædophiles have a great claim to be in the forefront of that struggle, but general acceptance by other liberationist movements must be dependent on their ability to talk in the same language, to share the same concerns. It must involve a willingness to step aside to let children speak for themselves. It must involve campaigning for children's other rights to control over their own bodies (no more incarceration for the so-called 'problem children', or care orders which ignore the wishes of the child, etc.); the right to independent financial resources. It must involve campaigning not just for the abolition of ages of consent laws, but enforcement of existing laws against violent assault, and finding ways in which children can complain, off their own bat, about assaults within the family, and have those complaints taken seriously.

Most people would agree that at best ages of consent laws are arbitrary; to some - like the coiner of the policeman joke in section one of this chapter - they are merely ridiculous;⁽⁹⁾ to others they are necessary evils which require judicial flexibility. To me they are intensely damaging, as the children who are subjected to medical examination by police doctors (far more akin to rape than the original 'assault') are much more likely to be traumatised by that experience than by the original sexual act.⁽¹⁰⁾ They are also ineffective in that most 'real' offences are never reported; and doubly ineffective because there is no evidence that the incarceration of 'sex offenders' has any effect whatsoever on their desire to have contact with children.⁽¹¹⁾

If, then, we conclude that the criminal law is a totally inappropriate instrument to deal with the sphere of consensual relations, we are still left with important questions unanswered as to what to put in its place. We still need general agreement as to what constitutes 'awareness of significance'.

There will also be those who transgress the bounds of that agreement. How are they to be found out? How can children obtain a real voice? And how does society deal with those who overstep the mark?

Power and Consent

These are the questions which child-lovers must address, and on which they should have important things to say. They must be a concern, also, for all liberation movements which renew themselves through young people. We reach such people, not through the arch-conservative family, not through abstract pedagogy, but through emotional/sexual/personal involvements. That is why it is so important that paedophiles are not isolated or marginalised.

This may all sound rather utopian, but better societies are built upon listening to our dreams and diving into our memories. In the meantime, there are real adults in real relationships with real children; there are men in prison who get beaten up by fellow prisoners while warders turn a blind eye, because they had a positive and loving relationship with someone the wrong age; there are rapists living in 'happy families'; there are doctors sticking their fingers in rubber gloves up the arses of eight year old boys; there are children who quiver with terror when dad comes into their bedrooms; there are children and adults wrapped in each other's arms, whose only fear is being 'found out'.

In all this confusion, misery, pain and injustice, listening to our dreams is a matter of urgency.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *The Hopi, for instance. The masturbation of children by adults, or fondling of their genitals is, or used to be, quite common in other societies too. See, for example, W. Davenport's 'Sexual Patterns in a South-West Pacific Society' (SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR, by F. A. Beach, Wiley, New York, 1965), and Margaret Head (COMING OF AGE IN SAMOA, first pub. in 1928/reprinted in Penguin Books, 1943).*
2. *According to J. W. Mohr, R. E. Turner and M. B. Jerry in their famous study, PÆDOPHILIA AND EXHIBITIONISM (University of Toronto Press, Canada, 1964), when parental warnings about the risks of talking to strangers are overstressed, this can have a "substantial harmful effect in instilling a paranoid attitude in a child."*
3. *STATES OF DESIRE, by Edmund White.*
4. *On the effects of sexual repression generally, see the works of Wilhelm Reich, especially THE FUNCTION OF THE ORGASM (Orgone Institute Press, 1948), and THE SEXUAL REVOLUTION (Vision Press, London, 1951). In his thesis 'Body Pleasure and the Origins of Violence' (BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, November 1975), James W. Prescott, who did a cross-cultural examination of many societies, went so far as to suggest that sexual/sensual deprivation in childhood often leads to violent behavioural traits, patterns of crime, and the type of conditions in which wars thrive. He found that in sexually permissive societies which allowed youngsters a certain sexual freedom, the rates of violence and crime were much lower than in sexually restrictive cultures.*
5. *This assault, which took place on August 14th, 1983, was perpetrated by three men and led to a general pædophile witchhunt which tried to implicate PIE, though the organisation had nothing to do with it.*
6. *At the hearing of a woman who was charged with breach of the peace after she had admitted trying to assault PIE members at their committal on incitement charges, the magistrate, Mr. Jack Taylor, said that in his opinion, "she was provoked." (The SUN, London, September 10th, 1983)*
7. *STATES OF DESIRE by Edmund White.*

8. *That children do often initiate sexual contacts with adults is confirmed by many studies, including those of Karl Abraham and D. Reifen, 'The Experiencing of Sexual Traumas as a Form of Sexual Activity' (SELECTED PAPERS OF KARL ABRAHAM, Hogarth Press, London, 1949), and 'The Child as a Victim of Sexual Offence' (BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRIC SOCIAL WORK, Vol.4, 1958), respectively.*
9. *Ages of consent laws are also highly contradictory. On the one hand, the law refuses to accept children's sexuality or their right to consent, while on the other, it claims that children in England can be deemed guilty of indecent assault if they are 14 or over, and in Scotland if they are 8 or over (the Sexual Offences Acts, 1956 & 1976, and the Sexual Offences - Scotland - Act, 1976). Now, if this is not the perfect example of having one's cake and eating it, then what is?*
10. *In a letter published in the TIMES newspaper (London, February 16th, 1978), Dr. A. P. McEldowney, who was for twenty-five years the Metropolitan Police Surgeon, said, "It was always my conviction that far more harm was done by repeated questioning by parents, police and myself, and by subsequent examination, than by the act itself, which if left alone the child would soon have forgotten."*
11. *Rates of recidivism among paedophiles, and particularly homosexual paedophiles, jump dramatically after a first offence. Thus, convicted paedophiles are far more likely to re-offend. (Information: J. W. Mohr et al, as above.)*

PART TWO

Miscellaneous
Chapters

Chapter 6

LOVE AND LET LOVE

TUPPY OWENS in conversation with TOM O'CARROLL

Tuppy Owens is best known as the editor/publisher of THE SEX MANIAC'S DIARY, an invaluable source of information for people with practically every known variety of sexual enthusiasm. In the diary, both PIE and paedophilia have received honourable mentions, and at the height of the silly-season hysteria in 1983, when Geoffrey Dickens, MP, and the tabloid press were clamouring for the abolition of PIE, Ms. Owens calmly reminded listeners to an LBC phone-in debate on paedophilia that children, including girls, have sexual feelings too, and suggested that adults can figure positively in their erotic lives. We now catch her in conversation with Tom O'Carroll, the former leader of PIE, who put the following questions to her for this book. -ed,

Q. Children's sexuality has to be accepted in any complete view of sex, it seems to me, Can you remember experiencing sexual feelings yourself in childhood?

A. Yes, right from my very earliest memories of childhood. I remember a big boy, when I was very tiny, sitting in a chair. I thought I'd love to kiss him, but I couldn't reach that high. So I told my parents in the hope of being lifted up, but they just fell about laughing. I knew then that I wasn't going to get a kiss and I thought it was a bit of a swizz.

Q. When you were pre-teen, did you fantasise relationships with big grown men, boys your own age, or what?

A. When at junior school, I had a 'play house' in my bed where I imagined I lived with several boys. There was no sex, though, because I didn't know what it was.

Q. When was your first sexual experience?

A. I went on a bed with a Hungarian aged twenty-one when I was about eleven, but the trouble was he didn't seem to be able to find anything to do with me. So although I would have liked to try it, I never in fact succeeded in getting into a developed sexual contact when I was a child. Arguably, if I had done, it might all have turned out disastrously and I might have grown up with a completely different attitude to sex. I can't deny that possibility, but it strikes me as unlikely.

Q. Not all women are as sexually enthusiastic as yourself, either in adulthood or as children. What would you say to those who might seek to write your experience off as wholly unrepresentative?

A. I thought you might ask me something like that, so I did a little survey of my own last night at a women's discussion group on sex. Apart from some reports that they masturbated on their own in childhood and played sex games with others in their own age group, six of the nine women there said that as children they had experienced strong attractions towards adults, and in three cases these were remembered as specifically sexual feelings. One of the women had been attracted to other girls, but not to men, and at age nine she had had a sexual relationship with a grown woman.⁽¹⁾ Interesting, don't you think?

Q. Certainly! It challenges those who see paedophilia as a 'men only' thing. It also shows there is the potential for two-way relationships, not just molestation by men. But did any of them say they had been molested?

A. No, none. One had no memories at all of her childhood, and that might have been the result of a sexual trauma; or perhaps her childhood was unhappy for some other reason, such as lack of attention or affection.

Q. *The group as a whole might seem luckier than average. Could this invalidate the survey?*

A. No small group can hope to be entirely typical or representative of women's experiences, but I do think that what these women said makes it hard to believe that little girls have no sexual feelings, or that they are necessarily uninterested in adults.

Q. *Yes, adults' recollections of childhood can be valuable; but wouldn't it be better if a latter-day Kinsey could talk with children themselves about their sexual feelings and preferences?*

A. Very much so. The trouble is that people fight shy of this because it is so politically dangerous, and it is hard to get funding for serious research. But it would be wonderful for the children themselves if it could be done.

There is a parallel, I think, with the 'Outsiders' Club'. Handicapped people, like children, so often have to put up with being spoken to as though they are not real human beings. People don't converse with them about sex or love. When I have talked about these things seriously, I've been told, "Fantastic! You're the first person who has talked to me about such things." Their faces light up at being involved in a real conversation at last.⁽²⁾

It's the same with children; they would love to talk seriously about whom they fancy and so on.

Q. *You told me earlier that you are happily unmarried and do not have children of your own. How would you answer the charge that your view of children is irresponsible and that your attitude to paedophilia would be different if you had had children yourself?*

A. I don't think all people's feelings about children are necessarily related to being parents. I know one man who gets very emotional and upset by the idea of paedophilia, but he's not a parent. On the other hand, by no means all parents are against other adults having sex with children.⁽³⁾

Q. *Do you feel that children are a 'special' category of people in any way? Lots of adults speak of having a special tenderness and protectiveness towards them, though some would say there's an excess of sentimentality here.*

A. Sometimes, yes, I've had that feeling. My little brothers were born when I was in my teens and I helped to bring them up myself. But I think it is also worth saying that parents, or those most responsible for bringing up children, don't necessarily know and understand their children just by virtue of doing that job.

A little girl of seven and her parents were guests at my flat once. The girl came into the bedroom occupied by myself and my boyfriend one night and asked if she could see us 'doing it' together. Well, I was not going to oblige, for I was worried that it might get back to her parents and of what they might think. So she lay down and asked if she could borrow a pencil. I gave her one and she started to demonstrate on herself with it. "Look," she said, "this is what you two should be doing."

Later on, I tried to tell the parents what had happened in case they thought I had been teaching her things. But they were just dismissive, saying, "Oh, she wouldn't know anything; she's been looking at her hamsters." I noticed then the gap that can develop between parents and children.

Q. *Some people might say that there is too much of a gap in terms of age, maturity and power between children and paedophiles. What do you say to this?*

A. The main thing is if people are attracted to each other and want each other. If erotic and affectionate feelings bring people of

different ages together, then that is a good thing. I think it is beautiful! In Holland, one can see men and boys talking to each other in the street; but one hardly ever sees this in England, and it's a pity.

- Q. *It is suggested, though, that the authority adults have over children makes it hard for them to disobey. If a man suggests it is a good idea for a little girl to take down her knickers, how can she do anything else?*
- A. Try persuading a child to eat cabbage if he or she doesn't like it. What price adult authority then? Children are not slow to express their dislikes, especially these days.
- Q. *Yes, that is a point I have made myself before now; but people are inclined to be sceptical when I say it as a man and as a paedophile. It is, of course, possible to ignore children's expressed wishes, but then we are talking about molestation. Do you see any possible sources of harm in sexuality that children find pleasurable and engage in willingly?*
- A. No, not in the activity itself; but harmful and sometimes long-lasting guilt feelings can be instilled if the child is later made to feel that what happened was wrong. The trouble is that just telling a parent or someone else about the experience and seeing the shocked reaction can be damaging.⁴ This is not a problem solely for adult/child sex though; there are plenty of adults who react badly to children's masturbation, or to any signs of sexual interest they may display.
- Q. *It is sometimes suggested that a child can appear to be willingly involved in a sexual act, but is not really enjoying it. Isn't it possible, especially with girls, for an adult to delude him/herself that he/she is giving a child a sexual turn-on?*

A. Girls do show signs of physical arousal, such as flushed cheeks. But the important thing to remember is that it is not difficult to know when someone is being sexy and wants to be touched.

Q. *You speak as though you think such contacts can be okay as long as there is mutual pleasure. Is this right?*

A. Yes. I think it might be a good thing to follow up relationships between children and adults, where they have had a chance to run their course without being stopped by the parents or whomever. It would be good to see how boys and girls grow up feeling about these experiences.⁶ So basically, yes, I see no harm in people giving pleasure to each other.

Q. *Is your philosophy pleasure for pleasure's sake?*

A. Yes. But I think a false equation is sometimes made between liking pleasure and being selfish. Just because someone likes pleasure does not mean they have to seek it at other people's expense. On the contrary, in my experience, pleasure-seeking can go hand-in-hand with wanting to give pleasure to others too.

Q. *And that can apply in terms of erotic pleasure-giving as between adults and children?*

A. I certainly don't see why not.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *Tuppy Owens (private survey, 1983).*
2. *The Outsiders' Club is a group for handicapped people where they can meet and talk over their problems, including sexual ones. The club has regular gatherings and is run by Tuppy Owens.*
3. *See, for example, Roger Moody's INDECENT ASSAULT (Word is Out, London/Peace News, Nottingham, 1980); Dr. Frits Bernard's THE PHENOMENON OF PEDOPHILIA (orig. pub. in Holland/reprinted in UNDERSTANDING PEDOPHILIA No.4, PIE, 1977); and DE HAAGSE POST (Holland, March 18th, 1978).*
4. *Even here, though, several researchers have pointed out that it is possible to exaggerate the damage done to the child. See, for instance, THE BOY SEX OFFENDER AND HIS LATER CAREER, by L. J. Doshay (Grune & Stratton, 1943), and 'Female Child Victims of Sex Offences', by J. Gagnon (SOCIAL PROBLEMS, No.13, 1965).*
5. *There is, of course, some research being done in this field now, and apart from the Sandfort study in the Netherlands and the NAMBLA pamphlet in the USA, see also the interview with Peter (reprinted in MAGPIE No.12, PIE/orig. pub. in CAMPAIGN, Australia); the interview with Mark Moffett, aged 15 (SEMIOTEXT, New York, 1982); and the interviews by Michel Berkel in the Flemish HUOMO (May 18th, 1978). More general trends enabling young people to discuss their sexuality can be seen in such publications as, I KNOW WHAT I AM; GAY TEENAGERS AND THE LAW (Joint Council for Gay Teenagers, GCFGT, London, 1980); BREAKING THE SILENCE; GAY TEENAGERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES, ed. by Michael Burbidge & Jonathan Walters (GCFGT, London, 1981); and ONE TEENAGER IN TEN (Alyson Books, Boston, USA, 1983).*

Chapter 7

CHILDREN AND SEX: A Child Counsellor's View

by MICHAEL INGRAM

The Effects of Adult/Child Sexual Relations on Children

When discussing the effects on children of sexual relationships with adults, one must keep in mind that there are different aspects to the problem. It all depends on the context of the act itself. If, for example, there was violence used on the child by an adult then, quite clearly, one could expect traumatic results, possibly even leading to adult neurosis.

But we are not exactly talking about that kind of assault on a child or anything where coercion is used, or the child is made to do things repugnant to itself; only to those acts where the child appears to freely consent. Not all these are innocuous; for example, I know of a child who was very grossly deprived, from a poor family, who was paid for sexual services and became a homosexual prostitute when he grew older. Clearly, the element that was damaging here was the payments to the child which ultimately resulted in prostitution. So one never expects that an assault on a child which involves force or coercion, or something repugnant to the child, or payment for the child's services to go without some sort of deleterious result upon the child's character.

However, extensive research over the last forty years⁽¹⁾ has indicated that sexual contacts between children and adults are most commonly between children and adults whom they know very well, with whom they have a good relationship; scoutmasters, youth leaders, even fairly close relations; people often known to the family, liked by the child,

and with these there is occasional consent to homosexual or paedophilic activity.

When this happens, one must consider the effects upon discovery and to what happens to the child's world. There is usually an excited scene in the family, police interviews, medical examinations, two or three and maybe more appearances in court; the whole world getting thoroughly excited about some passing incident that the child probably took to be an enjoyable affair. In this case, one can expect bad effects upon the child's character, not because of the 'sexual assault' itself, but because of the uproar it caused. A child below the age of puberty very frequently doesn't distinguish between homosexual and heterosexual activity; he is interested in pleasure in the genital organ and does not regard that sort of thing as being homosexual or effeminate in any way, just something that he might well have engaged in with other children whom he knew.

Parental Attitudes and Reactions

So why is there so much dismay and agony on the part of unfortunate parents whose children have had some sort of sexual activity of this kind?

The real answer lies with the total attitude of the adult world to the childhood world. We all live in a comfortable fantasy that the world of the child is one of innocence, of good morality, of ignorance of sex, etc., and this stereotype can be very damaging because it can restrict the child's growth. It can lead to a refusal, for example, of sex education, or of giving children the means of access to family planning, and so on. Parents also equate it with morality. They think that sexually, a child is a moral person and that his or her first sexual experience is the gateway to sin and vice; hence the still prevalent condemnation in Western societies of masturbation. And thus it is that when an adult introduces a child to sexual pleasure he/she is regarded as a monster of depravity rather than, as in many cases, a well-beloved friend or contact of the child.

The Pedophile and the Press

I have always intimated that many pedophiles are genuine child-lovers. They are affectionate and caring and have a lot to offer children. But there *are* 'monsters' and there are people who exploit children for their own completely selfish ends. Pedophiles, however, are no better and no worse than anyone else in this particular characteristic. They are certainly not as bad as those elements of the press who earn money, large quantities of it, by making sensational stories about events, most of which to my mind, need not be blown up as much as they are.

The Type of Children Involved

Let us now turn our attention to the sort of children most likely to become involved in sexual relationships with adults. To begin with, I should point out that sexual contacts between adults and children seem to be of two kinds. Firstly, there are those which result from an intense affectionate relationship, and this is usually found where the child comes from a deprived background, or is him/herself emotionally deprived. The other involves the rather boistrous, adventurous game of mutual masturbation, or just simply grabbing one another's genitals. This one finds in healthy, active, vigorous boys, and it can sometimes involve men. Now, quite clearly, we have two sorts of activity here, and the vigorous, boistrous activity of rough and rude men and boys must not be equated with a gentle, delicate, loving relationship between an adult and a child.

I speak, of course, from my own research experience, though I can't generalise too much as I tend to work with children - mostly boys - from deprived families. But on the whole, the researches of others tend to confirm my own in saying that many children who become involved in an affectionate relationship with an adult which is likely to lead to sex, are children who are deprived; often from a good family, but the one outsider so to speak.⁽²⁾

Who are the Pædophiles?

When it comes to the type of adults involved, it becomes clear that they have singular personal problems which are sometimes identified as being the cause of pædophilia, but that I myself believe are the result. When a child in the pre-pubertal years finds himself being attracted to other children sexually, or partly sexually, he is in essence being narcissistic; he is in love with himself.⁽³⁾ This is mainly because his attempts towards being affectionate towards other boys, in particular, are often repudiated; but it isn't until he becomes more mature that he absorbs the labels of homosexual or pædophile.

With men who love girls, it is slightly different in that it is regarded as quite normal for a boy to find a girl sexually attractive, even in the pre-pubertal years, and it is not until he gets to be considerably older than the girls he admires that he discovers he is a pædophile. There appears to be some sort of maturational problem, but many pædophiles can recall feelings and impressions going back to the ages of, say, six or seven, which they have kept bottled up until released to a counsellor in later years.

Can There be Benefits?

We are always hearing about the possible bad effects of adult/child sex, but what about the possible benefits?

This, of course, is a difficult area, mainly because it will be taken by some as offensive. To talk about the benefits of something which they would claim is immoral, would be a nonsense. However, leaving aside this objection for a moment, I will go back to the distinction I first made between sexual acts which result from an intimate and affectionate relationship and those which are adventurous. The beneficial effects between adults who love children and the children themselves can be seen to arise from the fact that they have love for each other; love which they might not have had otherwise from any other source. This love need not be sexual. If it is sexual, the sexuality

is quite incidental as far as the child is concerned. What he is concerned with is a loving relationship with a nice man - a man who is not a monster, and many studies have shown that relationships between children and these men can be very beneficial.⁽⁴⁾ It is known from cases that come before the courts that some of these men have done wonderful work for children; scoutmasters, youth leaders, and so on. There is no doubt about it at all that what many growing boys want is an affectionate relationship with an adult. I don't think that the sexual act, if it occurs, has any bearing upon this. It is incidental as far as the child is concerned, if not as far as the adult is concerned as well.

Ages of Consent.

So what about the question of the ages of consent?

Well, I am not at all sure that their abolition would be the answer. I would want to modify it very carefully. I wouldn't want to say simply abolish the ages of consent because that might leave the weak vulnerable in the hands of the strong. Certainly I believe that people should be allowed to express their sexual impulses without unnecessary impediment from the state; but I do not think that 'wholesale' sexual activity between older and younger persons should go completely unregulated. This has always been my opinion, an opinion I have expressed on many occasions.⁽⁵⁾ The matter of ages of consent must be considered very carefully; it is not an easy issue.

(NB, The above was transcribed from a taped interview conducted by the editor)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. See, for example, E. Revitch & R. G. Weiss, 'The Pædophilic Offender' (*DISEASES OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM*, Vol.23, No.2, 1962).
2. See *VULNERABLE CHILDREN: THREE STUDIES OF CHILDREN IN CONFLICT*, by Lindy Burton (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1968).
3. See *THE DEATH OF NARCISSUS*, by M. Fraser (Secker & Warburg, London, 1976), and *THE FORBIDDEN LOVE*, ed. by William Kraemer (Sheldon Press, London, 1976).
4. In J. Z. Eglinton's *GREEK LOVE*, for example (Neville Spearman, London, 1971), the author gave some impressive case histories to prove that pædophilia between men and boys, when handled with care, can actually reduce patterns of juvenile delinquency and alienation.
5. See various press reports from 1977, and my article 'Laws of Consent' (reprinted in *MAGPIE* No.8, *PIE*, 1977).

Chapter 8

THE PÆDOPHILES

by BEATRICE FAUST

Our community cannot begin rational debate about pædophilia so long as it accepts a fantastic stereotype of the pædophile, imagining a dirty old man, mentally sick, or at the very least, alcoholic or senile. Using sweets, money or guile to lure innocent children to lonely places, he then does unspeakable things to them, often rounding off the awful business with sadistic murder.⁽¹⁾

A Survey of Pædophiles Examined

Fortunately, in his book, THE CHILD-LOVERS, Dr. Glenn Wilson has assembled a more nearly lifelike composite pædophile that should exorcise the spirit of the identikit child molester for good.⁽²⁾

Most of our knowledge of pædophiles comes from the gutter press or from case histories of individuals seeking therapy because they are unhappy with their particular sexual bent, or studies of convicted sex offenders. Prisoners and patients represent a more troubled group that is probably not typical of all pædophiles. Glenn Wilson, however, reached an untapped group, members of the London based Pædophile Information Exchange. Very few of those who replied to his questions had experienced either prosecution or clinical 'help'. The sample was made up predominantly of individuals who had proved their ability to live competently in society.

Wilson's book is not a perfect piece of research, but is a very readable study, high on human interest, low on jargon. It contains enough hard data to prove its academic bona fides, but generous verbatim

quotes from the pædophiles' own replies gives it a satisfying tone of the living voice. It unearths some provocative information about the men who love children - regrettably, there were no female pædophiles within PIE at the time of the survey - and reveals how these men understood the meaning of the word love.

PIE's one hundred and eighty members were invited to complete two mailed questionnaires; the forced choice, short answer, Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ), and a less formal Pædophile Questionnaire (PQ). Seventy-five replied and a sub-group of these were followed up for face-to-face interviews. Wilson found that the men had a higher professional status and were less prone to unemployment than the general population. THE CHILD-LOVERS, then, tells us little about the pædophile on the Clapham omnibus, but it does show, unequivocally, how the pædophile stereotype crumples under evidence.

Wilson found the men's scores on EPQ exceptionally high on introversion, which is not considered pathological; otherwise, they were strikingly 'normal'. Comparing pædophiles' actual conduct with their fantasies and their expectations as to what they would do if the laws changed, he found that, for them, love is mainly gentle, nurturant, and not especially carnal. Almost half the men favoured non-genital physical tenderness such as cuddling and kissing. Almost a quarter preferred non-penetrative genital contact, mainly masturbation and oral sex. Fewer than one in ten chose any form of penetration. Almost one third would accept entirely platonic relationships.

Pædophile sexuality is not predatory; it is not wholly or even mainly genital, and child-lovers reveal at least as much agape as eros. It has some characteristics of the masculine erotic style, for many pædophiles enjoy visual stimuli and a variety of partners. But many also prefer couple-bonding and tactile stimuli that are more common in the feminine style.

Overwhelmingly, their love is process orientated (feminine) rather than performance orientated (masculine). All of us share both feminine

and masculine components of sexual style in varying degrees, but the most dominant characteristic of pædophilic love is the epimeletic - nurturant - response to children found in both sexes among chimps and some human cultures, but mainly among women in the industrial West.

Wilson's single biggest gaffe derives from his crass socio-biological view of human sexuality. Having previously decided that male sexuality is disposed to dominance, he deduces that pædophiles choose kids because they are easily dominated. His understanding of male sexuality is naive, his socio-biology is weak, and his own evidence contradicts his conclusions on child-love.

Paul Gebhard's mammoth study, *SEX OFFENDERS*,⁽³⁾ helps to explain the discrepancy between the identikit child molester and the gentle pædophile who emerges from Wilson's study and many others.⁽⁴⁾ Gebhard found that incarcerated, non-violent offenders against children may be divided into eight categories - pædophiles and seven others. Where the children were female, about one quarter to one third of the offenders were pædophiles. With male children, the proportion of pædophiles was about half. A few offenders liked children of either sex. The overall conclusion, then, can only be that not all sex offences against children are committed by people who are predominantly pædophile orientated.

In Wilson's study, a few men identified themselves as pædophiles even though they had never had a carnal relationship with a child, or at best only one. Some were pædophiles only in their fantasy life. I have the impression that sublimation comes more easily to pædophiles than to most adult males, and that both pornography and, more commonly, snapshot photography, play a significant part in their fantasies.

All this lends credibility to the common pædophile claim that consent is essential to a good relationship, and that they can take no for an answer if a child withholds consent. Several of Wilson's interviewees specifically pointed out that consent, kindness, and

respect for the child's feelings were the points which distinguished pedophiles from child molesters: 'If you genuinely loved children, you wouldn't want to hurt or coerce them'.

Dr. Paul Wilson, reader in Sociology at the University of Queensland, Australia, has already attacked the bogeyman stereotype in *THE MAN THEY CALLED A MONSTER*.⁽⁵⁾ This is an intensive study of one man, Clarence Osborne, assessed through face-to-face interviews over a period of eighteen months, and through selections from Osborne's own tapes, transcripts and manuscripts.

Osborne had been both a court and parliamentary reporter with an unblemished record for diligence, good behaviour and civic spirit. When a series of mishaps threatened to expose his relationships with more than two thousand five hundred boys, Osborne killed himself. The media presented this quiet, unobtrusive man as a chimera of Gilles de Retz, Dean Allen Coril and Godzilla.⁽⁶⁾

This scurrilous publicity brought a dozen of Osborne's ex-protégés to Paul Wilson. They corroborated Osborne's account; he did not use threats or bribery; he never initiated a relationship unless he was certain of the boy's consent; he was a mentor and father substitute as well as a lover; and he contributed to the boys' social development, including their transition to adulthood.

Clarence Osborne gave Paul Wilson a never-to-be-repeated opportunity for study and he seized it. Glenn Wilson also faced a unique chance and failed to make the most of it. He conducted his survey between 1978-9 when PIE was under the spirited, innovative leadership of Tom O'Carroll. This was shortly before the unjust and notorious conspiracy trial which put him in prison for two years.⁽⁷⁾

When PIE was approached for its co-operation, the organisation had three goals; to establish self-help in coping with anxiety, alienation and isolation; to raise pedophile consciousness and campaign for changes in restrictive laws; and to convince politicians and the public that

such change was both necessary and desirable. O'Carroll details PIE's history in his highly intelligent work, PÆDOPHILIA; THE RADICAL CASE, ⁽⁸⁾

Glenn Wilson was lucky enough to catch PIE in its expansionary stage, but his book was published in a period of moral backlash and post-Falklands jingoism. Tom O'Carroll stresses the importance of the Falklands fracas in turning the retreat from 'permissiveness' into a rout.

"Since 1975/6, things have been getting steadily worse and worse. What happened in England during this episode and afterwards served to show that there is a movement backwards; a move to what one might call atavistic values. People are looking towards military values, towards ideas that used to be associated with Empire. All this stands in opposition to sensuality and sexual self-expression, which are seen as anarchic, chaotic and destructive. Conservative values seem to be winning out, temporarily at least." ⁽⁹⁾

In THE CHILD-LOVERS, Dr. Wilson seems to have interpreted his material with one ear cocked for the strident voice of Mrs. Whitehouse. For example, the Lie Scale, built into the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, showed that pædophiles were honest and accurate at self-reporting. Nevertheless, he discounts their emphases on loving relationships and consensual carnality because they may have been trying to project a good image for themselves and for PIE. Is it likely that pædophiles would be truthful and accurate on one questionnaire and dissimulate on the other?

THE CHILD-LOVERS adopts many tokens of academic objectivity - psychometric inventories, graphs, cross-references, anonymity - but its tone is ambivalent and judgemental. The author acknowledges that the hostility aroused by love between adults and children is irrational and needs to be explained. But at the same time, he calls this love a 'perversion', a curiously dated word.

Pedophilia is just another paraphilia; a move away from exclusive heterosexual coitus. It belongs among the sexual curiosia. It is puzzling, but hardly a moral infection. Glenn Wilson's results are comforting, but his conclusion is pusillaninous; he finds legislative change would be premature (is it ever anything else?).

Paul Wilson, on the other hand, living and working in a different culture, is vastly more radical. His recommendations are true to his research findings. He confronts the problem of irrational prejudice, carefully separates personal from public issues, and suggests that the ages of consent concept be dropped and offences be considered on the basis of things like violence, fraud, or coercion. He further outlines a children's bill of rights, including their right to sexual freedom.

Orthodoxy teaches that children are, or should be, sexless, equating innocence with ignorance and immaturity. Suffragettes in all countries initiated ages of consent and incest laws to protect children from sexual exploitation - which was a real hazard - and premature sexual awakening - which was a Victorian middle-class phobia.

Even now, in the 1980s, the problems continue. Despite much extensive research, children are still regarded as sexless and a concerned minority are still trying to enforce unenforceable laws that define any sexual contact between children and their elders as molestation.

If sex is defined only as procreational activity, then it follows that pre-pubertal children will be viewed as sexless. Yet most human sexual activity is not reproductive but recreational, and children are capable of enjoying eroticism from babyhood. Without acquired inhibitions, sexuality would develop more strongly before puberty.

Sexual activity depends on an individual's bodily capacity, the stimuli available to awaken that capacity, and previous experience. By censoring stimuli and inhibiting experience, society has been able to pretend that the capacity is non-existent.

Blitz attempts to enforce sex laws, like 'Operation Innocents', a phone-in organised by the SUN (Australia) and the police with community help, perpetuate the illusion of children's sexlessness. This particular blitz lumped together child pornography and child prostitution with child sex abuse, although the first two are distinguished by a rampant profit motive and the third is a portmanteau category that encompasses many different types of encounter. A large number will be incestuous, while others will be anything from an impulsive assault by a stranger to a long-standing relationship with someone who is not a blood relative.

And the children do not suffer equally in all situations. Moreover, although the phone-in revealed six hundred complaints, there is inevitably a large number of 'crimes' without complainants. If each complaint led to a conviction, there would still be a submerged proportion who escaped. The guilty would become scapegoats for the rest.

THE CHILD-LOVERS shows roughly how this scapegoating works in England. Being a pædophile is not, in itself, an offence. The offence lies in a specific sexual incident. In ten detailed biographies, we find that no less than two hundred children were involved in relationships which lasted from six months to ten years. There were also several hundred ephemeral contacts. Ages of consent and indecent assault laws did not prevent these incidents and only four of the ten men were prosecuted. Three of the four had one conviction and one man had five. That is, the laws had been broken many times, but successfully enforced on only eight occasions.

In the case of non-violent contacts, the children are often more traumatised by the criminal proceedings than by the sexual experiences. There is no point in retaining laws that fail to prevent or punish; that cannot be enforced with equity; and which often cause harm to the children they were supposedly designed to protect.

The pædophile case against such laws is not based on the injustices of scapegoating but on children's right to sexual self-determination. This seems obliquely self-serving; obviously pædophiles cannot frankly demand the right of sexual access to children without setting up conflicts of interest - pædophiles versus children, and pædophiles versus parents. I believe there is self-interest here, but it is of a subtle and illuminating kind.

Afterthoughts

Some tribal cultures accept this blend of nurturance and eroticism as a normal part of children's socialisation. Perhaps the most common ritualised form of cross-generational sex is found in puberty rites among tribal Aborigines and some New Guineans.⁽¹⁰⁾ Boys undergo a period in the 'wife' role on their way to manhood. Later, as fully-fledged men, they may take their turn playing the husband/mentor role to the next generation of initiates, often as a prelude to their own heterosexual marriages.

Less formal relationships prevailed in ancient Greece. Pæiderastia was a chivalrous system in which the man taught the boy a code of honour, ethical behaviour, and good manners. Neither role was obligatory. Arguably, the relationship was supposed to begin when the boy entered puberty.⁽¹¹⁾ However, pæiderastia was not an alternative to heterosexual marriage and procreation, but an adjunct to it.

We are not a tribal culture, and ancient Greece ended before the coming of Christ. The chief legacy of the Christian West was to make sex anathema except for procreation. This very minute, recreational sex is struggling for cultural recognition. Some parents still discourage their children from masturbating, and child-love is as mysterious as it was in Lewis Carroll's England.

In the microchip cultures, pædophilia tends to be an exclusive preference that is usually incompatible with marriage.⁽¹²⁾ Furthermore,

the pædophile is not simply playing a temporary role, for his/her preference is at the core of his/her sexual identity, although he/she may choose whether or not to express this proclivity. Therapy or punishment is useless. Exclusiveness and permanence make the modern pædophile's dilemma that much more urgent.

Children cannot be wholly self-determining as long as factors like parental unemployment, poverty, or homelessness force them into prostitution or pornography. And they cannot exercise satisfactory sexual self-determination without adequate sex education.

Women and homosexuals, as well as children and child-lovers, are oppressed by the view that procreational sex is the only erotic activity that rates the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. 'Real' women become mothers, 'real' men impregnate women. But this view cannot survive the economic pressure for fewer children and the technocracy's demand for less, but better educated workers. Economics and technology are already carrying society in the direction to which women's liberation and gay liberation point. Procreation is no longer the hallowed activity it once was.

Accepting recreational sex makes it easier to accept the so-called paraphilias, including child-love. But what of the law? Historically, changes of law enforcement precede changes in the law itself. Parents and law enforcement agencies are beginning to question the wisdom of putting children through the gruelling ordeal of court proceedings. And research is increasingly emphatic about the differences between pædophiles and child molesters.

In Holland, many jurisdictions are already exercising discretion in enforcing the laws covering child sex. The Rotterdam Vice Squad, for example, tells the parents that a trial may be traumatic for the child, and lets them decide whether prosecution should go ahead. Their courts are also awarding lighter sentences to pædophiles in many cases.

Perhaps it is time to send some of our law enforcers to see how such matters are managed in Holland?

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *On the public stereotype/s of pædophiles, see Ken Plummer's 'Pædophilia: Constructing a Sociological Baseline' in M. Cook & K. Howells' [editors] ADULT SEXUAL INTEREST IN CHILDREN (Academic Press, London, 1981), and the same author's 'Images of Pædophilia' in LOVE AND ATTRACTION: AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, ed. by M. Cook & G. Wilson (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1979).*
2. *THE CHILD-LOVERS; A STUDY OF PÆDOPHILES IN SOCIETY, by Glenn D. Wilson & David N. Cox (Peter Owen, London, 1983).*
3. *SEX OFFENDERS; AN ANALYSIS OF TYPES, by Paul H. Gebhard et al (Harper-Hoeber, New York, 1965).*
4. *In D. J. West's HOMOSEXUALITY, for example, the typical pædophile is described as a "timorous, inhibited person" who "solicits with pathetic gentleness, with a view to no more than the sort of mutual fondling and inspection that children often indulge in with each other," (First pub. by Duckworth, London, 1955/reprinted in Penguin-Pelican, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1968 & 1974.)*
5. *THE MAN THEY CALLED A MONSTER; SEXUAL EXPERIENCES BETWEEN MEN AND BOYS, by Paul Wilson (Cassell, Australia, 1981).*
6. *Gilles de Retz, a close confidant of Joan of Arc was, of course, the notorious Marshal of France who sexually tortured and killed scores of young boys in obscene rituals. Dean Allen Corll was the man responsible for one of the biggest mass murders of young men in US history. Like de Retz, Corll tortured his victims sexually before killing them. See GILLES DE RETZ; THE AUTHENTIC BLUEBEARD, by Jean Benedetti (Peter Davies, London, 1971), and THE MAN WITH THE CANDY by J. Olsen (Simon & Schuster, New York, 1974), respectively.*

7. In his book, *POLITICAL TRIALS IN BRITAIN* (Allen Lane, London, 1983), Peter Hain, never a friend of pædophiles, said this about the trial: "Understandable' public distaste for his (O'Carroll's) activities diverted attention from the fact that Conspiracy to Corrupt Public Morals is a highly subjective and political charge; and also that the use of conspiracy enabled the prosecution to mount a case that would have been impossible on the substantive activities themselves which were not actually criminal offences." Patricia Hewitt had earlier come to a similar conclusion in her study, *THE ABUSE OF POWER; CIVIL LIBERTIES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM* (Martin Robertson, Oxford, 1982); "The considerable controversy aroused by the case, . . . , overshadowed the deplorable nature of the conspiracy charge used by the prosecution, *Conspiring to Corrupt Public Morals* is an offence incapable of definition or precise proof."
8. Peter Owen (London, 1980).
9. Personal correspondence with Tom O'Carroll.
10. See, for instance, *GROWING UP IN NEW GUINEA*, by Margaret Mead (first pub, in 1930/reprinted in Penguin-Pelican, 1973).
11. There is a lot of dissension about this, and some authorities would claim that such relationships only began in adolescence.
12. Although not necessarily. Some PIE members, for instance, were married, and others had children of their own.

Chapter 9

QUESTIONING AGES OF MAJORITY AND AGES OF CONSENT

by PETER TATCHELL

The notion of legally enforced ages of sexual consent is premised on social estimations of physical and emotional maturity. Until recently, this was overwhelmingly informed by a metaphysical moral fiction rather than biological and psychological fact. Current laws are based on the idea that only at a certain fixed age is a person able to make a free and responsible decision about sexual relationships. Yet, inevitably, fixed ages of consent are based on definitions of average maturity and responsibility. This necessarily means that some people 'mature' before the average and others after it. A rigid and inflexible legal limit on sexual activity cannot, therefore, take into account individual diversity from the generalised norm.

Of course, what constitutes physical and emotional maturity and the age of sexual responsibility is a subjective and precarious judgement, culturally and historically variable.⁽¹⁾ In mediæval England, betrothals and the consummation of marriages often occurred at thirteen or fourteen years of age, signifying a very different notion of when people were assumed to be fit to take on 'adult responsibilities'.⁽²⁾

So, the very idea of ages of sexual consent related to a broader concept of adulthood, is not a universal and historically immutable notion. It varies from society to society and from era to era. It seems quite reasonable, therefore, that we should question the present social and legal definitions of the age of majority. What purpose does it serve other than reinforcing a set of increasingly quaint, minority

Questioning Ages of Majority & Consent

moral values left over from the Victorian era? Shouldn't we be preparing and educating children for greater rights and responsibilities at an earlier age; perhaps critically re-examing our concept of childhood and viewing children more as young citizens?⁽³⁾

Certainly, in the realm of sexual ages of consent, we need to ask whether the law has any legitimate role to play in criminalising consenting, victimless sexual activity. As for protecting the young; the main protection they need, as do adults, is legal protection against forced, involuntary sexual acts which is afforded by the laws covering rape and sexual assault; plus protection against self-destroying feelings of guilt and anxiety which are so often stirred up by sexual encounters outside the ages of consent precisely because they are illicit and regarded as shameful. It is usually this social shame, more than the sexual act itself, which harms young people. The psychological scars of court cases and societal disapproval often remain long after the actual sexual encounter is forgotten; no more so than among Britain's young gay men who are still the victims of a discriminatory age of consent of twenty-one.

In a fully democratic and egalitarian society, there can be no question of adults usurping the rights of young people by keeping them in a state of ignorance, fear and guilt, or by resort to arbitrary and autocratic laws which deny them responsibility for decisions affecting their lives, especially about their own bodies and emotions.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *As evidenced by the varying ages of consent around the world which are often wildly dissimilar; for example, England's homosexual age of consent of 21, Japan's 13.*
2. *In earlier times, children held some important positions. There have, for instance, been many child naval and army officers.*

3. See various publications of the children's rights crusades, especially, *BIRTHRIGHTS: A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR CHILDREN*, by Richard Farson (Macmillan, New York, 1974); *THE CHILDREN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT*, ed. by Beatrice & Ronald Gross (Anchor Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1977); and *CHILDREN'S RIGHTS: TOWARDS THE LIBERATION OF THE CHILD*, ed. by P. Adams (Praeger, New York, 1971).

Chapter 10

ENDS AND MEANS: HOW TO MAKE PÆDOPHILIA ACCEPTABLE....?

by *ROGER MOODY*

They were no more than about eight or nine years old - possibly they were brothers. Freckle-faced, angular-limbed, bursting with smiles, the boys lay naked on their sunbeds, rubbing their own and each other's erections until they stood over white midriffs like miniature leaning towers,

All very normal to a libertarian, even to some open-minded parents; except that these young people were on an open beach at the busiest time of the year surrounded by scores of people of all ages. No-one took a blind bit of notice of their play - or rather, few of us were blind but none censorious. But this wasn't Margate or Palm Beach; this was last year at Zandvoort in the Netherlands..... and a million miles from Brighton.

I choose to grab the reader's attention through the device of a 'cocky' little yarn, not merely because what will follow is of high seriousness, but because the mutual masturbation of young children is in itself a highly serious business. Acceptance of the free sexual expression of the young is at the root of all sexual liberation. We need to ask ourselves why it is that some 'primitive' societies accept this, while placing proscriptions on what their young people will do when grown up, and why many 'civilised' societies do the opposite, seeming not to care what adults choose to do together, while denying virtually every sexual expression in their children.

More particularly, why do these societies abstract children's eroticism from all other dealings their young people have with the external world? Why are these, the most subjective and personal feelings as well as the earliest,⁽²⁾ regarded as fundamentally different from, say, what children do with their toys or even with the excreta from their own bodies? Why - to paraphrase Christiane Rochefort⁽³⁾ - is the strongest control imposed on growing people at the very age at which their desire for sexual expression is the most intense?

We have to consider whether or not such questions are false, or at the least rhetorical. We have no recorded instances of a human society in which children had sexual freedom, coexisting with strict regulation of what they did otherwise, or with the rest of their bodies. In all cases, erotic repression was linked with other kinds of restrictions; on the right to live where you wished; to choose the task you performed; to go where you would.

And this linkage appears so strong, so self-fulfilling, that until recently no anthropologist or social psychologist had dared to propose that it might be a fallacy. In other words, that trying to stop children doing what they want with their genitals is not an essential to the stability of a society - like discouraging them from eating poison berries or burning down their elders' houses must be; it is made to *seem* fundamental, partly because it is easy for adults to focus their control on a universal, and universally comprehended activity; and partly because of an historical and cultural confusion between sexuality and gender.

In order to dispense with the linkage, or at least to denystify it, we require more than logic. Just as we can undermine patriarchy, so we can undermine the false symbiosis of childhood sexual repression with social control, by asserting that it *should not* exist.

In the first instance, it is instructive to take a leaf out of the book of feminists who find that men organise language itself against them. When they try to argue the case for having their own space,

developing their own organisations and styles of living, they become 'separatists' or even 'oppressors'. In a similar fashion, those who respond to a child's need for love or sexual exploration become 'molesters' or 'aggressors'. So, to quote Gertrude Stein, a rose is a rose - or a kid is a kid is a kid, and children's weakness is defined solely by adults's views of what strength should be. As Paulo Freire has eloquently demonstrated,⁴ the mystification of language is the basic cement of social control. This process is not extraordinary at all, to women and non-white peoples who have been subjected to generations of such self-fulfilling prophesying. But what is more surprising is that many women do not see the striking similarity between how, historically, they have been typified by men, and how children are typified now. This is a point to which I shall return.

In the second instance, we must see clearly that changes in our attitudes to children's *eros* must relate to, but not be totally dependent on other social transformations. It is wrong, and utterly naive, to expect that free sexuality in children will become widely accepted without the defeat of patriarchal attitudes, the dissolution of the nuclear family, and the acceptance of children's rights. But it is utterly utopian, as well as wrong, for radicals to insist that positive and unexploitive childhood or inter-generational sexuality must be postponed until that day.

Thirdly, we have to acknowledge that the common equation of sex with gender is a fundamental error and, far from adducing support for oppressed women or gays, actually detracts from it. It follows that boy/man eroticism is quite different from that between man and girl.

Lastly, we must show that the prime position given to sexual practice and orientation in most Western societies is not because sexuality is *sui generis*, a unique constant, but on the contrary because it is uniquely suited to being channelled and manipulated by the powerful in the interests of maintaining their power.

The 'Utopian' Myth

The injunction to hold back on libertarian practice until power has been more evenly distributed in society is characteristic of many radicals, not least of feminists, and for obvious reasons. Many of us lived through the turbulent sixties in which 'making love, not war' was quoted as a panacea for numerous evils. We emerged from that period bruised and disillusioned, to discover that men still held the control of political organisations, women were still subordinate, and children's self-determination was still an impossible dream. Free love, especially for the young, became a dirty phrase. Paradoxically, children's sexuality was no longer a subject of dispute, but how children expressed it was being increasingly proscribed. This change in attitude was dramatically illustrated by the leading feminist Andrea Dworkin who supported inter-generational sex at the conclusion of a seminal attack on patriarchy a dozen years ago, yet in 1981 damned it as a key instrument of male oppression.⁽⁶⁾

We should, however, realise that it is not primarily the feminists and radical gays who reject child/adult eros, but the conservative psychiatrists and social engineers. The radicals, however opposed they may be at present to freeing childhood sexuality, do generally accept eventual children's autonomy. Their view of it is, however, highly rarified, and usually they are blind to the few examples of it which now exist.⁽⁶⁾ Moreover, they pre-empt the whole issue by declaring that they know best what children will want when they have the freedom to claim it. Their arguments over paedophilic relationships boil down to something like this: Yes, kids (especially boys) do appear to enjoy sex with some adults but this is because they don't have the freedom to do it with each other. Given the choice, they'd choose an age-mate every time.⁽⁷⁾ That this assumption is wholly unfounded on present evidence, for example from the German and American communes of the '60s,⁽⁸⁾ cuts no ice because they are not concerned with contemporary circumstances.

I do not intend here to rebut those who, like the extraordinary Leila Sebbar in her most recent essays on paedophilia,⁽⁹⁾ maintain that

children can never make their own decisions, though I would point out that their arguments are strikingly similar to some which come from the loony political right wing as being tautological and derisive of gains made by radical groups. Instead, I would like to meet the arguments of thinkers who, while calling for children's autonomy, may claim that male domination of the *methods* by which the young can achieve autonomy are too pervasive, in that men have no place in helping define, by responding to, children's sexual desires; or may accept that men can play a role in responding to boys' sexual feelings, but that it is too rarely linked with freeing children from dependence on adults. In other words that to talk of 'paedophile liberation' is both a contradiction and a con.

I have considerably more respect for the logic of the second objection than the first; indeed, I'm persuaded by it myself.⁽¹⁰⁾ I don't believe that there is such a thing as paedophile liberation, only the liberation of paedophilic relationships. In other words, the freedom of paedophiles to have sex with children is contingent on the freedom of both the younger and the older person to withdraw without any form of blackmail or hurt, and also to relate freely to others of any age or gender.

That this is now accepted among sexual radicals, including some paedophiles, is evident.⁽¹¹⁾ Unfortunately, the majority of paedophiles still can't see this. Many who profess to do so are merely being hypocritical, since their advocacy of children's rights is largely defensive, badly reasoned and rhetorical.

I find the claim that men as a gender cannot in any way respond to children's erotic needs contradictory and ultimately self-defeating. Similarly, though women's separatism may be a crucial strengthening strategy now, once it has been institutionalised it will surely justify men continuing to build and rule their own enclaves.

It is even less tenable that, in order to rear non-patriarchal adults, men should avoid relating to children, and especially to boys,

or should stifle their own genital feelings. How can feminists reconcile their injunction to men for taking on more child-care, with principled rejection of men as incapable of care? It is a very flimsy rationalisation to accuse men of imposing their own sexual needs or lifestyles on children. Men don't *need* to impose in the sexual sphere.

Who can deny that it is conformist sex education, whether on the streets or through the media, which is the key vehicle in the perpetuation of misogyny and aggressive sexual expression? Just as radical gay men have deliberately blurred, or even inverted, the conventional image of the dominant male as the macho or beefcake figure, so boylovers have the potential for doing the same. Unfortunately, only a few have taken the opportunity, notably Charles Shiveley and Dan Tsang.⁽¹²⁾ More commonly, we find paedophiles holding up the cultism of Eglinton, Thorkil Vanggaard or, to a lesser extent, Parker Rossman as examples of the blamelessness of inter-generational sex. But blameless for whom, we might ask? Only, of course, for those who want boys to grow up like 'real' men.⁽¹³⁾

The desire amongst our contemporary paedophiles to become respectable and acceptable in current society is perhaps the most critical, though understandable, failing; understandable, because minorities under attack usually seek integration into the oppressing society; lamentably shortsighted because not only is the integration an illusion (it can only end in dissolution of the values of the weaker group) but the compromise effectively alienates other oppressed social groups with whom alliances of strength could be built.

Essentially, the arguments of those who maintain that paedophilia is utopian fall down when we look at the dynamics of inter-generational erotic relationships; how power is both comprehended and redistributed between the younger and older partners in particular instances. I don't mean the facile power of the child to hold the adult to ransom - see Tom O'Carroll for example⁽¹⁴⁾ - but the way in which the boy can grasp new experiences through talking with his lover; can encounter new people, values and beliefs through the acquaintances of his manfriend; can be

regarded as a person for his own sake ("*pour soi*", to quote Sartre's existential term).⁽¹⁵⁾

This dynamic, common to many paedophilic relationships - though by no means all - serves to concretise separate experiences which might be confusing or meaningless for children or adolescents alone. And it is this concretisation which is both enabling and empowering, though the extent of its power may be recognised only at the time when the younger person breaks with his older lover; when he ceases to be an erotic sharer, yet continues to be a friend. Indeed, the way in which the break occurs is crucial in defining and justifying the relationship which preceded it; not just that the younger person might have been enabled to relate to girls, or might have accepted his own gayness but, more importantly, that he has been empowered to relate to *himself*.

The Myth that Sex Equals Gender

So far, I have discussed man/boy eros only, and deliberately so. The assumption that heterosexual and homosexual paedophilia are much the same is a convenient falsehood for those who wish to condemn them both. Unfortunately, it is endorsed by some paedophiles who should know better, notably by Tom O'Carroll and by David Sonenschein.⁽¹⁶⁾ While not condemning heterosexual paedophilia, I will let others marshal the arguments in support of it. Man/boy love is clearly different from man/girl love and much closer to korephilia (not to mention so-called hebephilia) because it is intra-genderal. Anyone who had ignored this fact some years ago might be forgiven.

The myth, perpetuated by both protagonists and antagonists, continues to prosper because sexuality is confused with gender. Discrimination against people because they are female (or male) is universally termed sexism, but it is clearly much more to do with genetic determination than with erotic expression. So-called transsexualism, in which men reidentify with women or vice versa, is really trans-genderism and, though many believe it, has nothing to do with 'being gay'; indeed, the majority of trans-genderal people would appear

to be strongly heterosexual. The general assumption that a man-with-a-penis will respond to a boy-with-a-penis in a similar fashion as to a girl-with-a-vagina; that the adult in a gay relationship will generally use his penis as historically his *gender* has done with women, is not true. In actual fact, paedophile men rarely penetrate young boys, or even desire to do so, and it is certainly true that boys penetrate men more seldom.⁽¹⁷⁾ Here we see a prime failure to regard people as being free to decide their expression of desire without it being dictated by biological gender. My point is not that it is easy to reject the social dictates of gender, but that frequently paedophiles have neither tried, nor have even seen the need, to do so.

The Myth of Sexual Pre-determination

The key myth concerns the role of sexuality itself, the almost universal assumption in Western societies that erotic expression is the basic human need, rather than one of many needs which it has been convenient for certain groups to abstract and manipulate for their own ends. At a time when the birth of children was the prime motive for heterosexual coupling, gender governed sexual relationships. As Brongersma and others have shown,⁽¹⁸⁾ sexual acts between adults and children, for instance up to the nineteenth century in France, were not condemned because of the sexuality but because they were *homosexual*, hence non-reproductive. The acts were certainly 'against nature' but not the nature of the child - largely taken as little different from their elders anyway.⁽¹⁹⁾

However, throughout the early years of the so-called Industrial Revolution the roles of many women and children were dramatically transformed. They moved from the countryside to the towns with their men, becoming the lowest-paid, most servile of the armies of the poor. It was in the liberal/humanitarian - and particularly evangelical - reaction to this new slavery that concepts both of ages of consent and of the 'infantness' of the child were born, as well as the concept of modern feminism, which had to be protected from overpowering masculine

sexuality released in the homes and hovels, after suppression in those 'dark satanic mills'.

Children and women were the first, and worst, casualties of modern consumer-capitalism, and it would be foolish - as well as blind - not to recognise the profound historical connection between the early women's liberation movement and that of child protection. (Although I know of no specific study done on the subject, I would also hazard the guess that the early Victorian passion for de-genderising, as well as de-sexualising, children - subjecting them to unigenderal clothes, hairstyles, language and the all-embracing nanny - was psychotically separated from the two main groups on whose ignorance and enforced weakness male dominance depended.)

When Freud supposedly rediscovered childhood eroticism in the latter part of the last century, what he elucidated was not original, polymorphous sexuality, but a transformed and perverted version of infantile sexuality which had already taken generations to construct. The Viennese neurotic's great contribution was not to free our thoughts on sensuality so that we could relate the whole nineteenth century suppression of it to the social oppressions of the time, but the very opposite. Freud was the *servant* of these notions. It was he who institutionalised erotic repression in his theories of sexual latency and the postponement of gratification, and the subservience of women's sexuality.⁽²⁰⁾ It is more difficult to accuse the Austrian doctor of cementing the historical confusion between male sexuality (as opposed to gender) and aggression; Erich Fromm, perhaps the greatest and most humane of non-Freudians, spent a lifetime de-mystifying those links.⁽²¹⁾ Nonetheless, it was Freud who invented the notion of 'primal horde' - society based on an act of rape; it was Freud who welded *eros* and *thanatos* together like the two sides of a coin - a heritage whose grim harvest we still reap when tinpot politicians, rabble-rousers and fifth-rate media hacks scream that sex is worse than violence, and even that 'sexual assault' can be 'worse than murder'.⁽²²⁾

Only now are we beginning to see these false rationalisations; how Freud's supposed shattering of taboos resulted simply in further, even more intransigent ones. By and large, the freak waves made by the father of the unfortunate Anna Freud continue to wash over us, so that early childhood sexual experience is regarded as *primo inter pares*, the key to childhood experience. This is not out of evidence, but circular logic; since adult sexual maladaptation must be owing to adverse childhood encounters, 'perverted' activities in childhood must produce neurotic or psychotic adults. There is not one straw of objective evidence to support this universal thesis. It would be extremely difficult to find it anyway, given that erotic feelings are among the most subjective (perhaps *the* most) evinced by *homo sapiens*. More important, 'investigators' who purport to show that adult/child sexual contacts or relationships must produce damaged lives break the cardinal rule of scientific enquiry; they dispense with controls and they hammer out moralistic conclusions, using moralistic tools in an atmosphere of constraint and apprehension, if not downright hysteria.

Significantly, as pædophilia has ceased, in some quarters, to be a totally taboo subject, so the results of enquiries into how children feel about sex with adults have dramatically changed.⁽²³⁾ Belatedly, some open-minded social scientists are acknowledging that it is not adult/child eroticism which creates trauma, but social reaction to it.⁽²⁴⁾ However, few people dare to take the next logical step of demanding the decriminalisation of pædophilic encounters, though, notably in the Netherlands, there are some brave exceptions.

Readers who have followed my arguments so far might wonder when I will be addressing the question at the head of this essay. I hope I have been addressing it throughout. I contend that it is impossible to advocate 'pædophile rights' without redefining what pædophilia means - an attitude towards children being part of a radical attitude towards people oppressed in society.

Nor is it any use settling for a little because the whole lot seems impossibly far off, if the little to be gained consists of dubious

advantages - furtive encounters, enclave sex-tourism, or the isolation of child eros as a special phenomenon, separate from children's experiences and demands for economic, political and social power. The last thing we should be doing is perpetuating the mythology of our detractors.

Certainly there are medium objectives which paedophiles can now set themselves, but there is no dichotomy between these and 'utopian' ones. The ends are always embraced in the means. As for the medium-term aims, there are at least three I view as essential:

- (1) The dissolution of all specifically paedophile campaigning groups; though not the self-help and advice groups which are essential for isolated paedophiles, and indeed for the discussion of issues like those raised in this essay.
- (2) The clear identification of homosexual paedophilia as a gay and feminist issue.
- (3) The formation and support of new children's liberation groups and publications whose objective is to enable and encourage young people to express and publish their own views on sexuality and autonomy. A magazine produced merely by adults - and especially just by paedophiles - advocating children's liberation is ultimately self-defeating, however necessary and inevitable at the present time. The final end must be clear throughout; to reject the notion of 'sex education' as an adult-imposed form of control, and to sponsor any initiatives by young people asserting the importance of their own experiences, needs and discoveries.

After all, it is mostly *their* world and not ours into which they are growing.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. For example, among the Muria of central India, originally 'discovered' by the anthropologist, Verrier Elwin, and whose 'free love' ghotul was the subject of a BBC feature film first screened in August 1983. See *THE MURIA AND THEIR GHOTUL*, by Verrier Elwin (Oxford University Press, 1947).
2. Sexual desire among very young children was noted by Kinsey et al, in the world famous Kinsey reports; *SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE HUMAN MALE* (W. B. Saunders, Philadelphia, 1948), and *SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE HUMAN FEMALE* (W. B. Saunders, Philadelphia, 1953). Research 'in utero' has shown that girls' vaginas lubricate while still at the foetal stage, and that male fetuses have erections. See Nancy Langer (*GAY COMMUNITY NEWS*, USA, 11th June, 1983).
3. *PRINTEMPS AU PARKING*, by Christiane Rochefort (Livre du Poche, France).
4. *PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED* (Penguin - now out of print).
5. See *WOMAN HATING*, by Andrea Dworkin (E. P. Dutton, New York, 1974), and her *PORNOGRAPHY: MEN POSSESSING WOMEN* (The Women's Press, London, 1981).
6. See, for example, *CHANGING CHILDHOOD*, ed. by Martin Hoyles (Writers & Readers Co-operative, London, 1979). This has a sizeable section called 'Children Strike' which consists of quasi-political actions and objectives, and unlike the *CHARTE DES ENFANTS* (Stock, France, 1977), doesn't address the day-to-day concerns of the vast majority of children and how these can be answered.
7. The most recent presentation of this argument was in *PEACE NEWS* editorial (Nottingham, October 27th, 1983).
8. *CHILDREN OF THE COUNTERCULTURE* (Rothchild & Wolf, Doubleday, New York, 1976).
9. See especially the essay 'Toute Femme est une Pedophile et une Maman' (*SORCIERES*, No.23 - a radical French feminist magazine - France, 1982).
10. See *MINOR PROBLEMS*, No.2 (London, 1983).

11. Over ten years ago, Richard Farson spelt it out in his historic *BIRTHRIGHTS* (Macmillan, New York, 1974). Since then, it has been picked up by GRED in France, the Studiegroep Pedophilie of Belgium, PIE in England and, to a lesser extent, by NAMBLA of America.
12. I'm thinking of Charley Shiveley's invigorating writings in various issues of *FAG RAG*, Boston's occasional gay newspaper, and the now defunct *GAY INSURGENT*, ed. by Dan Tsang.
13. J. Z. Eglinton set the pace with *GREEK LOVE*, (Neville Spearman, London, 1971), while Parker Rossman reached a canter in *SEXUAL EXPERIENCE BETWEEN MEN AND BOYS* (Maurice Temple Smith, London, 1979). Thorkil Vanggaard's *PHALLOS* (first pub. in Denmark, 1969/reprinted in Britain by Jonathan Cape, London, 1972) was the most extreme - though not the only - socio-psychological defence of pæderasty as an agent of social control.
14. In *PÆDOPHILIA: THE RADICAL CASE* (Peter Owen, London, 1980).
15. See his massive work, *BEING AND NOTHINGNESS*.
16. See his pamphlet, *WHAT IS PÆDOPHILIA ANYWAY?* (Austin Pedophile Study Group, Texas, 1982).
17. See, for example, *SEXUAL ASPECTS OF PÆDOPHILE RELATIONS*, by Drs. Theo Sandfort (Pan/Spartacus, Amsterdam, 1982).
18. See Dr. Edward Brongersma (*LE PETIT GREDIN*, No.3, France, 1983), and by own article, 'Man/Boy Love and the Left' (*THE AGE TABOO*, ed. by Daniel Tsang, Gay Men's Press, London, 1981). For the most detailed and persuasive view of an historical identity between youth and older men's homosexual experiences, confronted with a uniform persecution by a heterosexist society, see *GAY/LESBIAN ALMANAC* (Jonathan Ned Katz, Harper & Row, New York, 1983).
19. *CENTURIES OF CHILDHOOD*, by Philippe Aries (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1962).
20. At least, that is what Juliet Mitchell in her forthright study, *PSYCHOANALYSIS AND FEMINISM* proposes (Penguin, 1975). Other feminists, like Ros Coward, point out that Freud broke with the concept of an innate femininity and was the first to talk about the social constructions of sexuality, thus opening the way towards overcoming prejudgements about how gender defines consciousness: 'The Making of the Feminine', by Ros Coward (*CHANGING CHILDHOOD*).

21. See almost any work of Fromm's, especially *ESCAPE FROM FREEDOM*.
22. As, for example, several political opportunists did, in both the USA and Britain, during the child porn scares of the late '70s.
23. *CHILDREN AND SEX*, by Larry Constantine & Floyd Martinson (Little, Brown & Co., USA, 1981), and *PÆDOPHILE REALITIES*, by Monique Muller (Netherlands, 1983).
24. For example, D. J. West in the revised edition of his classic work on homosexuality, *HOMOSEXUALITY RE-EXAMINED* (Duckworth, London, 1977).

Chapter 11

SOCIALISM, CLASS, AND CHILDREN'S RIGHTS

by JOHN LINDSAY

The Position of Children from a Socialist Perspective

Let us start by being quite clear about one thing; there is not something called the 'socialist movement'. There are *57 varieties* of socialists and a cursory glance at history will show that frequently they have shot one another. I must then specify my understanding of what the transition to socialism will comprise.⁽¹⁾

Socialism does not come about by reforming parliament, electing councils, installing left leaders; it does not come about by supporting Russian tanks in Hungary, Afghanistan or Poland; socialism is not a matter of planning better housing, more hospitals, or being nice to people. It is the question of the seizure of class power by the working class - the producers of wealth, from the bourgeoisie - the owners of property.

How this will come about we do not know, although studying the past tells us about the successes and failures of previous attempts. It is indeed from the consequences of previous attempts that we can say what socialism is not. Further, precisely because the liberation of the working class will be the act of the class itself, we will not be able to prescribe how that liberation will be perceived.

What follows from this is not that there are children, but that children are divided into classes like everyone else. In general, though not always, children succeed to the class of their parents. One

of the arguments of social democracy during the post-war period of growth in capitalism was that vertical social mobility was possible/inevitable. Indeed, the growth of tertiary education during the '60s and '70s produced much of the generation concerned with questions of sexual liberation. There is also no doubt that the white-collar sector of the working class has expanded at the expense of traditional manual layers; but with the onset of worldwide recession, even the possibilities for a considerable increase in personal wealth in the OECD countries have receded. For the masses of the rest of the world, they were never on the agenda in the first place. We die in the class to which we were born.

So the question of the rights of children must be separated into two parts; those who will inherit property and those who will remain propertyless. I would prefer to leave aside sociological problems as to whether a video recorder constitutes inheritance and rather say that, at the macro-level, the distinctions are fairly clear. There is also a layer in the middle, some of whom are moving up, others down, and it is for this layer that many of these questions are the most important; but that layer is tiny in comparison to the layer of the real propertyless.

This means that our first support for children must be support for every national liberation struggle, for every struggle against capitalism in general. And how to become involved in that struggle readers of this will probably already know.

But an accusation follows from this which claims that unless the problems of the world can be solved, or unless there is an internationalist socialist workers' revolution, there can be no possibility of doing anything at all. Now this is not true, but the statement of the range of things which can be done has to be seen in the context that little reforms here and there are of no point unless they proceed to the major question. Indeed, a succession of tiny victories is swept away in a moment during a major conflict. Similarly, dozens of tiny defeats are swept away in major struggles like those of 1968 or 1974.

Learning from the Defeats of the Past

There are two reasons why we have to be involved in the tiny struggles of the day. Firstly, it is through these that people learn of their potential to bring about larger changes; to change the world by their own activity in it. When such struggles lead to defeat, over Cruise or the NGA for example, then it is essential that the activists learn the lessons of the defeat. Should they fail, then demoralisation sets in. But when these struggles lead to victory, it is important to see in which direction the struggle must next move. It cannot stand still; always it sways backwards and forwards. These small struggles often reach the limits of what the interests or demands of certain classes amount to, and they then change sides - less clear to see in a period of general decline of struggle, but stunningly clear during a major period.

The second reason is that it is during these small struggles that people are tested, their ideas proven or disproven. It is through the efficacy of tactical proposals and their relationships to the generalities that we learn.

Childhood, The Family, School, and other Ideas

The position of children and the questions over which struggle takes place are then historically and culturally specific, though there are some generalisations which can be made. It was as a result of urbanisation and industrialisation - big cities and factories - that we have ideas of child and parent, a domestic division of labour, the home, the private life. All these commonsense ideas actually came from a specific historical location.⁽²⁾ The dominant ideas of a period are not 'natural' - they have not always been the dominant ideas, and are not inevitable. They are the ideas of a particular class. The ideas exist because they perform specific functions. They are produced by, and serve, the interests of a certain class - the class which owns and controls the means of production. However, just as there are contradictions in the means of production, so there is struggle over these

ideas. In other words, not only do ideas arrive with a particular genealogy, they are also an area of activity.

The home is both a prison and a refuge.⁽³⁾ It affects men and women differently, but the basis is just the same. And it is from this that child-battering, murder, and incest follow.

If the family and the home is a prison and a refuge, then the school and the social services system take the argument a stage further. From the point of view of capitalism, whether children are brought up in homes or institutions is a matter of the economic level of reproduction of the classes, both in the short and long term. Schools are also mechanisms for more general socialisation than is possible in the home.⁽⁴⁾ Production requires a workforce with a general level of skills and shared social being which could not be produced in millions of disparate homes. Compulsory education, church schools, canings, uniforms, girls-doing-cookery, boys-doing-carpentry, racism, cutting school meals, shortages of teachers and computers; all these factors can be seen only in an understanding of the larger structure, as can levels of health provision, the general level of hygiene, the appearance of rickets and tuberculosis among children again in Britain, the quality of housing, privacy, sports facilities, fresh air, exercise, military training, work, and so on.

For the masses of workers, the children are the only point of existence. Having no position or power in society apart from the sale of one's labour power, the children become the purpose and point of life; in peasant societies, even more so, for without them one would almost certainly die.

So, the sorts of demands we make and fight around depend on the general level of the class struggle at the time. In 1911, in the wake of the enormous strike level, school children struck. In the 1970s, in the wake of the industrial struggle, the National Union of School Students organised on a massive level and led action against canings,

uniforms, and the arbitrary power of teachers. In national liberation struggles, children have taken up arms, ⁽⁵⁾

Moving Towards Children's Autonomy

In the Britain of the '80s what, then, are the realities of fighting for the rights of children? Firstly, we have to defend the National Health Service and the education system as best we can. Cuts campaigns, hospital closures, teachers' wages, school libraries, the quality of housing,..... all these things affect children the hardest because they have no power of their own. They force the cost of reproduction onto the family, and particularly women, increase the pressures in the home and the levels of violence, illness and malnutrition.

Secondly, we have to try and hold the ideological line about rights and privacy, and the role of the police. Sus laws, the Police and Criminal Evidence Act, the whole apparatus of law along with ideas being taught in schools; the right of managers to manage, the British economy, the Falklands War, the troops in Northern Ireland; all these are battles which affect the rights and freedoms of children. And it is here that the sexual rights of children will have to be defended against the Whitehouses, Andertons, and Thatchers.

However, we have to be brutally frank; most of these battles will lead to defeats, partly because of the confidence of the workers' movement, partly because labour leaders and trade union bureaucrats will march them off the battlefield at every opportunity. The class has suffered unnecessary defeats which have made it more and more difficult to fight.

Within each of these fights, though, there are a minority who are looking for answers. There may be twelve, twenty or sixty. What is important, then, is not just that they learn the reasons for the defeat, but also more consistent policies so they can survive for the fights to

come. It is here, more than anywhere else, that the question of the sexual liberation of children becomes crucial.

There have been a number of cases - PIE, the NUT in Jersey, Coronation Street's hero, the Brighton boy - where the onslaught of the right has had a field day. Where people have been unsure about their position on the sexuality of children, they have not been able to respond properly. Common sense requires that we argue that children are sexual from birth, that they learn sexual behaviour, that there is no necessary harm in adult/child sex, that there is no consistency in arbitrary ages of consent; but that there is no possibility of real freedom for children until they have economic independence.

The importance of the argument on the relationship between economics, the family, and sexuality, cannot be overstressed. This means that in the general strategy for the struggle for socialism, and in the small fights of today, the argument has to be made for the liberation of children, for their gaining economic power. But when the bigger battles take place the children will have to be there in the front line. Finally then, categories of child and adult, of education and work in socialism may well have to be broken down.

The precondition to a successful struggle for socialism will be the building of a politically conscious socialist workers' party which has children among its cadre, organising other children, building the general politics and organisation of the workers' movement. This will be done out of the tiny struggles of today.

Socialists in this period cannot create struggle where it does not exist. We cannot build picket lines by willing them, either to defend paedophiles or the NGA. But we can relate to anything that moves, build solidarity where we can, and explain patiently.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *The basic principles of Socialism are, of course, contained in the works of such pioneers as Marx, Engels, Lenin, etc.*
2. *For an historical analysis of how some such institutions were formed and changed as a result of socio-economic conditions see, for example, Lewis H. Morgan's ANCIENT SOCIETY (1877), and Frederick Engels' THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY, PRIVATE PROPERTY, AND THE STATE (orig. pub. in Switzerland in 1884/reprinted by Pathfinder Press, New York, 1972). On the evolution of childhood specifically, see Philippe Arie's CENTURIES OF CHILDHOOD (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1962), and THE HISTORY OF CHILDHOOD, ed. by Lloyd de Mause (first pub. in 1974 by the Psychohistory Press, USA/first British edition, Condor Books, Souvenir Press, London, 1976).*
3. *Some interesting thoughts on the modern nuclear family - how it works and affects those involved - are contained in David Cooper's THE DEATH OF THE FAMILY (Allen Lane/Penguin Press, Middlesex, 1971), and R. D. Laing's THE POLITICS OF THE FAMILY (CBS Publications, Canada, 1969).*
4. *There are many good books and articles on schools and how they tend to oppress the young. Particularly recommended, however, are the works of John Holt, Ivan Illich and Paul Goodman.*
5. *See CHANGING CHILDHOOD, ed. by Martin Hoyles (Writers & Readers Publishing Co-operative, London, 1979).*

PART THREE

Protection
or
Oppression?

Chapter 12

CHILDHOOD SEXUALITY AND PÆDOPHILIA: SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED

by WARREN MIDDLETON

Despite decades of research from such eminent sources as Ellis, Moll, Freud, Kinsey, and in more recent times, scholars like Sandfort, Martinson, and Ronald and Juliette Goldman, the myths of childhood innocence and the asexuality of children continue to survive. There are a number of reasons for this, many unconnected with the desire to protect. For by accepting children's sexuality - and the evidence for it is overwhelming - society would be taking that first step in the direction which ultimately leads to giving power to the young; the power to effect their own decisions, and it is this path which, even now in the late twentieth century, it still doggedly refuses to tread.

This is not to say that childhood sexuality isn't recognised; it is, but it is not accepted in sexophobic cultures like our own. Human sexuality is our birthright and one of our most natural and necessary urges; so why are children and many adolescents denied their right to express it? There are those who seek to justify this betrayal by appealing to the conditioned sensibilities of others, and this is where emotively laden terms such as 'protection' and 'too young' come into play. Many would insist, however, that these invalidations of children's sexuality are nothing short of ageist put-downs designed to keep the young both shackled and powerless.

The debate surrounding childhood sexuality has, in recent years, seen a number of objections put forward by straights, gays, feminists and others, particularly where it concerns the right of the young to engage in sexual relations with adults. Some of these criticisms are reasonable enough, but others are based on false premises and cannot be

allowed to parade as truths. One of the purposes of this book is to answer such questions and to show that child lovers are not afraid to face opposition. The principal reason why British Pædophiles and other supporters of children's rights have not done so, until now, to the satisfaction of some is that their efforts to do so have been consistently thwarted from all sides. The media, for instance, have proved extremely adept at presenting a one-sided story - the Establishment line - and it is usually only the voices most opposed to adult/child sex who get a hearing. Little wonder, therefore, that misconceptions are rife when the very people most important to the debate - children and pædophiles - remain unconsulted.

It is a sad indictment of our society when people can be hounded by police and press, attacked, prosecuted, lose their livelihoods and all that is near and dear to them simply for espousing an unorthodox opinion. Yet this is indeed the reality of the debate concerning intergenerational sex in the Britain of today; a debate which the enemies of freedom have attempted to turn into a one-way argument; theirs and theirs alone.

In the present chapter, then, I propose to review some of the most nagging questions to have surfaced to date, the intention being to make the case for childhood sexuality and the right of the young to enjoy mutually desired sexual/sensual relationships with people of their choice. In the process, you will see how some of the sacred myths and stereotypes about children and pædophiles fall when analysed, and you will notice that many of the following objections can be turned upon their heads. The method chosen will take the form of a dialogue between an imaginary questioner and the author, and as such, is a slight departure from the format used in all previous articles, bar one. Nonetheless, I feel confident it will suffice.

Q. Given that adults, especially men, have power and that children are, by contrast, powerless, isn't it a fallacy to talk about their consent to have sexual relationships with adults when these are inevitably based on inequality?

A. This question and various extensions of it which I also intend to confront has emerged as one of the most crucial to the debate on cross-generational sex. In the absence of counter arguments from Britain's pædophiles, for reasons already stated, it appears to have been taken on board by many feminists and those on the left who, I contend, have not analysed the issue carefully enough. Because of this, I make no apology for replying to the criticism at some length, and by doing so, I will prove why this criterion is, in itself and alone, an inappropriate basis on which to judge adult/child sex.

It has often been said that we live in an imperfect world. It is a world where, for one reason or another, various groups of people have power over others. There has been considerable debate as to whether this state of affairs represents the natural order of things, is an imposition by one on the other, or is, in certain circumstances, a combination of both. I don't intend to get too enmeshed in such arguments here, except to say that love or hate it, power is an undeniable fact of everyday modern life. Thus, in general terms, whole sections of communities have power over others, a strong élite of males has power over other men, males have power over females, both have power over children, and older children have power over younger ones.

If we look to the origins of power we can see that one section presumes authority over the other by virtue of certain factors like money, property, better education or experience, superior military machines, greater bodily strength, and so on. Needless to say, the pursuit of power is often a history of struggle, with the ascendant group asserting authority over another whose rights it restricts accordingly. And so we have the stronger and weaker, the leaders and the led, each conditioned to rear new generations to propagate their roles or classes, and to set up various structures and institutions to safeguard that power and ensure that it continues.

The family and school are perfect examples of such institutions and structures. By brainwashing people to accept their allotted roles, they propagate the power of the patriarch and the power of adults over

children. Childhood itself is a further case in point. It has become an institution, structured by adults, where young people perform the limited roles and tasks within the confines of what adults will allow. Despite the fact that life is a continuum, as Holt suggests, " it is still seen as a training ground for adulthood; the paradox being that it is a training ground where children are 'allowed' only a limited right of association with adults and a restricted experience of the real world. This is a situation foisted on the young by a powerful élite of elders who also withhold their rights, without consent, and teach them, and other adults, to accept such servitude.

Genuine freedom means having a maximum choice of alternatives, but few, if any people, have this. Since children, given alternatives, would probably opt to escape the adult imposed restrictions of childhood, it becomes necessary to make sure they are given no choice in the matter. Many adults seek to justify this oppression by blurring it with protection. Their logic runs thus; 'We know what is best for the young because we are adults; because we are more experienced.' Adults forcibly limit childhood experience then use the above argument to claim that they are 'protecting' children when they are, more truthfully, oppressing them. You don't protect people by restricting their experiences, and you don't free them by making sure they have no choices. The right to experience is the inalienable right of us all, for it is through it that we learn, that we become more knowing, and we can't do this if we are locked away from the experiences of the real world, as children virtually are.

It behoves us all to work towards a society where people have greater equality, and to do this, we must break down oppressive structures, institutions, and ideas, such as sexism, racism, classism, and ageism which keep us imprisoned and mould us to accept our imprisonment. One way to achieve this is to ensure that people are given an equal start; that they are not, through any human fault, already disadvantaged from the outset. As reinforcement, we should make sure that everyone, including children, has recognisable rights, and that their individuality will be respected along with the right to make

personal decisions affecting their lives. It is evident, therefore, that equality of opportunity is the important thing, though what we choose to do with such opportunity is yet another story.

We will find, however, that no matter how far we advance in this direction in the future, there will still be built-in inequalities in every situation; where people, for one reason or another, are not equal with others in various respects. Like it or not, inequality is, and will always remain, a true fact of life; from inequalities of size, shape and strength, to those of education, experience, capacities and needs. Since life will go on regardless, people have to learn to live with such inequalities. All of us must continue to have experiences, interactions and relationships with others, for if we didn't everything would soon grind to a halt. Individuals will still have emotions, will still go on loving and hating, *and will still want to have sex together*. Why? Because we live in a *real* world with real people who have undeniable emotions and needs. None of this should - nor can it - stop simply because of inequality.

Logically then, it follows that we can't stop people's interactions merely because of a power element. If we tried to, *everyone's* relationships would need to cease as from now. And this is the reason why it is demonstrably wrong to use the power argument to forcibly prohibit the young from having mutually desired relationships, including sexual ones, with their elders, for by using the same principle we would then have to outlaw sex between males and females since men have power over women. In the non-sexual sphere, we would also have to stop relations between children and their parents because parents, as adults, have similar power over children. Such ideas are unthinkable, yes - we can't prohibit men and women from having sex, and we won't stop the young from loving their parents - but remember that I'm only citing these examples to prove why power is, in itself, the wrong criterion to use in the everyday world.

Whether inborn, acquired, or a combination of the two, everyone then, has power over the other in some shape or form, even children.

The boy of twelve has greater size, strength, and experience than the boy of nine. The non-handicapped child has more advantage than the handicapped one. Boys have more power than girls. All are examples of inequalities bestowing authority. But it would be ridiculous to suggest that these parties should be kept apart just because there are differences. Moreover, such differences don't stop the children involved from consenting to like each other or play together - and the reason should be obvious; it is because they *want* to. Is this not important? By denying that the young can consent, or want to have sex with adults, gays, feminists - whoever - are, in effect, saying that it isn't important, and by doing so they are further invalidating the young as people, reinforcing classism and ageism (which youngsters themselves have identified as oppressive),⁽²⁾ and helping to ensure, perhaps inadvertently, that children remain chained to the same old sex-negative order that many have pledged to challenge.

It cannot be claimed that the mere possession of power and use of it are, in themselves, abusive, any more than it can be said of the sexual act itself. If they were, *everything* would fall into this category. No, it depends on individual circumstances; it's the *way* we use our power which counts and the *intention(s)* we have while doing so. This is not to suggest that 'real' sexual abuse doesn't occur; of course it does, and when this happens it is indefensible. However, we should also remember that the term is an extremely overworked one often representing little more than an emotively charged value judgement. In such circumstances, it has the added effect of distorting research and inhibiting reasonable discussion. In few other areas is this more clearly demonstrated than with the issue of adult/child sex where the power argument is used, albeit unsatisfactorily, as an attempt to put down paedophiles and silence opposition.

The refusal to concede that adult/child sex can be anything but abuse, and to make clear distinctions between mutually desired pleasurable acts and those involving threats, force, coercion, drugs, or hypnosis, etc, brings its adherents perilously close to the school of thought whose creed proclaims that all sex is rape. Not only is their

position untenable; it also produces new generations of guilt-ridden sex haters whose doctrine entails denying their own and other people's pleasure. As well as generating the typical 'character armour' described by Reich, such ideas aggravate a condition known as the 'Abuse Mentality Syndrome', common in sexually restrictive cultures, whereby children discovered to have had sex with adults are 'conditioned' to believe that they have been abused, defiled and deflowered, even when their innermost feelings tell them otherwise. In this way, what may have been, in reality, a reciprocated enjoyable act with a friendly adult becomes abuse. If children are repeatedly told that they have been abused, they will eventually accept this, whether truth or not, and sex to them will, from then on, often be viewed as something dirty and shameful. This is the legacy of sex-negativism which is, in essence, a denial of the self.⁽³⁾

In the field of human relations, including sexual ones between adults and children, there are three important questions we need to ask. (a) Were the feelings of the less powerful party respected or ignored? (b) What was the intention(s) of the more powerful party; benevolent, malevolent, or indifferent? (c) What were the short and long term results of the given act; beneficial, harmful, or neither good nor bad?

Where, we must ask, do pædophiles score on such a scale? Judging from the facts and figures already known of them, the result is certainly not uncomplimentary. With regard to the first question, their own literature and that of others constantly emphasises that the child's consent is of paramount importance. This claim is frequently confirmed by other studies which refer to many children as willing participants and co-conspirators who often return for sex time and time again, sometimes for months, and even years. On the second count, most studies stress that pædophiles are, by nature - to pluck a phrase from Virkkunen - "gentle, fond of children and benevolent", and that the use of threats or violence is exceptional. Recent research is beginning to reveal that sex is only one part of what is often a much broader relationship which, if left alone and handled responsibly, could well prove extremely beneficial. In more sexually open climates encouraging freer attitudes,

studies on children who have had such encounters tend to bear witness to the fact that they viewed these relationships in a positive light. When we come to the third point, we already know that many studies agree that children are not usually damaged or 'corrupted' by enjoyable acts with friendly adults. We may safely conclude, therefore, that it is not the sex itself which is most often harmful, but the societal reactions upon discovery.⁽⁴⁾

It is when we consider the second point, concerning people's intentions, that we begin to realise just how inept the term sexual abuse really is, except when used in its strictest sense. On the one hand, 'protectionists' see their role as shielding children, while on the other, 'liberationists' view theirs as freeing them. However, both sides would insist they are acting benevolently, especially the former, as most have been brainwashed into accepting this view. The fact of the matter is, though, that protectionists, as adults, have taken it upon themselves to act without the consent of the young who are kept both unrepresented and unconsulted about decisions which affect their daily lives.

The other crucial aspect to consider is the consequences of their actions upon the young. If socialists, gays and feminists really believe in working towards the goal of greater equality and a more even distribution of power, they must be prepared to accept that such a programme should benefit all and not just some; for - to quote the famous words of Virginia Coigney - children are people too. Supporting the campaign for children's rights is the supreme catalyst of power and they cannot, therefore, defend the position of so-called protectionists, since with their policies, the young will always remain in a second class compartment on their own, oppressed, powerless, and devoid of rights.

The word protection seems to offer a safe haven to its users, despite the fact that it is one of the most misused in the language and frequently hides a multitude of sins. As with invoking the name of God, its magical ring stirs the emotions and acts as a rallying call

summoning the faithful. Anything done in the name of protection or God must be all right, so the followers convince themselves. We must never forget, however, that one person's protection is another's oppression, and that what one would call protection, another would call abuse.

The protective instinct is, of course, essential to safeguard babies and infants from harm. But there is a world of difference between protection and over-protection which many fail to appreciate; for while the first is both necessary and good, the second restricts and suffocates. The type of 'protection' which affects the young is, all too often, of this engulfing, restricting variety which inhibits expression, experience, responsibility and growth, and because it is 'imposed' by adults is, in reality, little short of oppression 'masquerading' as protection. The only difference is that the oppressors have worn the cloak of protection for so long that they now no longer recognise, or refuse to admit, their true identities.

Genuine safeguards will always be necessary to shield us from abuses of other people's power. As I have shown in this article, however, it is only under strictly limited circumstances that human sexuality itself can be considered abuse, since the need and occasion for sex would still be there even if the power element were absent. But protection minus the agreement of the protected is often a sham, its victims virtual prisoners, and since it is usually an unwanted invasion of liberty, automatically leaves protectionists open to the charge that they themselves are misusing their power. It is only in the most extreme cases that non-consensual 'protection' can ever be justified, and it is the contention of the children's rights lobby that children and young people - certainly beyond babyhood and infancy - should be considered no such extreme.⁽⁵⁾ This, then, is what the movement for children's rights is all about; freeing a sizeable percentage of the world's population from the tyranny of oppression dressed as protection, and supplying the young with escape routes, should they need them.

If we return to the issue of sexuality, it becomes clear that what adults have done is to take one of the human race's most basic drives

and turn it into a reserve by establishing territorial rights over the area. They have claimed it as their exclusive domain, their property, and children who stray are regarded - and treated - as trespassers. This is, at base, a profoundly selfish attitude for adults to take, and it is little wonder that sociologists talk about an age gap and the alienation of the young when this sort of thing is allowed to happen. The plain truth is that if children were not intended to express their sexuality they would not have been born with the capacity to do so in the first place. That would not have come until much later, in adulthood. The fact that they do have such capacity should tell us something, and the fact that adults forcibly try to forbid its expression should tell us something else; that this is, in truth, a misuse of adult power since it takes place without the consultation or agreement of the young, and thereby destroys a fundamental right that most others now take for granted.

When we come to the specific issue of adult/child sex, the people most qualified to talk about these experiences are the children and adults involved. Everyone else, no matter how well intentioned, is obliged to speak from an outside point of view. In sexophobic societies like our own, where people are usually 'taught' that such relationships are bad (depending on the individual and variable age when negative conditioning is fully assimilated), even adult accounts of these episodes must, for this reason, be considered suspect, their authenticity questionable, since these are susceptible to adult interpretations which may not necessarily reflect their true feelings about the experiences when children.

It is for these reasons that feminists and others must show a willingness to listen to the children, taking what they have to say seriously, and if they are really interested in young people's freedom, this means not preconditioning them towards sex-negative values beforehand (there is enough of that going on already) but letting them make up their own minds. In addition, they should not try to claim that children cannot consent to have sex, for by doing this, they make themselves vulnerable to the charge that they are ageist. Refusal to

recognise consent is a refusal to recognise the person. Refuse to recognise the person, and it follows that one will automatically question the fact that he/she should have rights like any other. It is surprising that some feminists fail to see this, and it is this same failure which will help to perpetuate the myth of childhood sexlessness and keep the young powerless. We should remember that the experiences of young people, at any given age, are just as important and valid to them *then* as at any time later, and shouldn't be ignored or dismissed by adults.

The act of sex between two consenting people is meant to be a fulfilling and pleasurable experience for both. It is certainly not something which should be regarded as sick, sinful, dirty, disgusting and/or criminal, and those who view it this way have corrupted its very meaning. If some children genuinely want and like having sexual experiences with chosen adults - and as the research shows, many do - then the law should not interfere, except in cases where there has been demonstrable harm done by the sexual act itself - and these are very rare - or where exploitation is involved. Blanket condemnation is just no good. Instead, we need to look at the merits of individual cases, listening carefully to the wishes of the children involved.

When pedophiles support the campaign for the recognition of children's social and sexual rights, they are proving, in the most effective way possible, their willingness to share power; for they know that by reducing the love of power, they are making way for the power of love. It is now up to feminists, gays and socialists to decide which side they will take in the coming battles for children's autonomy. In the meantime, they would do well to remember that there will be no liberation, sexual or otherwise, without children's liberation.⁽⁶⁾

Q. But how can children consent to have sex when they don't really know what it is they are supposed to be consenting to?

A. This objection emanates from protectionist philosophies which dictate that children must, or should be, innocent and sexless, and youth groups would automatically brand it as ageist since it questions the right of the young to make personal decisions affecting their lives.

Since the protection racket crosses most class barriers and is now big business affecting both the young and old, it is necessary to dig a little deeper than the label. At its core is a powerful élite of adults who condition others to believe that theirs is the magical age, and that only their decisions have any real validity. And this is why protectionism, when taken to extremes, is such a dangerous creed: because it presumes a God-given right to take choices from other people's hands, thereby denying responsibility and experience which, in the case of the young, are both necessary ingredients for development and growth.

Protectionist doctrines rely, in part at least, on the power of force (laws, etc.) and by their very nature cast people in the mould of property - the property of parents or state - and property is the enemy of freedom. Since people have different personal needs, wishes and aspirations, decisions taken by others purporting to be on their behalf are unlikely to be representative of the wishes, etc. of the 'protected', but are far more likely to reflect the experiences and aspirations of the 'protectors'. But protectionism needs conformity, and for this reason it is also the enemy of individualism.

Those who deny that the young can consent to sex or have a right to make personal decisions are, therefore, exposing their own reluctance to relinquish power - an important requirement for greater equality - in favour of the young; for by accepting the right of children to make their own choices, we are, in effect, affirming their status as people, not property, and by doing this we will help to break the stranglehold of enforced protectionism.

It is true to say that adults are, in some respects, better equipped to make difficult decisions than the young, but part of the

reason for this is that grown-ups *won't let* children make decisions, *don't allow* them a choice of alternatives, and *won't let* them take responsibilities, at least to any appreciable degree.⁽⁷⁾ However, this does not alter the main contention: that the right of young people to make their own decisions must be defended, and this includes the right to make bad choices, for although adults have a duty to guide they shouldn't have an automatic right to order, except perhaps under strictly limited circumstances. The learning process is not something confined to the young, and occasional wrong decisions are as necessary to our development as right ones; indeed, they help to form character. The person who makes decisions in the certain knowledge that they are always correct is privy to a secret no-one else knows.

There is no earth-shattering decision involved in consenting to have sex, and the fact that objections are raised over this issue when they are not about any other proves the point about living in a sex-negative society where eroticism is often seen as a malevolent force. In more sexually positive cultures, it would be viewed as benevolent, and sex between consenting adults and children would, under the right conditions, be considered educational - and why shouldn't it be? If teaching about sex and sexual techniques is regarded as educational on the theoretical level, it is indeed a strange quirk of logic which insists that it can't be on the practical.

The important thing to remember is that there are children and adults who genuinely want and like having sex together, and often, as we have seen, the sex is only one part of a much broader relationship which helps to offset alienation by bridging the generation gap. Why is this considered so bad? If pædophilia, which Goethe once said was "as old as mankind", was not natural or meant to be, we can be sure that the evolutionary process would have signed its death warrant long ago.

The consent to have sex is, at base, an expression of one's wish, want or willingness to engage. It is, if you like, an agreement which implies making a decision. When a child agrees to have sex with another child or adult, it is done in a reasonable anticipation of pleasure with

a chosen friend. Sometimes, however, especially when one consents to something one has never experienced before, the consent is not so much for the act itself but for a willingness to try the experience. In such circumstances, the child must have a right to withdraw consent at any time to that particular experience, even though his/her consent may still hold true for other sexual acts.

This brings us round to the question of how far consent should go. When one agrees to a sexual act with another, his/her consent is valid only for the duration of that specific episode. We cannot presume that it will still be in force for further encounters since these will require renewals of agreement. To remember this is to show respect for the individual and proves that we are not prepared to take things for granted.

The key to a successful pædophilic relationship often lies in the adult's ability to forego power and become again, in effect, the child he/she once was. The younger partner's consent is usually a sign that trust is present and that the adult is attuned to the same wavelength; that he/she has been prepared to meet the child on the child's own terms.⁽⁶⁾ Children are fascinated by sex, and if the adult shows an interest too, it often comes as a pleasant surprise to them, since they are far more used to hearing adults talk about sex dismissively or not discuss it at all. But the grown-up who is simply on a power trip will get nowhere fast, unless he/she is prepared to use threats or force, in which case he/she could be correctly termed a child molester.

None of what has been written thus far should be taken to imply that present sex education is satisfactory; far from it. It doesn't begin nearly early enough, and in many respects, such as information about birth control methods and sexually transmitted diseases, it is sorely inadequate. In addition, it is heavily loaded towards heterosexuality and procreation, whereas proper sex education should include factual, non-biased information about sexual varieties like homosexuality and pædophilia. As has been said, however, the

theoretical basis of sex education is not enough without the recognition of children's right to practical experience,⁽⁹⁾

Children first learn about the pleasures of sexual/sensual stimulation from their own bodies - autoeroticism. But they soon discover that these same joys can be shared with others too. Studies which concentrate on the erotic behaviour of the young teen with details about the types of activities which are most common among children. These include kissing, cuddling, stroking, licking, mutual masturbation, oral sex, and intercrural intercourse. All these are similar to those involved in paedophilic relationships. Thus it cannot be said that the typical child is performing activities that he/she had never previously encountered.

In our present society, children can only express their sexuality with other youngsters - and even this is severely frowned upon. If consensual adult/child sex is eventually legalised, this would give the young more alternatives, and more alternatives, as I have said, must necessarily denote a greater freedom.

Q. How can a child actually refuse an adult's sexual advances?

A. This criticism underestimates the effects on children of sex-negative conditioning and constant parental/Establishment warnings about the risks of talking to strangers. The purdah between adults and the young, in combination with the second factor, results in a state of affairs where the average child is extremely suspicious and apprehensive about meeting adults, especially those outside the confines of his/her normal environment (family, school, youth club, etc.).

For such an encounter to move any further, the adult would, therefore, have to (a) prove him/herself capable of smashing the 'bogeyman' image and other preconceived ideas; (b) demonstrate a willingness to surrender power; and (c) show a genuine interest in the child and his/her problems, to the extent of sharing intimate secrets.

These things are no five minute affair; they take time, and it is only when this obstacle course has been successfully negotiated that the younger partner will feel confident enough to consider engaging in sexual activities with a new adult friend - and even then the circumstances have got to be right.

The circumstances which precipitate a child to say yes or no to sex differ from one youngster to another, so that when one would consent, another would refuse. Sometimes the discussion of sex is initiated by the child, at other times the adult, but it is often the child who makes the first sexual advance.

A child may refuse consent for any number of reasons. He/she may want the adult as a friend, not a lover; may not be in the mood; may be too shy; may not like or trust the adult enough; may think he/she is too ugly or old; may think that sex is dirty; may be a little scared, and so on. Whatever the reason, children often refuse consent, some for very similar reasons which affect adult relationships, and accounts by pædophiles frequently refer to cases where the agreement of the younger party was withheld. Indeed, some youngsters react with great hostility, and the adult may be called names like 'queer', 'pouf' and 'bender', or described as disgusting and filthy.

Although it is, to some extent, true that pædophilic relationships where an adult has authority over the child's life in public (teacher, scoutmaster, youth leader, etc.) can cause complications, the older partner is often capable of stripping down the power element in his/her personal and sexual involvement with the child. In these cases, it is even more important not to prejudge the issue, but to look at the quality of the relationships and listen to the wishes of those involved.

In the answer to question one, I spoke of childhood being an institution, structured by adults, where young people 'perform the limited roles and tasks within the confines of what adults will allow'. Sex in general, and sex with adults in particular, is well outside the confines of what society will permit. It therefore seems somewhat

strange to ask how youngsters can refuse adult sexual advances when they are consistently taught to do just that. The fact that many don't refuse is often further proof that children want to, and are, making their own choices in this area.

True liberation is contingent upon the right to say no to sex as well as yes. In this context, the authors of this book firmly believe that when the time comes for the ages of consent to be abolished, the potential for exploitation - itself an overworked term - would be drastically reduced, since with greater freedom there would be less need for subterfuge. Children would be that much more educated about sex and discussion of the subject would be entirely open.

Q. Both homosexuality and pedophilia involve deviant sexual practices. Why, then, should society endorse them?

A. To begin with, we should remember that terms such as 'deviant' and 'perverse' are moral evaluations based on a majority concept of 'normality'. And herein lies the problem; for there is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes normal sexual behaviour. Instead, we find that such definitions are historically and culturally variable, so that behaviour which one society views as normal might not be considered so normal in another.⁽¹⁰⁾

In truth, words like the above should be dropped from our vocabularies since they are detrimental to a proper understanding of human sexuality. They breed guilt and intolerance, and are, in addition, unrepresentative, as I now hope to show.

In the one hundred and ninety societies studied by Ford and Beach,⁽¹¹⁾ adult/adult heterosexuality - and specifically heterosexual coitus - was found to be the most prevalent form of sexual activity. However, these researchers discovered that secondary sexual behaviours were also a common feature of these societies. This important fact led the authors to conclude that such activities constituted a "basic

mammalian pattern", and that all of us possess "an inherited capacity for erotic responsiveness to a wide range of stimuli".

The same authors continue: "Men and women who are totally lacking in any conscious homosexual leanings are as much a product of cultural conditioning as are the exclusive homosexuals who find heterosexual relations distasteful and unsatisfying. Both extremes represent a movement away from the original, intermediate condition which includes the capacity for both forms of sexual expression."

To simplify, then, it must be averred that people are born sexual and have an inbuilt potential to enjoy various kinds of sexual stimuli. But through a strong heterosexual conditioning process in sexually restrictive societies, individuals are channelled towards heterosexuality and its attendant lifestyle. The capacity for responsiveness to a wider spectrum of behaviours is most clearly marked in the young, but once the social conditioning process has been fully absorbed, other types of activity are frequently denied, repressed, or forgotten.⁽¹²⁾

Sexual liberation requires the reclamation of such behaviour patterns - homosexuality, its cross-generational counterpart, and cross-generational heterosexuality - for society has a duty to ensure the greatest happiness for all its members. People who are 'exclusively' homosexual, pedophile, or heterosexual have, in many cases, built a psychological wall against enjoyment of other types of activity. It is incumbent upon us all, therefore, to help break down such barriers, and the best way to do this is to challenge the values that maintain them.

As we deduce from the Ford and Beach study above, the 'primacy' of conventional heterosexuality would not be threatened by the introduction of alternatives. Nor do such alternatives imply unbridled promiscuity. On the contrary, with more freedom of choice regarding age and gender, people would tend to gravitate - and should be encouraged to gravitate - towards forming real loving relationships, rather than one night stands, especially if these were to become legally and socially acceptable.

Q. Why are women pedophiles so rare?

A. This is a common fallacy, and one which owes much to put-downs of female sexuality for its survival. Once again, it depends upon interpretations; on how the words pedophilia and sexuality are defined and what they mean to society, and to women in particular.

Feminists have always been traditionally reluctant to label themselves with words coined by men - the term was devised by Krafft-Ebing⁽¹³⁾ - or to join organisations, like PIE, run by them. To many feminists, pedophilia has become, quite unjustifiably, an unspeakable word and women who identify as such know that they are risking being ostracised and flung out of the movement. These are important points which, to some extent, help us to understand the hesitancy of women to come out as pedophiles.

It is true that criminal statistics reveal a smaller percentage of women involved in such offences than men, but these statistics are not necessarily representative, as has been said elsewhere. Aside from this, there are a number of points which may help to explain the discrepancy.

For one, women's sexuality tends to be downgraded in our society and is somehow considered less important than its male counterpart. It is also seen as more benevolent than the latter, and this could offer a reason as to the reluctance of parents, etc., to prosecute, especially where it concerns women and boys, since many would regard this as an instructive form of initiation which, for the boy, was but a foretaste of pleasures to come. One has only to look at newspaper reports of women involved to confirm that such attitudes are common. Women are, in general, not just treated more leniently by the press, but also by the courts.

In this respect, then, women come off better than men. But they are luckier in other ways, too. We all have an instinctive need to give and receive affection and tenderness, but whereas these emotions are

accepted and encouraged in women, they are rejected and discouraged in men. In this way, behaviour which is permitted to women would almost certainly land most men in jail for 'indecent assault'. Thus, kissing, cuddling, stroking, and even under certain circumstances the handling of children's genitals, are all allowed to women under the umbrella of natural feminine tenderness. Equivalent behaviour in men would, however, be frowned on, seen as cissy, and in most cases, severely punished. It is clear, therefore, that there is also discrimination here.

Another reason why women may not appear so frequently as men in the statistics concerns the verdicts of several court cases. For example, in October, 1976, at Caernarvon Crown Court, Wales, a thirty-five year old sub-postmistress was acquitted on four counts of indecently assaulting boys aged fourteen. In directing the jury to find her not guilty, the judge made the following important comments: "There is not, and never has been, an offence known to the law of a woman having sexual intercourse with a boy under sixteen. If you (the jury) were to consider this particular case, the prosecution could not rely on the mere fact of sexual intercourse with a boy or boys as of itself constituting an indecent assault."

Nor was this an isolated case. Thus, the US BOSTON GLOBE of February 10th, 1978, reporting on the case of a twenty-three year old housewife charged with contributing to the 'delinquency' of a minor by having intercourse with a fifteen year old boy, said the case was dismissed on the grounds that "intercourse with a young boy is nothing more than sex education, essential and necessary in his growth."

These cases, and others like them, explain a lot about the reluctance of the authorities to prosecute women involved in adult/child sex. They also say much about the supposed impartiality of the law.

There are few who are better qualified to discuss pædophilia in women than female pædophiles. With this in mind, we now hear from twenty-five year old Annemieke, a Dutch student and part-time

babysitter. Annemieke is a pædophile who first discovered she was sexually attracted to children a number of years ago.

"It just happens that I am a girl; that is by greatest alibi. Nobody blames a girl or woman for caressing a child. That is just motherly instinct. You can always do that."

According to Annemieke, pædophilia is just as common in women as in men; but it is not suspected in women. Just as two women together are not as suspect as two men together. It is part of our social patterning. Adult women are *supposed* to caress children.

"I am conscious of the risks you run if you go further with a child than is permitted by society. I would greatly prefer to have a really free relationship with a child, but I hold myself back. I am afraid of the consequences - police, shocked children, disturbed relations with the parents, being cast out by society. No, I am too conventionally orientated to let myself go in that direction."

Her last experience convinced her more than ever that the initiative often comes from the child.

"I had to take care of a family with an eight year old boy. He sat on my lap the whole evening and I had to read a book to him. He couldn't get enough of that and he refused to get off my lap.

"The following morning he crept into the bed with me. First he lay nicely against me, and then he tried to get into my bedclothes - actually tried to take them off. I had to keep down a sense of panic but I was able to tell him calmly that he couldn't do that.

"He was clearly disappointed. And I can truly say that I would have found it very nice; but it cannot be. If I were less restrained, I think it would have been possible to make love. Children are so wonderful! They are so open and spontaneous. Adults just aren't. I

don't turn adults away, though. I am drawn to all kinds of people - homo., hetero., pædo."⁽¹⁴⁾

Despite hostility from certain sections of the women's movement, more and more women are, however, finding the nerve to come out of the closet; indeed, several prominent feminists are themselves known to support various aspects of cross-generational sex, among them, Germaine Greer, Kate Millet, Jody Emerson, Pat Califia, Gayle Rubin, Jane Rule, Jacqueline Livingston, Christine Holland and Beth Kelly. In addition, there are now a number of women members in nearly every foreign pædophile group, some taking active roles. A recent edition of GAI PIED HEBDO, the French gay journal, included letters and interviews with women korephiles - lovers of girls - and in his ground breaking pamphlet, WOMEN PÆDOPHILES, author David Sonenschein showed that female sexual attraction to children was really not so uncommon.⁽¹⁵⁾

Q. Won't pædophilic relationships simply help to propagate the existing social order?

A. For a start, there are two important points which must be understood. Firstly, it should be pointed out that nowhere in this book is it inferred that pædophilic relationships are blameless or free of problems. Of course there are problems, and in this respect they resemble all other interactions in our society. The social conditioning process and mental blocks we erect against alternatives combine, along with various other factors, to ensure that *no-one* in this society can claim to be in a relationship which boasts of total consensuality; and this is a vital point which must be appreciated. What our study does suggest, however, is that it is both wrong and inhumane to try to stifle or deny the possibility of alternative sexuality by legally enforced means. It is utterly naïve to legislate against human love - in no matter what form - by resorting to the power of force; a power which, moreover, brands people 'criminals' and imprisons them, often for many years, merely because they happened to love someone who, in society's

eyes, was the wrong sex or age. Such methods solve absolutely nothing, and can only help to contribute to human misery.

But despite all the protestations, nothing, more's the pity, is likely to change very much in the foreseeable future since we can't change society overnight. This brings me to the second point; that most of the proposals we have outlined are essentially idealistic in that, whatever we think, such ideas as abolition of ages of consent and societal acceptance of children's rights are simply not going to materialise in the Britain of today. In this context, then, they represent more of a blueprint for the future than a mandate for the present. The conditions necessary to produce such changes may take generations to realise; indeed, they might never come to fruition at all. However, this is no reason to lose hope and discontinue the struggle as inertia will get us precisely nowhere.

I mention these points because they have led to a dichotomy of thought on the issue between those who, while continuing to work for future improvements, insist on keeping their feet firmly on the ground, and others who maintain that all intergenerational relationships should be postponed until such time as we live in a perfect world. Though I, of course, support the ultimate cause, I take issue with this latter statement,⁽¹⁶⁾ and apart from the *obvious impracticality* of the request (try asking gays or straights to remain celibate for the rest of their lives) I do so for the following reasons.

In law, there is often no distinction made between persons whose motives towards children are friendly and benevolent, and others whose intentions are injurious. Instead, we find that these two very different types are frequently lumped together and punished with comparable prison sentences. All the time this is happening, such radicals are therefore, by their silence, effectively washing their hands of this injustice. In addition, they are giving their seal of approval to a measure which infringes a basic human right;⁽¹⁷⁾ a law which claims to protect the young, but undoubtedly does them more harm than good.

The promised land, let's face it, has been a long time coming, and when it does - if it does - it will be far too late for many. Though we must all work for the revolution, we have to be honest with ourselves and admit that just as there is no absolute proof there is a Heaven above, so there is no guarantee there will ever be a Heaven on earth. We can only hope. In the meantime, we must remember that we are living in the here and now, not in some abstract, intangible world of the future which may or may not be an impossible dream.

By trying to invalidate present examples of pædophilic relationships, sexual radicals are burying their heads in the sand. We cannot pretend they do not exist merely because we believe they shouldn't; for the fact remains that not only do they exist, but have existed for centuries with many thousands of people having been enriched by them. As with any other caring relationship, they possess an inbuilt potential - when given the chance - to provide people with enormous pleasure and happiness. Ages of consent laws, however, take no heed of these factors. Instead, they are frequently administered by bigoted outsiders, most of them conventionally heterosexual, and such people can have little or no idea about the dynamics of these relationships. Their only answer is punishment and retribution, and as with many cases of this kind, that is no answer at all.

The women's and children's liberation movements are 'relatively' new crusades, as are their philosophies, and people are notoriously suspicious of, and sometimes openly hostile to, new ideas and changes, especially when perceived as threatening to the established way of life. Like it or not, we are all, to a certain extent, conditioned into our present modes of thought and it is, sadly, still only a minority who have had any real access to the ideas put forward by such radical thinking groups as gays and feminists. As I said in section one, though, we need to examine people's intentions in individual relationships, since blanket condemnation serves no purpose. And this is why abuse is an inappropriate term to use under many circumstances, and why punishment is *definitely not* the answer in these cases.

The parents who bring their children up under the most acceptable child rearing procedures are, to a degree, inevitably helping to perpetuate the existing social order. Will this stop the parties involved from loving each other; and do we suggest that adults refrain from being parents because of it? No, of course not. Modern teaching methods also help to inculcate authoritarianism. Do we propose that children be forbidden access to educational learning materials and those most qualified to teach them? Of course we don't. Many of us, feminists included, help to propagate the self-same state of affairs by refusing to listen to children and denying them choices. Do any of these things justify a prohibition on people's relationships? No, and common sense should tell us that such ideas are impractical and absurd. In addition, they pose a threat to another basic human right; that of association. So, while the overall situation may be oppressive - and let's face it, we are all oppressed in various ways - the solution, once again *cannot* lie in yet more authoritarian dictates which try to forbid people from consorting together or forming relationships.

Clearly then, none of us - pædophiles included - can exonerate ourselves from all blame for children's oppressed position. Likewise, we all, in some ways, give at least passive support to the existing social order by the very fact that we live and work in it. But by backing programmes on children's rights, pædophiles and some others are at least stating clearly which side they are on and showing that necessary willingness to help turn the tide on the oppression of youth both publicly and in their personal relationships - and this is more than can be said of many other groups.

As a minority who are themselves heavily oppressed, pædophiles can often readily identify with the oppression of others, especially those who are most close to them. Such experience frequently produces adults who are markedly antiauthoritarian in outlook, and this could well mean that child-lovers would be less assertive than many other groups. There is now evidence that, in numerous ways, pædophilic relationships, far from indoctrinating the young towards authoritarianism, actually help them to reject and overcome it.⁽¹⁸⁾ As often happens, these

relationships can help children perceive a wider perspective of the world and the people in it. Within such interactions, children are seen as people of worth; recognised, wanted, valued and appreciated, and through the adult, they will encounter new experiences, places, people and beliefs. Adult/child relationships often represent, therefore, an escape from the usual cloistered world of the child. As Gerald Hannon observed; "Pædophilia is revolutionary activity, and the activists of tomorrow are more than likely in someone's arms today".⁽¹⁹⁾

If laws, punishments, and prohibitions on human relationships are not the answers, what, we are entitled to ask, is? Surely, it must lie in changing people's attitudes through a comprehensive, systematic re-education programme of the masses which will encourage individual awareness. This is the only solution, and from it we begin to appreciate why it is so very important for gays and feminists to show solidarity with pædophiles, for it is the interests of each and every one of us, as libertarians, to raise levels of consciousness. Pædophiles have a lot to learn from feminists, but feminists can also learn something from pædophiles. *Nothing* will ever be achieved by isolating them. On the contrary, we will gain both strength and confidence by presenting a united front.

Let us take one last look at what patriarchal values entail. In his well known study, *SEX IN HISTORY*,⁽²⁰⁾ Rattray Taylor showed that patriarchalism is nearly always linked, to a greater or lesser extent, with sex-negative attitudes. In such cultures, women and children are classed as subordinates, and strict controls on their sexuality and all other activities are typical. The successful overthrow of patriarchy will therefore depend on the overturning of sex-negativism, the acceptance of women's and children's rights, and the *sharing* of power on a basis of equality.

We already know that sexual repression has devastating results in terms of health and happiness; but if, as researchers like Prescott maintain, it is also a principal cause of human aggression, haven't we a

duty to ensure that the world is made a safer place for all? Who knows, the future of our planet may yet depend on it.

Q. At this point, what would you say to those who still have misgivings?

A. The first point to remember is to be wary of judging things on face value, or because a majority happen to believe they are right, for the truth is that not all issues are straightforward, and that because of propaganda bias, majority opinion is frequently wrong. Yet these mistakes are still extremely common in discussions of intergenerational relationships. When thinking of this, I am prompted to recall Wilde's famous maxim, that "public opinion exists only where there are no ideas."⁽²¹⁾ Some ideas, at least, deserve to be considered and used, since we cannot prove their rights or wrongs until they have been thoroughly tried and tested.

People who cite the power argument in their efforts to dismiss paedophiles conveniently overlook the fact that it is this self-same adult power which now forbids the young from expressing their sexuality through ages of consent laws which, by their very nature, help to keep youth powerless. They serve to satisfy the interests of those who wish to project onto children *their* notion of what modern childhood should entail - 'innocence, purity, sexlessness' - and to hell with evidence to the contrary. It is this false, adult invented 'institution' of childhood which the present study criticises, therefore, rather than childhood itself.

Living in a sexophobic society, such as ours, inevitably means that its very language will be hostile to libertarians, and words like 'abusers' and 'corrupters' (note how these definitions carefully dissociate children from sexuality or any hint that they themselves could be the initiators) are used to vilify dissidents, whereas in cultures with freer attitudes such terms would, in many instances, be replaced by more positive sounding descriptions. In these

circumstances, disagreeable terms might then be reserved for those whose philosophies were antisexual. Either way, the meanings are important in relation to the type of society in which we live; whether eroticism is viewed favourably or unfavourably.

It follows from this that definitions of what constitute protection or abuse are culturally variable and often purely dependent upon ideological interpretations. Thus, to put it another way, while one side claim that libertarians are abusing the young by seeking to ensure their social and sexual rights, the libertarians charge that so-called protectionists abuse children by the very act of denying and withholding these rights, and that this is, in essence, the ultimate betrayal of youth.

In all this apparent sea of confusion, it is crucial to spotlight the reason for this particular ideological clash. It has materialised because protectionists have deliberately placed the young in an inferior economic, social and sexual position. This is not, by and large, a condition of children's choice, but has been dictated by adults, regardless of young people's wishes.

Readers who have followed the arguments thus far should, by now, be able to appreciate that limited choices and alternatives mean limited freedom, and although it is equally oppressive to invalidate people's relationships in the context of present society, we can surely only enhance the cause of greater freedom by providing access to a wider range of alternatives. And this, in a nutshell, is the whole message of this book.

At this point, we will return to the power issue since it has provoked some amazing inconsistencies within the women's movement. As has been said, the contributors of this study support the crusade for women's rights, but that in no way alters the fact that some of their statements on intergenerational sex are ill-conceived and erroneous. This has led to all sorts of problems and contradictions, as I will show in a moment.

Modern feminism consists of several strands, not all of them hostile to adult/child sex. Nonetheless, it is evident from much of their writings that the movement has been 'infiltrated' by a sizeable number of women whose objectives are, in some ways, diametrically opposed to libertarianism. Sadly, these 'new Puritans' have elected a stance which is as antisexual as anything from Cromwellian England. In response to their tirades, we need to ask ourselves why such women have deliberately singled out sexuality for attack when there are other areas just as, and more, worthy of criticism, such as the physical beating of children. In this particular case, part of the answer, of course, lies in the uncomfortable fact that many women are themselves the abusers.

In the early 1980s, the US National Organisation for Women condemned 'pæderasty' by invoking the power argument, and claimed that cross-generational sex was "an issue of exploitation or violence, not affectional/sexual-preference orientation." At the same time, they welcomed lesbians among their ranks and vowed to give them every support and encouragement. Nothing wrong with this, one may say. But they seemed oblivious to the obvious contradiction, that on this power basis, lesbians should have come under the same hammer as pæderasts; indeed, by that criterion, everyone's relationships would. And this clearly illustrates why the power argument must fail.

I will now assume the role of devil's advocate for a moment to furnish another example where such feminists show a lack of consistency in their position on power. The following concerns the cuddling and affection which is given to children. Since this is more accepted of women than men, it is reasonable to say that the activity is more prevalent among females. For women, it may or may not have sexual connotations, and although this would make an interesting area for discussion - as would the reasons why tenderness and eroticism are automatically delineated - we will sidestep these issues here.

By using the above criterion, we would have to conclude that cuddling is undesirable as the adult has power. It is 'exploitive'

since it gives the adult satisfaction, and because the child can't consent.

One does not need a crystal ball to visualise the answer from these women. "Ah," they'd say, "but cuddling is a 'benevolent' activity and research shows that children do get pleasure from it, and that they often initiate such displays. Furthermore, we know that youngsters can benefit enormously from affectionate interactions with adults." Quite so, but the only reason why sex is not regarded in the same light is that we live in a sexophobic society. Chances are that if we lived in a culture which condemned tender displays between adults and children, we'd be couching our criticisms in similarly negative terms, and cuddlers would be tarred with the same brush that is now used to smear pædophiles.

Now, it is from the above replies that we see where such women have been hoist with their own petard, for they are not addressing the central criticism - *that if a child can't consent to sex, then he/she can hardly consent to cuddling/affection either or, indeed, to any other activity with adults, and that this in itself must be considered abuse, especially when the adult receives sexual satisfaction from the interaction.* Further to this, their replies indicate that they are merely trying to wriggle their way out of a sticky position by picking what they want out of the situation and attempting to justify it. However, they really can't have it both ways.

Realistically though, it need hardly be said that children do, of course, initiate cuddling; that they can and do enjoy it under the right conditions; and that they often refuse consent for various reasons. Likewise with adult/child sex, and the only objection can be where a child is threatened, coerced or forced etc., into these activities against his or her will. The positive construct surrounding the first activity, cuddling, tells us these things, and the only reason we are led to question the second, sex, is because of its negative construct

and the fact that we have been 'taught' to believe that children are 'innocent' and 'asexual', and couldn't possibly want, like, or initiate sex - so we do our best to ensure they are not given the chance.

Accepting, as most of us do, that tender embraces between adults and children are natural, beneficial, and everything else maintained above, one is then led to question the reasons why children would want to refuse their consent to such activities in the first place. They undoubtedly would, under some circumstances - and that is their right - but at least these will not be for the artificially constructed reasons they often refuse sex; reasons directly connected to living in a sex-negative society, such as the belief that 'it's dirty' or 'wrong', or that one's 'parents wouldn't approve', etc. The leading feminist, Audre Lorde, made a subtle point when she wrote that we have been raised to distrust the erotic, and to "fear the yes within ourselves".²² Needless to say, this process is, of course, especially true of women.

The contributors of this book are 'old fashioned' enough to believe that human sexuality - or more specifically heterosexuality, homosexuality, and their cross-generational counterparts - is also natural, and that it can be immensely enriching. As Audre Lorde puts it: "The sharing of joy, whether physical, emotional, psychic, or intellectual, forms a bridge between the sharers which can be the basis for understanding much of what is not shared between them, and lessens the threat of their difference." (Ref, as above)

By now, I hope to have demonstrated just how and why young people are oppressed. They are stifled by adult behaviour and institutions designed to keep them under their elders' thumbs. Inevitably, such a system robs them of rights and discourages expressiveness. So, rather than being the children *they* want to be, they become the children *adults* want them to be.

Thus, for society to condemn what it so one-sidedly calls the 'abuse' of the young by pædophiles is hypocritical in the extreme. It represents the typical case of the pot calling the kettle black, and the

people throwing the stones should be reminded that they themselves are living in very fragile glass-houses indeed. As mentioned earlier, we are all responsible for the oppression of youth, in various ways, and pædophiles are no better or no worse than anyone else in this respect.

Strictly speaking, though, it is in many cases both misleading and unhelpful to accuse ordinary people of abuse when they don't necessarily know what they are doing is wrong. Unfortunately, many people have been so thoroughly conditioned to accept modern child rearing patterns that they no longer question the 'wisdom' of so-called experts, but blindly trust to their 'better' knowledge. This sorry state of affairs is, of course, compounded by the lack of access to non-oppressive child rearing dogmas, since these would be unacceptable to the Establishment with its interest in the authoritarian control of children.

When thinking of this, we would do well to remember that medical science, in the nineteenth century, became obsessed with the masturbation of children, insisting that it caused blindness, ill health, and insanity. This panic led to the invention of the most hideous and inhumane preventive devices. Before Bowlby, many pædiatricians cautioned mothers against encouraging the sensuality of infants by breast-feeding or bodily contact, and it was only after thousands of babies had died from marasmus that this nonsensical philosophy was eventually discarded. So much for medical experts.

Today, the trend continues just as vehemently, but instead of masturbation or the sensuality of mothers and infants being the targets, the modern folk-devil has become the sexual abuse of the young. Recently, this has grown into witchhunt proportions and is so obviously engineered since it pays no heed to children's right to say yes. As a result, countless children are being guilt-tripped, intimidated and bullied just to satisfy the thirsts of those who seek vengeance - at whatever price.

And the price is horrendous, for such children will almost certainly grow up damaged, not so much, as I said earlier, by the sex

itself, but because of unjust laws, insensitive police and police surgeons, gruelling court cases, and hysterical adults who treat the child as if he/she had been contaminated. Put together, such behaviour can only teach children two things: to distrust all adults, and to fear sex, for such children will soon convince themselves that sex must surely be the filthiest thing on earth.

In this context, it would be instructive to take a closer look at the messages and signals that everyday children receive from society. Adult love and sexuality are continually paraded to them, full-frontal so to speak, though, admittedly, more by accident than design. Children see couples making love in the street, on the TV and on the big screen. They hear passionate scenes on the radio, and they read about them in books and magazines. Human sexuality is all around them and is inescapable. If adults do it and like it, so children think, then why can't they? But woe betide the child who tries to express his/her feelings, for he/she will be mercilessly slapped down, told that it's dirty and wrong, and ordered to keep his or her place. This is the double standard at its very worst. It is utterly naïve not to expect children to want to come along for the ride, and measures taken to prevent it will, for this reason, always be doomed to failure.

In their attempts to answer this, some critics would claim that youngsters don't want or desire sex with adults anyway. The statistics, however, are not on their side. One does not have to look very far for the young boy who masturbates over thoughts of women's well-proportioned bodies, or the girl who fantasises having a sexual relationship with a grown man. Again, many youngsters desire an erotic relationship with an adult, rather than another child, precisely because adults are seen as more affectionate and sexually experienced, and because they can add to the child's erotic vocabulary, both in theory and practice. Regrettably, most adults have been placed - or have placed themselves - out of the reach of children and are thus often seen as inaccessible and unapproachable.

Given these things, it is incomprehensible why children are still always seen as the 'innocent victims', rather than, as in many cases, willing participants, if not the actual seducers. And to those who would ask why 'exclusive' pædophiles can't seem to relate sexually to adults, one could ask, why can't such adults relate sexually to the young? Though many repress it, the sexual attraction of adults to children is, without doubt, far commoner than earlier studies suggest, and if we were to be entirely honest with ourselves we would have to admit that this is not really so surprising, since children and youth are, æsthetically speaking, the most naturally beautiful people on earth.

From what has been said so far, it should, by now, be obvious that the adult who has sex with a child merely because he/she wants it, irrespective of the child's wishes, is being oppressive. Equally oppressive, however, is the adult who 'presumes' that a child couldn't possibly want sex with a man or woman. We none of us wish to see a society where children can't say no, but it should be just as inadmissible to support a society where the young are not 'allowed' to say yes - or even if they do, are not taken seriously. Yet this is precisely what is happening at the moment.

In the light of all this, it becomes patently evident that the *true* reason for the recent hysterical condemnation of pædophiles stems, not so much from a genuine concern to 'protect' children, but from a desire on the part of the Establishment, Church, and some parents, etc, to *reassert their own authority and control over the young*, which demands for children's rights - including sexual rights - are seen to threaten; and, needless to say, this involves a total unwillingness to change, or to view things from a radical perspective. Ironically, and for obvious reasons, their purge has only succeeded in putting children at far greater risk from the unscrupulous than they ever were before.

Adult oppression of the young has built two worlds - one for adults, the other for children. But the day is coming when this régime will be recognised for what it is; a cruel system of apartheid based on

age. Due, in part, to international condemnation, the inhuman face of South African apartheid is now falling apart at the seams. It will only be a matter of time before this other, equally inhuman form of apartheid is similarly condemned.

Though ongoing, the battles for women's liberation and black liberation were, and still are, two of the most important struggles of the day. The contributors of this book are firmly convinced that the battle for the rights of children and youth is just as important, and that it will constitute the next great struggle - and probably the fiercest - of the future.

So what of the way forward? As outlined earlier, the way ahead cannot and must not lie in banning people's relationships. It must lie in re-educating people, thus enabling them to raise their levels of awareness. It must lie, not in criminalising love and sex between consenting parties, but in recognising oppressive behaviour and attitudes and working harder to overcome them. Men, as we have said, have power over women, but despite this, most women still love and desire sex with their husbands or boyfriends. This is an unquestioned fact. If sex between men and women were ever to be banned - however unlikely - the time would soon come when we wouldn't have to worry over issues like power and inequality any more, for obvious reasons. And herein lies the answer as to why the power argument is finally scuttled.

The road to liberation will be a long and tortuous one, with many pitfalls on the way. But we have a duty to take it if we can be honest with ourselves and admit that children must be in the forefront of our minds. And we can start the journey now, by remembering, as far as possible, to act towards others in our daily lives as if the revolution had already come.

Q. Finally, what sort of proposals and recommendations are you making for future change?

A. Aside from the recommendations already made throughout this book, suggestions for reforms, in the sexual sphere, must obviously fall into two categories: the short term and the long term.

Short Term

1. Firstly, we (the contributors) believe the word 'indecent' is an unnecessary appendage that should be dropped from assault trials. It has a prejudicial ring, and such cases could just as easily be accommodated under the umbrella of ordinary assault laws.
2. At present, there is considerable misunderstanding on the part of the public, in so-called 'indecent assault' proceedings, that threats or violence are essential ingredients in such instances. Where children are involved, this leads to an understandable reaction of horror and rage. Yet most cases of this kind, and especially those involving children, include no such elements. This is an anomaly which is in obvious need of reform. In the interests of justice, and to allay confusion, we propose, therefore, that *only* those episodes which incorporate threats or force be prosecuted under the assault statutes.
3. In other cases, where no 'genuine' assault, in the strict sense, is alleged, we propose a new Bill to be classified under the general heading of abuses of power. This would cover cases in which drugs, hypnosis, prostitution, coercion and trickery, etc. are involved - where, in other words, there is either no consent on the part of the less powerful party, or where consent is questionable. Needless to say, such a Bill should also be used in the non-sexual area. Where sex is involved, however, the emphasis should be upon punishing the guilty, not so much for the sex itself, but because such offenders showed a bad example by employing dubious and unacceptable methods to their advantage.
4. It is a common delusion among opponents of adult/child sex to believe that children always need an ulterior motive when agreeing

to such activities; that they have to be 'lured' by secondary factors. We frequently read press reports of children being 'coerced' by sweets, though the thought of a Mars bar encouraging a child to perform behaviour against his/her will stretches the bounds of credulity to the limits. Of course, children will not necessarily refuse money or gifts when offered to them by an unthinking adult who may be mistakenly trying to 'justify' him/herself; but the normal child will not associate sex with rewards unless he or she has been continually taught to expect them for these activities.

We therefore aver that aside from prostitutes, children, generally, need no further initial incentive than the thought of pleasure involved in sex itself; or, to put it another way, that children who are likely to engage in such activities would still do so anyway, even if secondary incentives like cash or gifts were absent - as indeed they frequently are.

It is for this, and other reasons that we agree with those studies, plus the testimony of numerous pædophiles, which suggest that many children are consenting parties and, sometimes, the actual initiators.

Under these circumstances, it is imperative that such 'offenders' be treated differently than those in Nos.2 and 3, where the child's consent is dubious, or not present at all; and, depending on the gravity, offenders in the previous categories should be dealt with more harshly by the courts. This would provide pædophiles themselves with a *reason* to act more responsibly and thoughtfully. Such a measure would, we believe, greatly lessen the risks to children since, realistically speaking, offences of this nature are not going to stop merely for the asking.

5. Incest, rape, buggery, etc., should be abolished as 'special' crimes and covered under one of the three sections outlined above.
6. Children must be spared the ordeals of police interrogations, medical examinations - without consent - and appearances in conventional courts. Ideally, cases involving youngsters should be

taken from the hands of the police and ordinary courts and entrusted to the hands of sympathetic trained counsellors who could conduct investigations in a more relaxed atmosphere, amid pleasant, informal surroundings. In cases where the child freely participated in sexual activities, or where he/she made the first sexual approach, both the child and the child's guardians (where incest is not involved) should be allowed an important say as to whether prosecution should go ahead. When prosecution is recommended, the child should, at all costs, be kept out of conventional court hearings - if these are absolutely necessary - while the strongest possible measures are taken to ensure the defendant's position is not compromised in the process. This would also have the effect of substantially reducing the number of pædophiles who plead guilty simply to protect their young friends from the trauma of court appearances.

7. In the event of a separate category of 'sex offences' being retained, then the Home Office and prison governors must take extra steps to ensure the safety of such prisoners from assaults by other inmates. Any abuses by prisoners should be automatically recorded, and those responsible made liable to loss of privileges, loss of remission, and, in more serious cases, prosecution. Prison officers should not be allowed to inform inmates what any particular prisoner has been convicted for, and failure to comply with this rule should result in disciplinary proceedings, or dismissal.
8. All defendants in court cases, whether sex is involved or not, should be protected from 'trial by the press'. We think, therefore, that names and addresses of the accused should, by law, be kept out of the news media until such time, at least, as a verdict has been announced.

Long Term

Readers will, by now, be fully aware that all the contributors to this study agree that we should be working towards the day when children's sexual and social rights are both recognised and accepted. If that day should ever come - as I believe it must - and the ages of consent were to be either dismantled or drastically reduced, it need hardly be said that we would be living in a very different age where people were far more conversant with the issues.

In the event of these things happening, we would, of course, need to retain and strengthen assault laws and the law covering abuses of power (accepting that our proposal, or something similar, had previously been implemented), since libertarians would not look upon threats to the new freedom too kindly. As we have already intimated, however, the mere fact of an adult having consensual relations with a child should not, of itself, be construed as an abuse. As detailed earlier, this should depend on other factors.

There are bound to be problems, disagreements, misunderstandings, and minor infringements of people's rights in every relationship, and when these occur, counselling and/or warnings are considered to be the just and appropriate way of trying to reach a satisfactory solution.

To police this suggestion, we propose that advisory bureaux, specifically designed for children and young people, be set up and annexed to schools, colleges, children's libraries, playgroups, youth clubs and hostels, etc, where children and youth should be encouraged to go to discuss their problems, their new found rights, to lodge complaints, or simply to have a friendly chat.

Such bureaux should aim to foster a warm and understanding atmosphere, and should be staffed by sympathetic, positive-thinking young people and adults who are well versed in the area of

children's rights, and who would meet the child on the child's own terms. When it comes to problems in sexual relations, they should work on similar lines to our present marriage guidance clinics, and their emphasis should be on rescuing or patching up relationships, rather than destroying them. However, in the case of a serious complaint, such as an assault, the bureaux should have the power to recommend the institution of legal proceedings or, in other cases, lawsuits on the child's behalf.

In all cases where a complaint has been made, the bureaux should have the power to order the offending party to attend the bureau, where the complaint can be discussed calmly and rationally, either in the company of the child, or in his/her absence. In the case of minor problems or complaints, we feel that where people are prepared to listen, re-education is far more productive and preferable than punishment, which should only be used in more severe cases.

Counsellors from these bureaux should also be able to make regular visits to the homes of children and adults who are listed on their files. This would facilitate a closer monitoring, and although there are those who might find this objectionable, it would certainly be far more preferable to the complete outlawing of all adult/child sex.

To some, all this may sound rather idealistic; but it really could work - *if we are prepared to give it the chance*. Only history, however, will tell us if we will ever reach the Promised Land.⁽²³⁾

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *ESCAPE FROM CHILDHOOD: THE NEEDS AND RIGHTS OF CHILDREN*, by John Holt (Penguin Books, Middlesex, 1975).
2. See, for instance, Michael Alhonte in *THE AGE TABOO*, ed. by Dan Tsang (Alyson Books, Boston, USA/Gay Men's Press, London, 1981), and Sally and Llona in *GIRLS ARE POWERFUL*, ed. by Susan Heamings (Sheba Feminist Publishers, London, 1982).
3. *Let us be quite clear about the consequences of the systematic inculcation of sex-negative values and the deprivation of sex/sensuality in childhood. It causes paralysing feelings of guilt and shame, sexual dysfunctions, neuroses, depression, and numerous other mental/nervous disorders. The equation often runs as follows: oppression entails repression, and repression, requiring some outlet, frequently manifests itself in psychological disturbance, aggression, crime, and other antisocial behaviour. In addition, it can also lead to unhealthy obsessions, and the only sure way to cure these is to satisfy the desire whose repression caused them in the first place.*

In his book, TOWARDS A PSYCHOLOGY OF BEING (Van Nostrand, New York, 2nd, edn, 1968), Abraham Maslow had some important things to say on the character of obsessions; and Dr. Edward Brongersma, the Dutch researcher, made a fine analogy on the subject in his treatise, ON LOVING RELATIONSHIPS, HUMAN AND HUMANE (from CHILDHOOD RIGHTS, Vol.1, No.2, PIE, 1978):

"I belong to a generation that still remembers vividly the horrors of the last winters of the war, 1944/5, when under German occupation there was almost no food and we had to eat sugar beets and tulip bulbs. In that period, food became an obsession; you thought the whole day about eating; you dreamed of a fine dinner; and you looked at the illustrations in a cookbook as avidly and greedily as if they were pornography. As soon as food became available after the war, however, this obsession disappeared."

And this is why the demands of people like homosexuals and pædophiles will never lead to a dangerous excess; because desires,

once met, will then reassume a more natural and healthy position in the human psyche - Reich would have called it 'sex-economic self-regulation'. The result, says Brongersma, "will not be more frequent sex; it will be less frequent but better sex - more dignified, more tender, more humane". (Source as above.)

4. For those wishing to verify the points made in this paragraph, the following studies are thoroughly recommended, though they do not appear in any particular order, and represent only a small fraction of the works which could be cited: 'Victim-precipitated Pædophilic Offences', by M. Virkkunen (the BRITISH JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY, Vol.15, No.2, April 1975). 'Remarks on the Interaction of Perpetrator and Victim', by Hans von Hontig (JOURNAL OF CRIM., LAW & CRIMIN., Vol.31, 1941). 'Quelques Propos sur le Victimologie', by R. Lafon (ANNALES DE MÉDECIN LÉGALE, Vol.41, 1961). 'Victimologie et Criminologie des Attentats Sexuels sur les Enfants et les Adolescents', by R. Lafon, J. Trivas, J. L. Faure & R. Pouget (ANN. de MÉD. LÉG., Vol.41, 1961). 'The Reactions of Children to Sexual Relations with Adults', by L. Bender & A. Blau (AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ORTHO-PSYCHIATRY, Vol.7, 1937). 'A Follow-up Report on Children who had Atypical Sexual Experience', by L. Bender & A. L. Grugett (AMER. J. of ORTHO., Vol.22, 1952). 'A Study of Girl Sex Victims', by J. Weiss, E. Rogers, C. H. Dutton, & M. R. Darwin (PSYCHIATRIC QUARTERLY, Vol.29, 1955). 'Experiences of 500 Children with Adult Sexual Deviation' J. T. Landis, (PSYCHIATRIC QUARTERLY, Vol.30, 1956). 'Die Bedeutung Sexueller Attente auf Kinder unter 14 Jahren für die Entwicklung von Geisteskrankheiten und Charakter Anomalien', by A. Rasmussen (ACTA., PSYCHIAT., KBH, Vol.9, 1934). SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE HUMAN FEMALE, by A. C. Kinsey, W. B. Pomeroy, C. E. Martin, & P. Gebhard (W. B. Saunders, Philadelphia & London, 1953). SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR IN THE HUMAN MALE, by A. Kinsey et al. (W. B. Saunders, Philadelphia, 1948). '100 Sex Offences Against Children', by Elsa-Brita Nordlund (STATENS OFFENTLIGA UTREDNINGAR, an official Swedish government research publication, 1953). 'On Psychosexual Development', by W. Simon & J. Gagnon (HANDBOOK OF THEORY AND

RESEARCH IN SOCIALISATION, ed. by D. Goslin, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1969), CHILD VICTIMS OF SEX OFFENCES, by T. C. M. Gibbens & J. Prince (Institute for the Study & Treatment of Delinquency, London, 1963), THE BOY SEX OFFENDER AND HIS LATER CAREER, by L. J. Doshay (Grune & Stratton, 1943), 'De Betekenis van de Verleiding in Homofiele Ontwikkelingen', by F. J. Tolsma (PSYCHIATRICAL-JURIDICAL SOCIETY JOURNAL, Amsterdam, 1957), 'The Wolfenden Report; Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences & Prostitution', by J. Wolfenden, et al (HMSO, London, 1957), 'The Speijer Report; Advice to the Netherlands Council of Health Concerning Homosexual Relations with Minors', by the Speijer Committee (first pub. in Holland, 1969).

5. Even the protection of babies and infants should not be of the suffocating, restrictive variety, but should encourage growth and freedom, as far as possible.
6. By children, I refer to girls just as much as boys, for sexual liberation will never be accomplished if girls are omitted from the programme. Their exclusion would, instead, only reinforce discrimination and inequality by perpetuating a classist society. Though I accept that, at present, there are important differences in rearing between boys and girls, I contend that true sexual/social liberation must include girls as well as boys.
7. In matters requiring considerable skill, it may be justifiable to set tests for capability, as Holt suggests in ESCAPE FROM CHILDHOOD.
8. In his study of pædophiles, C. H. McCaghy suggested that this was the precise reason why childlovers have so much general success with children; because they....."see children as 'significant others' whose judgements and appreciation are crucial for the adult's self-concepts. Such adults would not jeopardise their self-concepts by committing acts which would detract from the child's regard for them". The only unfortunate thing about McCaghy's treatise was its title: 'Child Molesters; A Study of their Careers as Deviants' (in M. B. Clinard & R. Quinney's [eds.] CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR SYSTEMS, pub. by Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1967).

9. *It need hardly be said that sex education should also stress the importance of responsible attitudes, equality (not sameness), respect for the other, and of course, sex within the context of loving relationships.*
10. *See, for example, SEX IN HISTORY, by Alex Comfort (Penguin/Pelican, Middlesex, 1964).*
11. *PATTERNS OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR, by C. S. Ford & F. A. Beach (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1952).*
12. *In sexually restrictive cultures, the taboo on pædophilia is so strong, and penalties so severe, that most people - despite the fact they may possess them - won't allow themselves to even think about having pædophilic inclinations, let alone admit to them. However, in more sex-positive societies, as Ford & Beach show, eroticism between adults and children is often a recognised and accepted fact of life.*

The noted researcher, Wilhelm Stekel, also viewed pædophilic impulses as natural. "As far as I am able to trace, it (pædophilia) must be regarded as a normal component of the sexual drive.....The sexual stimulus that proceeds from children is all the more remarkable because, for many centuries, we have done our best to desexualise the child and to regard it as something holy." PATTERNS OF PSYCHOSEXUAL INFANTILISM (Liveright, New York, 1952.) Brongersma agrees, "Nearly every man and woman has a percentage of pædophilic tendencies in him or her; it is a question of more or less." 'Pædophilia; The Person' (MAGPIE, No.10, PIE, 1977.)

13. *In PSYCHOPATHIA SEXUALIS (first edn., Stuttgart, 1886/12th edn, pub. by F. J. Rebman, New York, 1906).*
14. *'Pædophilia', by René de Voss (NIEUWE REVU, No.44, November 2nd, 1979, Holland). Interestingly enough, a letter to PIE from one of its former women members agrees with most of the points made by Annemieke. In this letter, she claimed to know at least four other female pædophiles, and admitted to having had a number of sexual relationships with both boys and girls in Eastern lands. On pages 3-4, she wrote; "It has always been a known fact that many males are sexually attracted to the young. But for some unknown reason it has never been admitted that there are also many female*

pedophiles. This is, in some ways, similar to masturbation. It has always been shouted around how the majority of boys and grown men enjoy this, but nothing was ever heard of female masturbation, young or old. I suppose we females are able to keep our unusual loves and sexual tastes a secret longer than males can." (Letter to PIE February 20th, 1975.)

On this point, it is only fair to mention that there is a considerable body of opinion which suggests that women pedophiles are not, in fact, as common as men. Advocates of this school of thought maintain that this is, in part at least, due to the psycho-physiology of the adult woman, in that maximum sexual gratification, in many cases, tends to proceed from deep penetration - a function that many children could not properly satisfy. Whatever, it is likely that this stems from cultural and/or social conditioning processes.

15. Austin Pedophile Study Group (Texas, USA, July, 1983).
16. One of the real reasons why people do not openly defend child-lovers is, of course, fear; fear of the possible consequences to themselves. It is a sad reflection on our society when people feel forced to betray their most basic principles and beliefs so as not to offend the bullies of the state. This is an inevitable consequence of giving too much power to governments who are now, in most cases, the masters of the people rather than their servants.
17. Readers should be perfectly clear about what I am saying here. It is an undisputed fact that early feminists, such as Josephine Butler, took a leading role in the formation of ages of consent laws. No-one doubts the sincerity of their crusade to reduce child prostitution. The trouble was that they unwittingly helped in a process which also had the effect of desexualising children still further.
18. See, for example, *I KNOW WHAT I AM: GAY TEENAGERS AND THE LAW* (already cited), and *ONE TEENAGER IN TEN* (already cited).
19. 'Of Men and Little Boys' (*BODY POLITIC*, Canada, July/August, 1972 issue).
20. *SEX IN HISTORY*, by G. R. Taylor (Thames & Hudson, New York, 1957).

21. 'A Few Maxims for the Instruction of the Over-educated', by Oscar Wilde (orig. pub. in the SATURDAY REVIEW),
22. USES OF THE EROTIC, by Audre Lorde (Out & Out Books, New York, 1978),
23. The following is a list of books and articles consulted for this chapter and recommended for further reading: CHILDREN'S SEXUAL THINKING, by Ronald & Juliette Goldman (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1982), CHILDHOOD AND SEXUALITY, by E. H. Erikson (Triad/Granada-Paladin Books, London, 1977), HOMOSEXUALITY: POWER AND POLITICS, ed. by Gay Left Collective (Allison & Busby, London, 1980), 'An Enquiry Among a Group of Pædophiles', by Dr. F. Bernard (THE JOURNAL OF SEX RESEARCH, Vol.2, No.3, August, 1975), THE FARTHER REACHES OF HUMAN NATURE, by A. H. Maslow (Viking Press, USA, 1971), THE NAKED APE, by Desmond Morris (Jonathan Cape, 1967/Corgi Paperbacks, London, 1968), INTIMATE BEHAVIOUR, by D. Morris (J. Cape, 1971/Corgi, 1972), THE HUMAN ZOO, by D. Morris (J. Cape, 1969/Corgi, 1971), BABY AND CHILD CARE, by Benjamin Spock (Giant Cardinal/Pocket Books, New York, 1966 - orig. pub. under title of THE COMMONSENSE BOOK OF BABY AND CHILD CARE, 1945), TOWARDS A PERSPECTIVE FOR BOY-LOVERS, by Den W. Nichols (Editorial Creative Products, Lansing, Michigan, 1976), GROWING UP ABSURD, by Paul Goodman (Vintage Books, Random House, NY, 1956), CELEBRATION OF AWARENESS, by Ivan Illich (Calder & Boyars, London, 1971), THE SENSUOUS CHILD, by Hal M. Wells (Scarborough Books, NY, 1978), 'Sexual Offences, Consent and Sentencing', by R. Walmsley & K. White, Home Office research study, No.54 (HMSO, London, 1979), BISEXUALITY: A STUDY, by Charlotte Wolff (Quartet Books, London, 1977), THE BISEXUAL OPTION, by F. Klein (Priam Books, Arbor House, NY, 1978), FIRST RIGHTS: A GUIDE TO LEGAL RIGHTS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE, by M. Rae, P. Hewitt & B. Hugill (NCCL, London, 1981), SUMMERHILL, by A. S. Neill (Penguin-Pelican, Middlesex, 1968 - first pub. by Victor Gollancz, London, 1962), THE SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR OF YOUNG PEOPLE, by Michael Schofield (Penguin-Pelican, 1968 - first pub. by Longmans, 1965), THE TWISTING LANE: SOME SEX OFFENDERS, by Tony Parker (Hutchinson, London, 1969), 'Of No Concern to Others', by E. Brongersma (old GAY NEWS, No.128), 'Nicer Than PIE', by Tim

Brown (*THE LEVELLER*, No.40, August, 1980). 'Power and Pædophilia', by Eric Presland (*GAY NOISE*, No.9, December 4th, 1980). 'Sex Under Sixteen; Young Women Talk About the Consent Law' (*SPARE RIB*, No.108, July, 1981). 'Teaching Sexuality', by Jane Rule (*BODY POLITIC*, Canada, June, 1979). 'Women and Pædophilia', by Jody Emerson (*GAY COMMUNITY NEWS* (Australia), November, 1982). 'Sexual Politics, The New Right, and The Sexual Fringe', by Gayle Rubin (*THE LEAPING LESBIAN*, February, 1978). 'Consensual Acts', by Anna Durell (*CAPITAL GAY*, London, September 24th, 1982). 'Pædophilia is a Lesbian Issue', by Christine Holland (*BODY POLITIC*, June, 1982). 'Replace the Age of Consent', by Simon Raven (*FORUM* magazine, Vol.13, No.7, London, 1980). 'The Importance of Being Children', by Keith R. Hose (*QUORUM* magazine, Spring, London, 1975). 'Monica-philia', by Ray Brown (*FORUM* magazine, Vol.12, No.7, London, 1979). 'You Show Me Yours and I'll Show You Mine', by Richard Louv (*PLAYGIRL ADVISER*, February, 1977). *PÆDOPHILIA AND PUBLIC MORALS*, ed. by Dave Landau, Tim Brown, Edward Bell & Peter Norman (Campaign Against Public Morals, CAPM, London, 1980). *SEX; FACTS, FRAUDS AND FOLLIES*, by Thomas Szasz (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1981). 'Pregnant at School', ed. by Dame Margaret Miles et al (National Council for One Parent Families, September, 1979). *SEX, POLITICS AND SOCIETY; THE REGULATION OF SEXUALITY SINCE 1800*, by Jeffrey Weeks (Longmans, Essex, 1981). *THE LITTLE RED SCHOOLBOOK* by Søren Hansen & Jesper Jensen (Stage 1, London, 1971/orig. pub. 1969/70, Denmark). *THE SEXUAL LIFE OF THE CHILD*, by A. Moll (Macmillan, London, 1912). *PSYCHOLOGY OF SEX; A MANUAL FOR STUDENTS*, by Havelock Ellis (Emerson Books, NY, 1946). *CHILDHOOD AND SEXUALITY*, by Stevi Jackson (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1984).

PART FOUR

How Youth
See the Issues

Chapter 13

THE OPPRESSION OF THE YOUNG: An inside perspective

by JEFF VERNON

As mentioned earlier, the crusade for the rights of children and young people is a 'relatively' new one, and as with all new movements, it is having its fair share of teething problems. Differences of opinion, even among advocates, serve only to remind us that there is still a long way to go; that the debate is still only in its initial stages.

Inevitably, much of what has been said and written thus far on the issue has stemmed from older adults. Clearly, they have an important role to play, but in the end, young people themselves will need to defend their own ground. The least we can do, as adults, is to listen and, yes, to learn from what they have to say.

In many parts of the world, youth groups have organised to raise levels of consciousness and to challenge adult privilege. In England, one such group is the Gay Youth Movement (GYM). I asked Jeff Vernon, a spokesperson, what GYM defined as children's rights; what it identified as the causes of young people's oppression; and what needed to be done to rectify the situation.

Writing from a gay perspective, he discusses the 'institution' of childhood, then concentrates on three areas: education, the family, and social work. As an exercise in letting young people speak for themselves, it is my fervent hope that others will follow the example.
-ed.

Introduction: The GYM Charter

Principles:

The liberation of lesbians and gay men implicitly requires the liberation of women and all other oppressed groups, including sexual minorities such as transsexuals, transvestites, and paedophiles. This requires a society where all forms of consensual sexual activity are regarded as equally valid, and the eventual abolition of all ages of consent for consensual sexual acts, regardless of sex, sexuality, or age.

The proper function of education, both in school and in the home, is to encourage the development and expression of free and informed opinions.

Young people must have freedom from the control of the family and the state, insofar as such control is due to their age, status, sex or sexuality.

Young people must have the right to full expression of their sexuality, and acceptance and acknowledgement of that sexuality.

Young people must have the right to associate freely with people of their choice. In particular, they must not be kept isolated from adult lesbians and gay men.

Young people must have the same right to freedom of belief, opinion, assembly, and expression as other members of the population. This must include the right for all young people to organise themselves independently of adults.

Young people need economic independence from adults, including parents. This means the right to jobs, state benefits, and grants at all levels of education.

We Demand:

1. Whilst there is an 'age of consent', it shall be the same for both homosexuals and heterosexuals,
2. The full recognition and acceptance of lesbians and gay men in all roles in education, youth and welfare services, and organisations,
3. A full education representing positive images of all sexualities as an integral part of the curriculum on an equal basis with other subjects,
4. The right of all people to employment in all fields regardless of their sexuality, and their full legal protection in that employment,
5. The provision of funding and facilities for lesbian and gay youth groups, clubs and organisations, on an equal basis with other youth groups, clubs and organisations,
6. The adequate provision of local authority housing for lesbians and gay men, singly, in couples or in groupings, regardless of age,
7. The right to be adopted or fostered as open lesbians or gay men by the people we choose, and as open lesbians and gays, the right to have, adopt and foster,
8. The positive coverage in the press, on TV and on radio, of events concerning all sexual minorities,
9. The abolition of the privileges and special status afforded to heterosexual couples,
10. Homosexuality should no longer be considered as a sickness or disease, and should not amount to, or form grounds for, restriction

or detention under the Children and Young Persons Act, Mental Health Act, or similar statutory provisions.

We demand equality; equality in the civil and criminal law, and in all rules and judgements made by society.

(Address: Gay Youth Movement, BM-GYM, London WC1N 3XX)

English Childhood: A Brief History of the 'Institution'

In the fourteenth century, around fifty percent of all babies died in their first year. Swaddling, wet-nursing, primitive hygiene and plague were not particularly class-specific, and it is likely that adults of whatever status invested much less emotion on new-born children than is now felt to be normal. 'It might die in a year, so baptise it quickly, but why waste a lot of 'affection'?

Beyond rudimentary attention to feeding, no-one took much notice of young children. They milled around with adults in the buildings and on the lands of extended feudal households. Even at this early age, many of them worked alongside adults and were certainly not emotionally dependent on their biological parents - even if they knew who they were. Orphaned children attached themselves to a convenient manor, or became wards of tradespeople and craftsmen who were reimbursed by parish tithes. If they couldn't work, they begged. Some were taken in by church hospitals endowed by the wealthy, but wherever they were, children participated in the economy, affairs and leisure of adult society. There were no special children's amusements, clothes, foods, sleeping quarters. Between the ages of seven and fourteen, all able-bodied children, whatever their situation, went into agricultural or domestic employment, or were apprenticed to landowners or others, nearly always from their places of origin. Some trained for holy orders. Everyone became responsible for their actions from the age of seven.

By the early sixteenth century, the feudal manor system had broken down; the land was being turned over to sheep farming, the baronial armies had been disbanded. With smaller households, the middle classes employed fewer servants and apprentices. The dissolution of the monasteries closed another source of food, shelter and pious good works. Unemployment and poverty were rife. The upper classes differentiated sharply from the 'riotous poor'. They distanced themselves materially (smaller, sequestered families where servants had separate quarters for the first time) and ideologically, by cultivating the idea of privacy, and less association with manual labour.

All this produced changes of attitude to children, too. Families being more intimate, the young were now more in evidence. The merchant and yeoman classes didn't work at anything 'obviously' useful, in that the results of their labours didn't visibly change the landscape. Consequently, their children became products that either reflected well or badly on the family. The education of middle class boys was undertaken more earnestly than before. Meanwhile, the authorities did what they could to try and remedy the social crisis of the time, and young paupers and vagrants were sent to hospitals set up from the 1550s onwards for basic education and training.

By 1620, all children had to learn a trade, with fees paid by parents or parishes. Increasingly, anxiety about the welfare of the young gave way to the new middle class ideas about domestic propriety; multiple occupation of rooms and beds, alliances between servants and children, bawdy entertainments, etc. The schools run by Jesuits, Puritans and Jansenites were advocating prosperity through discipline. Notions of what was 'appropriate' for children took hold and children's toys appeared. Middle class boys up to the age of seven began to wear clothes no longer fashionable among the aristocracy, though girls and the entire working class were dressed in adult clothes on the emergence from earliest infancy.

With the civil war of the 1640s, the system administering the training of young people collapsed and the new Commonwealth reversed

earlier ideas of state responsibility, believing more in personal ambition and success, and moral fibre. In the late 1660s, land enclosure and land allocation, irrespective of family size, brought renewed strife to land-workers. To mop up surplus workers and give them some minimal subsistence care, the 1772 workhouse statute was passed. This time, it was altogether clear that individuals were being blamed for their circumstances, and the workhouses were intended to punish the idle poor. Religious penitentiaries for unmarried mothers were founded, morality being the basis for this and all subsequent state action on pauperism for one hundred and fifty years.

Naturally, much of this legislation concerned children. All of it upheld their subjection to the frantic economic order of the day, and where precious energy could have been spent on examining working hours, work regimes, safety standards and industrial health, there was usually only prissy outrage about such things as nudity down mines and sleeping arrangements in mills.

Hanway's Act of 1767 compulsorily removed all children for reception into a workhouse. Parliament seemed quite phlegmatic about the destination of these children. Many went to work usually with, in or under water-powered machinery in the new factories for up to fifteen hours a day. The smallest children could be employed; indeed, poor relief was withheld from families if they weren't. When the state became concerned about England's population increase, it was because of crime, corruption, moral danger - anything but the provision of homes or food.

Robert Peel's 1802 Act stipulated separate dormitories for boys and girls, work not in excess of twelve hours a day, and religious instruction. The inspection of factories was, in the main, not implemented. Chianey sweeps worked under intolerable conditions, while mining children were deployed in the most noisesome parts of the seams. Indeed, they could be imprisoned by magistrates if they refused. In an attempt to herd people into the workhouses, the 1834 Poor Law Act withheld poor relief from anyone capable even of sweating.

Social reformers of the time waxed eloquently about fetid transportation ships and pestilential jails, but their voices were usually silent about the children who were in them, often for refusing to crawl under unguarded textile machines. The 1855 Reformatory Schools Act couldn't even acknowledge genuine philanthropic gestures ungrudgingly; children who went to these schools were obliged to spend fourteen days in jail first, as part of the 'reformatory' process.

The middle classes were supposedly taking a more sentimental view of children at this time. This should be reinterpreted; the middle classes believed that their horrific spawn might develop into acceptable adults if they were tortured enough. A German 'child care' manual of 1887 (Schmid) defined discipline as "the partial suppression of the joy of living," and later went on to say that "the health and vitality of a political system owes much to flourishing obedience to law and authority." For more evidence, we need only look at Landermann's study, *OF THE CHARACTER OF EXHUBERANCE* (1887); "The best way for education to proceed is by shielding the child from all influences that might stimulate feelings, be they pleasant or painful."

Then, as now, there was a peculiar horror of sexuality. In the context of the small, bourgeois family this was, and is, understandable. Children are reared in their parents' own image; they are a matching accessory, completing the household like a kwik-fit kitchen or a patio. Destined to inherit and propagate their parents' middle class values, they must not be allowed any thoughts or drives of their own. Sexuality threatens the stability of the family. If the child masturbates, he/she is momentarily free of the collective consciousness of the household; is experiencing something other than the approved tedium. Who knows, with too many independent ideas, he/she might leave the home and establish an identity before the training in parental hang-ups is complete.

Thus it is that sex becomes an adult prerogative, and children who dare to explore their own or other people's bodies are often punished, threatened and guilt-tripped. At any age, a child who is sexually involved with another may be hounded by parents, teachers and social

The Oppression of the Young

workers. A boy discovered appraising his father's penis will find himself in a child guidance clinic and the father may be prosecuted. In adolescence, legal intervention in people's sexuality begins in earnest and the young adult is now forced to face the added hazards of care orders and prosecutions.

Adults have devised for children a programme of vocational boredom; compulsory schools, homework, household chores, bedtime, junk food, playgrounds where one doesn't disturb adults and where one mixes only with people of one's own age, religion, and piano lessons; no choice about clothes, décor, shopping expeditions, visits to and from relatives, etc. The reason? To maintain a dull, complacent, terminally unaware population of people under sixteen.

Adults just can't accept that children might have desires, values and aspirations in conflict with their own. Very young children, especially, are forced to put up with their parents' psychological engineering. New parents don't question what they do because of the smug conviction that their every repressive act is an expression of love. And anyway, who's going to find out or care if they lock their children in their rooms, force-feed them, confine them to the house, vet their friends for them, exploit their financial dependence, threaten or terrify their pets, assault them, humiliate them, or give them sleeping drugs? The child is supposed to show gratitude, otherwise this is regarded as 'sulking' and is also punished.

The purpose of childhood as an institution is to prepare young people for the economic and moral imperatives of the era. There is a strange duality here: on the one hand, it is supposed that children will go along with all this because somehow it's in their constitution. At the same time, it is recognised that children are potential dissidents, and that without the 'civilising influence' of their parents, John and Tracy would be off somewhere orchestrating hell on wheels. The sad truth is that many young people believe their parents are among the worst things that happened to them. This alienation is not going to change until adults change their attitudes to children.

Compulsory Miseducation

Education is supposed to happen only in schools, it has been monopolised by the state and is, consequently, a resource which has necessarily limited values, and which benefits only those who survive eleven years of deference to teacher and the curriculum, wearing uniforms, being tidy, walking along the left-hand side of the corridor, and learning to exchange one's labour for good marks.

So far, so trendy. A lot of liberal 'progressive' commentators on education would go along with this. They might even agree with me that schools aren't so much concerned with stimulating activity as with instilling 'proper' attitudes and structuring young people's ambitions to fit in with what society will eventually offer them.

It is not even difficult to find articles recommending the abolition of compulsory schooling, to be replaced by 'incidental learning' from one's environment. Attractive though this sounds, many young people's immediate surroundings aren't all that scenic: disused pit-heads, abandoned textile mills, crumbling tower blocks, alcoholic parents. With this present reality, this, and compulsory education, seem irrelevant to many young people who are 'voting with their feet', dodging school and leaving theorists to bicker over the ruins.

The education system co-opts nearly all people at the age of five and gives them an extended course in adult establishment values. Very few school leavers have any doubts about what is considered to be 'appropriate' behaviour, because fifteen thousand hours of their lives so far will have been taken up with talk and subliminal images of citizenship, law-abidingness, obedience and conformity. When outraged public figures dismiss modern teaching methods, they talk about pupils' attitudes, not their academic attainments. Employers complain of lack of skilled school leavers, but at a time when industrial skill is needed more than ever before, what they mean is that some of the little malcontents would notice if they were chained to a treadmill. A 1981 Department of Education and Science pamphlet crystallises the purpose of

modern schooling very well; "Pupils should be made aware of the importance to Britain of the wealth-creating process."⁽¹⁾

Even if the language of education theory, with its talk about conformity and industriousness, were radically different the school structure would, on its own, still communicate a particular view of the way the world should be organised: a special building sequestered away from the community; adults in authority, adults as experts; timetables; syllabi; bells; mealtimes; segregated ages; assessments; grades; exams; reports etc. Most school leavers know they are points on a mark sheet, judged by authority, but never judging it.

The education system has engendered a powerful myth; performance, success and intelligence are all individual attributes, the products of one's unconscious, or even of one's genes. They are emphatically not the results of assessment criteria, opportunity, or teachers' preconceived ideas as to what is desirable. Teachers, administrators, quackiatrists all magnify the individual approach. If one doesn't respond well to it, if one doesn't like being assaulted by teacher when homework isn't of the requisite standard, if one fails to pass exams, then it is the fault of the individual. In this sense, then, individualism becomes a sinister philosophy since it justifies personal scrutiny of every person in a classroom. This is ostensibly for benign reasons - to assess areas of need, to monitor progress. Rarely is it asked, 'What is need?' because certain standards are taken for granted, and they are white, male, middle class, heterosexual, able-bodied standards. The teacher assesses by how much a child deviates from the norm and compensates accordingly, correcting pronunciation, criticising style of dress, commenting on the way one holds one's pen, remarking that some girls are too 'boisterous' and boys 'cissy'.

The needs only mean anything in relation to the workbench or kitchen sink the pupil is expected to inherit, and in both cases what is needed is a docile, guaranteed non-thinking labourer. The training starts early on. Schoolchildren have to be passive and contained, and this too is now considered 'normal', so that at the first sign of

spontaneous brain activity, the child is likely to be labelled hyperactive or precocious.

'Progressive' schools are superficially more pleasant places to be in. This is a coercive measure: 'If we can create the illusion that the kids have some control over the floor-sweeping rota, they'll shut up, sit down, and copy their notes.' But such schools still have traditional subjects, division, syllabi and exams; they still have professional adult teachers; they still emphasise the individual rather than the collective, discouraging people from thinking of themselves as, say, a class of young people, or a class of lesbian and gay men. They may be even more prurient about 'deviant' sexuality than traditional schools; worse, they may see themselves as so aware and liberated that sexuality isn't an issue. All in all, they still regard the young as incomplete people, and the school is designed to turn out socially acceptable grown-ups. Nothing is relevant to the situation of children *now*.

It is imperative that we work towards the abolition of the authoritarian school system and encourage democracy. This is especially necessary since, at the moment, our school system trains children to accept capitalism, exploitation and sexual divisions as natural and desirable; and because it is the single most well-developed monitor of young people up to the age of sixteen. However, truancy is dramatically increasing and I would argue that the system has already lost these children. Press ganging them back to school will only elicit a surly resignation from them.

Learning should be a pleasure not a chore, and this is another reason why compulsory miseducation fails, because schools are so regimental, and such boring and unexciting places to be in. Since learning is the gateway to liberation, we must devise alternative approaches. Adults need to learn too, so perhaps there's a case for bringing education, minus the conditioning, out to society at large. Who knows, maybe modern computer technology will provide us with an answer.

Towards a Nuclear-Free Family

The first thing to say about the family is that, nowadays, it is a rarity. Only eight percent of all fuck-contracts called families consist of a heterosexual married couple with a man who goes to work and a woman who stays at home and raises 1.8 children.

The problem is that the idea of the family isn't dying with the institution. All political parties claim to have invented the family. Trade unions bleat about the family wage, while advertisers know that alluring family images sell almost everything; and nearly every day tabloid newspapers, anxious to sustain the family fiction, report mundane incidents hyped to look newsworthy.

The law in England and Wales reinforces the family as the unit of society. Local authorities give housing priority to nuclear families, while employment practices and social security policy mean that symbiosis with men is the only way of surviving for many women. Whole industries churn out family insurance, family railcards, family medical practices, etc. The incentives to form a family are seductive; relationships are put on a very obvious economic base, and this makes the love and attraction model of heterosexual pair bonding look very fragile when it needs all these financial rewards and social approval to shore it up. The result of familist propaganda is that lesbian communes and male gay couples all mimic, to some extent, the family routine.

So, is the family objectionable on principle? Yes, it is. Families ensure that routines are followed, traditions preserved. One of these traditions is that women perform unpaid domestic slavery, reproduce a future workforce, and still minister to the needs of their knackered-out working menfolk. Another is that children are the property of their parents and will inherit their values, their neuroses, their wealth or their poverty. The family is also a means of social control, and convenient for divisions of labour and sex roles, taxation, census returns, benefits assessments, and housing allocation. It can be held responsible for the supposed deficiencies of the young, the economy

and the nation's health, whereupon the state can deploy its social workers to harass people.

The family's sentimental appeal is well known and can be exploited by politicians who wish to distract attention from industrial disputes: there are more votes to be made out of gurgling at a baby than holding talks with a group of striking workers. The family is considered sacred, inviolable, a sanctuary from the hurly-burly of world politics and economics, individual couples, and selfish consumers. It is resistant to change and perpetuates its own ideas (except that those ideas are really those of the Establishment). Within this artificial system, people have fairly strictly defined roles, and everyone relates to others in a controlled, dishonest way.

Families - or rather, the superstitions attached to them, even if one is part of some oppositional arrangement - are a neat prescription for the oppression of everyone in them. They are there to ensure that children go to school, are inculcated with guilt, and are not rude or 'delinquent'. They provide the origin, food and shelter for the day inmates of educational establishments.

In times of threat, the establishment can seem very accommodating in building up morale. One example is the expansion of state benefits and public services after wars, to make people more efficient workers and soldiers for capitalism. This provision can also be retracted, again in the name of the family..... 'We support the family, so housewives will just have to look after the new-born, the very old, the sick, and the disabled while we demolish hospitals and nurseries.'

If domestic considerations about who does the laundry, who feeds the baby, and who earns the money, etc., are going to change, then employment practices will have to be very carefully monitored and directed, and de-legislation of family and welfare payment laws will have to proceed. All privileges pertaining to marriage, 'couplehood' and heterosexuality, will either need to be abolished, or will be discretionary. All this implies more state intervention than I would be

happy about, but is anyway unlikely. We can't even be sure that any of the desired effects - less predictability about home life, and less control of young people - would result.

Another way would be to launch a huge propaganda campaign to persuade people to construct a life and then think about families, rather than the other way round as happens at the moment. This would necessitate a change in local authority housing allocation; more single person housing provision, and larger dwellings to be run on co-operative lines by unattached people, without age limits and without any ownership of the tenant implied. Ultimately, people would not live in 'their own' house, but would be free to stay in any or all houses run on this basis, in any part of the country.

To start this kind of scheme, campaigners would need to persuade councillors on local authority housing committees to use their power to allocate unoccupied dwellings without consulting the housing department. Failing this, sustained pressure, squatting, occupation of common land, and even occupation of private property.

This is not an impractical scheme; people are doing it at this very minute. Of course they get evicted, but then no-one ever swayed a local authority bureaucrat after one confrontation. The new features in this plan are (a) making it a general practice, rather than one confined to large metropolitan areas; and (b) publicising the effort and persuading sympathetic pressure groups to guilt-trip authorities into giving way.

None of this is likely to revolutionise social arrangements at once, but people who discover it will be able to escape, or avoid altogether, the confines of marriage, families, and living in one location. It is especially relevant to young people who, through lack of money and support, have no choice but to live at home, and who may be undergoing brainwashing for their lack of servility, or their sexual variations.

The Social Work Plague

Immediate post-war measures to provide for deprived children in England and Wales showed a number of clear features. One was the constant emphasis on 'a normal home life', and this must have seemed like a good idea to anyone living in the precincts of a workhouse. Another was that working class families seem to have been regarded as inherently void, inadequate, something to be remedied by providing normative standards of care for working class children. A third was the trilemma posed by adequately policing families to assess need, giving state care to their children (while still shoring up the caricature I described earlier), and still not spending too much money. The legislation of the time, the government pamphlets accompanying it, and parliamentary comments show all this quite starkly.

The 1948 Children and Young Persons Act obliged local authorities to appoint children's officers to deal with instances of need that came to their attention. Officers were advised to 'examine unsatisfied personality needs' and 'build on and preserve what was good in the family'. And if this failed, or wasn't feasible, children could be taken into care where they would be initiated into the middle class mysteries of a normal home life before being returned to the family.

A 1950 Home Office circular⁽²⁾ encouraged local authorities to intervene before the break-up of families through neglect; and a statement issued jointly by the Home Office, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Health in the same year suggested that local authorities install officers to liaise with services concerned with the welfare of children in their own homes.

In 1952, the Commons Select Committee on Estimates reviewed the cost of the new welfare provisions since 1948. The Committee recommended more attention towards the means whereby situations that end in domestic upheavals and disasters might be dealt with before the actual break-up of the home occurs.⁽³⁾ This coincided with John Bolby's 1952 study for the World Health Organisation which proclaimed a

correlation between maternal nurturing and the subsequent mental health of children,⁽⁴⁾ Also in 1952, an amendment Act obliged local authorities to enquire into the situation of any child thought to be in need of care and protection.

The state was well informed of post-war developments regarding the massive unemployment of women and their unwilling redomestication, the peak divorce rate of 1947, and the uneasy relations between women, children and shell-shocked menfolk. In consequence, there was an all-out PR job for the family, and local authorities were now empowered as never before to judge families and find them wanting.

A 1953 report from the north of England confirms the method of child care that was most favoured there at the time. Between four and six, children were accommodated in small homes "in the charge of a married housemother whose husband follows his normal occupation. The housemother is a full-time employee of the local authority, and her husband receives free board and lodging in return for taking a fatherly interest in the children".⁽⁵⁾

The Ingleby report of 1960 was concerned with the operation of juvenile courts. It recommended that, in addition to their criminal jurisdiction, the juvenile courts should also process young people in need of protection or discipline.⁽⁶⁾ The motivation behind Ingleby was very much connected with family responsibility. The report urged a statutory duty for authorities to prevent family suffering due to neglect which, of course, entails rigorous monitoring of children at school, and further underlines a socially-approved form of family and the idea of individual neglect, rather than, as was often the case, externally created poverty. The Children and Young Persons Act of 1963 followed.

In 1964, a pamphlet circulated by the Labour Party⁽⁷⁾ further privatised unemployment, race tension, poor school performance, etc., and favoured a more comprehensive and potent social services department, remarking on the situation of children from poor and undesirable homes.

The eventual 1969 Act was in the same spirit; the Home Secretary was worried that the deprived and delinquent children of today would become the inadequate, unstable, or criminal elements of tomorrow. The Act established much wider power of care agencies and sentencing, and enhanced the 'medical model' of social work through observation, diagnosing and treating.

Although there were undoubtedly some good effects from all this legislation, the end result, as far as people are concerned, is that social work intervention in their lives has increased dramatically. Not surprisingly, many young people regard their social workers as the reason for their care orders, secure accommodation, youth custody, and supervision orders. Meeting social workers, or reading their bland, vacuous writings in professional journals, one can often see why.

The plain truth is that many social workers view themselves as agents of the state, accountable to their departments for the care and control of their clients who have 'problems', and who may be 'offenders'. Even radical social workers rarely forget their pop-psychology for long enough to think about what constitutes a problem or an offence; for the fact is that many juveniles are placed in institutions for offences which, if perpetrated by adults, would not be classed as criminal offences at all. Instead, they critically examine government proposals for a new lock-up by remarking on the cost, or the proportion of recidivism, or by welcoming determinate sentencing. Surely they could exercise themselves more usefully by exposing or denouncing behaviour modification therapy, forcible druggings, beatings, the withholding of meals, short-sharp shocks, the nonsense of curfew, and on-the-nod court proceedings.

The social workers that John Hart interviews in his study SOCIAL WORK AND SEXUAL CONDUCT⁽⁹⁾ sound like wonderfully enlightened people. But do they say the same things to their clients? It's much more likely that they spout the kind of neutered, detached clinicspeak I found recently in an anthology concerning social work with adolescents..... "Pressures can cause the admission to residential care of adolescents

with no positive need of treatment, and thus from the social work perspective, this kind of action is negative. However, negative reasons for the use of residential care do not negate its positive potential; the residential setting allows more control of the total environment and more opportunity to use social work and other techniques, and use them effectively."

Adolescents are revolting, increasingly, and don't see why they should be 'forced' to live at home, suppress their sexuality, smile at relatives, or live under the constant supervision of social workers. Civilisation is so artificial, and morals so fragile, that society can't cope with the merest deviation: such people must be punished. A large proportion of all child clients are being policed because of truancy, sexuality, irreverence, 'perverse' interests, or behaviour interpreted as bizarre. Naturally, it doesn't always show in the statistics; 'illness of parent', 'unsatisfactory home conditions', etc., often obscure the real reasons.

If there's one shred of comfort from all this it is that social workers aren't always very good at their own game. Thus the chief social worker for West Sussex, attempting to commit an eighteen year old gay youth to care and psychiatric treatment for another year, said in court: "I think I'm right here... perhaps your worships can help me... but I think there's no consent under the age of twenty-one?"

The parents of sexually active teenagers often knowingly involve the police, social services and psychiatrists. Some refuse to let 'their' children out of the house. Others threaten murder. Inside institutions, one's sexuality might be dismissed until one no longer believes in it oneself. Almost certainly one will be prevented from exercising it.

Today, certain types of orders and institutions are being used much more than they were. In 1983, youth custody (borstal) orders on young people aged fifteen to twenty were up by sixty-nine percent compared with equivalent orders the year before. Someone who helped swell the

statistics was Paul Berry who was sent to borstal for six months for attempted buggery and gross indecency with males over twenty-one when he was seventeen.

In 1984, four hundred million pounds was being spent annually on maintaining children and young people in care, 4.6 million went to assisting families, which says something about the 'prevention' ethic in practice. If 'care' is the answer at all, and money and services can provide it, why can't these millions of pounds be spent directly, instead of maintaining a hierarchy of middle class critics of so-called working class deficiencies?

The response of young people must be to insist that their own views have never been considered in the entire history of 'provision' for them. Professional bodies like the British Association of Social Workers, and the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders must be aggressively lobbied. The message is that many young people get a shitty deal, and that youth is angry.⁽⁹⁾

Two useful organisations:

1. Children's Legal Centre,
20 Compton Terrace, London N1 2UN
2. National Association for Young People In Care (NAYPIC),
c/o organisation & address above.

Postscript

Since this is the last chapter in the book (proper), it was generally agreed that it would be particularly appropriate to end with a postscript which takes a look at what other radical minded young people (including children) are thinking and saying on such areas as we have just covered, plus others. What follows then, is a selection from their writings which serves to prove that *the young are demanding a voice, and will be heard.*

"When I was 6 years old I ran away. But I didn't go very far. My father followed me down the street with a movie camera, laughing at me. When I was 13 I ran away again. The reason wasn't clear, but whatever it was I must have been feeling it pretty strongly. I stayed out in below freezing weather and slept in an old bus. I was not free, I couldn't leave, because they have horrible, mind-shrinking places to put you in. I was lucky. My parents never called the police. But how many people are not so lucky?" (A)

(Laura, aged 16)

"Ever since I was very small I had trouble with school. I was impatient and I had teachers that wouldn't tolerate this. I remember one year I went less than half the school year because I became so hurt and upset. Going to high school I came across many people telling me 'what life's all about'. Hell, it's been school that's been stifling my own self and keeping me from finding out what life's all about. School is a very clear symbol of how young people are treated. Living as a 'minor', 'juvenile', or any other label placed on young people, I rapidly became aware of our carefully-drawn 'limits'." (B)

(Cathi, aged 16)

"I ran away 3 times last spring and my mother was thinking of putting me in a mental hospital because that's what her minister recommended. I came home and compromises were worked out. After a short period of time my mother had broken most of the promises she had made. When I brought up the subject, she usually wormed out of it. Sometimes I used

to wish I'd gone into the mental hospital; Jon was there and he said it wasn't bad, Anything to get out, I know my mother is wrong - horribly wrong, but she fools people well enough so they don't realise the frustration and bullshit I have to deal with every day, I can't even explain how awful it is, Sometimes I think of the butcher knife in the kitchen drawer and what I could do with it, When I'm in the same room as my mother I ignore her as much as possible because I dislike her, I'm scared of being like her, I'm moving out for the last six weeks of the summer to a house with three other sisters, I never want to come back to my mother's lifestyle, It's fucked up and I'll fight it till I die." (C)

(Alice, aged 14)

"Coercive constraints imposed by adults cannot, in our epoch, do anything but keep young people in a state of dangerous childishness, expressing itself in conscious refusal or revolt, retarding as much in the family as in the collective life of the school." (D)

*(d'Arsonval School Action Committee,
France)*

"Generalisations are made all the time, just based on age, not taking that individual into account, You are judged on your age before you've even opened your mouth, I don't believe they'd make that ignorant assumption about class or race.....

Since becoming involved in the women's liberation movement, we'd often felt that in our relationships with a lot of older women there was something which made us feel uncomfortable, and when we thought about it more - shock, horror; dare we say it? - patronised, It wasn't until we

started identifying ourselves as young women that we realised how we'd been identified or even classified by older women. By older, in this context, we mean anything as venerable as 24. We had already recognised our oppression as young women in the wider society - laws, parents, school and so on. But we hadn't realised we were also oppressed by older feminists.....

The women's movement must now come to terms with the contradiction of needing young women to be a part of it, and treating us as if we were smaller, inadequate, and immature versions of the older women in it..... We can never really be together until the oppression of ageism is recognised and worked on." (E)

(Sally and Fiona)

"I hear you are looking for true experiences between men and boys. Well, I met this guy who is 36 years old while playing little league baseball last summer, when I was 12 years old. I don't know how to say this, but it was me who wanted to have sex with him first, and now we do it every weekend and it's fantastic. I know it goes beyond sex because I love him like a father, and all I know is that sex doesn't have to be dirty or wrong. It's really beautiful with my friend. Hope this helps you. You can use my name and address. It's OK." (F)

(Dennis, aged 13)

Researcher: "What do you find are the unpleasant things in sex with Marcel?"

John: "There isn't anything unpleasant."

Researcher: "Are there any things that would be unpleasant?"

John: "I don't know. What's supposed to be unpleasant about it?"

Researcher: "Is there something that you'd rather really not do? You find it all so nice but perhaps there is still something where you think, 'Well, I really do have a little trouble with this,' or, 'Yes, I think that's an unpleasant side'?"

John: "No. Marcel has always told me if you do something you don't want to do you always have to say so. But I have no trouble with it. He likes to do it and I like to do it....." (6)

(John, aged 13)

"My first homosexual experience was when I was 13, but I'd realised earlier that there was something different. In fact someone called me lesbian when I was 8 - at school we used to grab each other. I was shocked; I knew what it meant.....

I've four brothers and a sister, all older than me, and nieces and nephews. One nephew of 20 thinks I'm mentally sick and one of my brothers thinks it's a big joke. Another brother is excited at the idea of watching me have sex with a woman. A third brother plays at being bisexual. He recently left a message for me: 'Lesbians are mentally retarded'.....

People at school know, and a few tease me. They say, 'Get lost you queer' and make other nasty comments. I told a teacher that I was depressed and that I was a lesbian. She was very liberal and thought it fantastic that I could tell her. She didn't say anything about it being a 'phase'. One day the truant officer came into my bedroom. She realised I was gay and wanted me to see a psychiatrist. I refused." (H)

(Elizabeth, aged 15)

"I want to see the consent laws abolished for both heterosexuals and homosexuals because if two people want to have sex then no-one has the right to say at what age they can. If you believe that people can't give their consent freely in this society because of power imbalances between men and women and between adults and children, then no-one could do anything.

You can't talk about the consent laws in isolation - you can't just look at this law and say it should be abolished, and not look at all the other laws and oppressions that surround it, and at all oppression of young people. For a start, we have got to rethink completely the whole idea of childhood and adulthood,.....

We can't wait until we have the perfect world before we abolish the consent laws. If you think that this law protects young women, then you're living in cloud cuckoo land, because the largest number of sexual assaults on young girls occurs in the family, and this law can do nothing to protect them.

Although it may be older men and not teenage boys who are prosecuted for having sex with minors, the law is used as a threat against young people. *Just to argue for young people's sexual liberation is to challenge the whole way society is constructed,* (1)

(Two young women)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM*, Department of Education and Science (HMSO, 1981),
2. *DEPRIVED CHILDREN*, Home Office Circular No.157 (HMSO, 1950),
3. *Sixth report from the Select Committee on Estimates, sessions 1951-2* (HMSO, 1952),
4. *MATERNAL CARE AND MENTAL HEALTH*, by John Bowlby (World Health Organisation, 1952),
5. This was the local authority report which, at the time, was circulating around Bolton,
6. *Report of the Ingleby (Children & Young Persons) Committee (1960)*,
7. *CRIME; A CHALLENGE TO US ALL*, the Labour Party (1964),
8. *SOCIAL WORK AND SEXUAL CONDUCT*, by John Hart (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1979),
9. Some other articles/books referred to for this study and suggestions for further reading:
THE CHILD SAVERS; THE INVENTION OF DELINQUENCY, by A. M. Platt (University of Chicago Press, 1969), *SOCIAL WORK WITH ADOLESCENTS*, ed. by Jones & Pritchard (RKP, 1980), *THE UNDERGROUND AND EDUCATION*, by M. Smith (Methuen, 1977), *INTEREST AND DISCIPLINE IN EDUCATION*, by P. S. Wilson (RKP, 1971), *FOR YOUR OWN GOOD*, by Alice Miller (1981), *DISCIPLINE AND PUNISH*, by M. Foucault (Penguin, 1977), *LEARNING TO LABOUR*, by Paul Willis (Saxon House, 1977), *ANARCHY* magazine (Nos. 53, 64, 107, 111 - articles on education), *WHAT IS TO BE DONE ABOUT THE FAMILY?* ed. by Lynne Segal (Penguin, 1983), 'Second Report from the Social Services Committee', sessions 1983-4 (HMSO, 1984), 'Youth Policy and the Labour Party' (*YOUTH AND POLICY*, Vol.1, No.2, 1982).

Postscript References

- (A) From 'We do not recognise their right to control us', *Youth Liberation of Ann Arbor (THE CHILDREN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT, ed. by B. & R. Gross, Anchor/Doubleday, New York, 1977).*
- (B) Ditto
- (C) Ditto
- (D) From 'Children Strike' (*CHANGING CHILDHOOD, ed. by Martin Hoyles, Writers & Readers Publishing Co-operative, London, 1979).*
- (E) From *GIRLS ARE POWERFUL; YOUNG WOMEN'S WRITINGS FROM 'SRARE RIB', ed. by Susan Hemmings (Sheba Feminist Publishers, London, 1982).*
- (F) From *BOYS SPEAK OUT ON MAN/BOY LOVE (NAMBLA, New York, 1981).*
- (G) Source: *THE SEXUAL ASPECT OF PÆDOPHILE RELATIONS, by Theo Sandfort (Pan/Spartacus, Amsterdam, 1982).*
- (H) Source: *BREAKING THE SILENCE: GAY TEENAGERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES (JCfGT, London, 1981).*
- (I) From 'Looking at the Age of Consent Law' (*GIRLS ARE POWERFUL, as (E) above).*

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

PIE: FROM 1980 UNTIL ITS DEMISE IN 1985

by STEVEN A. SMITH

The name of PIE has cropped up several times in this collection. Since the group had, in its time, been so thoroughly misunderstood and misrepresented, it was deemed only fair to allow Steve Smith, its last chairperson, an opportunity to redress the balance. Accordingly, he now takes up the story from where Tom O'Carroll left off. -ed.

Questions of Priority

It seemed to me, when I succeeded O'Carroll as chairperson in 1979, that the most sensible order of business for PIE was firstly to regulate its internal affairs (MAGPIE⁽¹⁾ was appearing very erratically - partly my own fault - and members were receiving nothing else of value from the group); secondly to begin an energetic recruitment drive to replenish our depleted executive committee; thirdly to formulate collectively a coherent body of policies on key issues; and fourthly to tackle our campaigning objectives *as a group*, rather than as one or two individuals speaking on behalf of the group. More than simply addressing an occasional CHE branch, student gaysoc or academic conference, what I wanted to see was PIE producing a manifesto on video for the widest possible circulation (as GYM had done), or trying for 'community access' slots on TV and local radio, or producing posters and broadsheets aimed at the public rather than potential members, or even working in concert with the NUSS (the now-defunct National Union of School Students) to redress the steady flow of anti-pædophile propaganda which the police were imparting to schools all over the UK.

PIE had always felt a sense of kinship (not often reciprocated) with the gay movement, and a firm commitment towards autonomous youth liberation (children's rights), but I wanted to see develop a far closer interaction - on practical as well as philosophical levels - between PIE and the various paedophile groups in Europe and the States. I felt we should lend considerable effort to the formation of an international alliance along similar lines to the International Gay Association (this was before we discovered how bureaucratic the IGA was in practice). Lastly, with the abandonment of PIE's Contact Page under the menace of further prosecutions, the EC felt very keenly that members still needed something from PIE in the way of social support; something beyond the ad hoc counselling which many committee members undertook on a one-to-one basis. If British law prevented paedophiles from writing directly to one another through a simple small ad service, then some alternative had to be found which would abrogate the profound isolation which had driven them to the desperate resort of joining PIE in the first place. We began to look afresh at the establishment of local groups, which PIE had attempted in earlier years without much success.

In the event, PIE failed to draw onto its committee the kind of radicalised, hard-working people that were needed, and not one of the above objectives was realised. Year by year, PIE had sunk deeper into a state of collective torpor, grimly determined to survive, if only in catatonic immobility. So, we failed to attract into PIE useful paedophiles who were committed *both* to political action and to the development of a mutual support framework - this was due in part to PIE's consummately negative image in all quarters (the radical leader was quite as easily duped by the press stories about us as anyone else, judging from the strange impressions of PIE that had reached our ears), but due also to obstruction and non co-operation wherever we sought wider publicity for the group's address. Many gay and alternative journals must share the blame for PIE's then continued parlous, debilitated condition. I'm convinced there are still many thousands of paedophiles in the UK alone who are ignorant of PIE having ever existed, and I know for certain there are many others who saw the various 'exposés' and shock reports about us, but were thwarted in their efforts

to find us.

Perspectives on Pearl Harbour

A former treasurer, on resigning from the EC, put it to me (though not quite in these terms) that PIE's reputation across the board had become so desperately negative, that the group's mere existence could only harm the paedophile cause, whatever we tried to do about it. We were a pariah among alternative movements, evil incarnate to society at large, and by continuing to exist so doggedly in the face of all opprobrium, PIE was doing for British paedophiles what AIDS was doing for the gay community. A harsh judgement, I feel. If AIDS had not existed the Moral Majority would've had to invent it. If PIE had not existed, it would have been necessary for the NEWS OF THE WORLD to invent us. And in one sense it's true to say that the gutter press *did* invent PIE - or at least, the image of PIE which had been in general coinage since 1977; that of a secretive international 'cult', probably with underworld connections, certainly with influence in 'high quarters'; a porn-producing syndicate of callous men intent upon nothing but their own sexual gratification. But if PIE's early strategy had been different, how different would its public image have been?

Several times the idea of folding PIE and replacing it with a new paedophile grouping was mooted on committee, but we'd never have successfully jettisoned PIE's reputation by the simple expedient of a name-change, and even a substantially different alignment would not for long have escaped the vitriolic attention PIE had enjoyed. This rose by any other name would have smelled no sweeter. There was nothing endemic in PIE itself which another broad-based group could have avoided and thus somehow bridged the 'credibility gap'. NAMBLA in the US, for example, has placed its emphasis exclusively on gay paderasty (men attracted to teenage boys and youths), thus neatly sidestepping the two most controversial planks of PIE's platform - heterosexual and pre-teen paedophile relationships. Notwithstanding this, NAMBLA has been attacked, boycotted and obstructed every bit as much as PIE had been by the media, women's groups, sections of the gay scene, and has come in

for just the same intimidation and harassment from the authorities. So much for tactical compromise. PIE's trajectory into the public eye in 1977 can be compared to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour, after which Admiral Yamamoto observed; "I fear that all we have done is to waken a sleeping giant and fill him with a terrible resolve". Doubtless, many paedophiles wish we'd let this particular giant sleep on, but neither they nor children can be liberated from his tyranny without at least waking him in the process.

The conflicting demands of our campaigning and befriending objectives from the start presented a fundamental dichotomy in PIE. What for years we viewed as one of PIE's greatest strengths may in truth have been its greatest weakness, or at least its greatest liability; our acceptance into the group and onto its Executive Committee of paedophiles, whatever their attitudes, abilities or political persuasion (with the exception of the far Right, of course). By straining to be all things to all paedophiles I doubt that we fully satisfied any, and we certainly alienated a few. There is a very powerful argument which runs thus; that the accommodation of a passive, inert membership consumes so much of the energies of a small group's activist core that the raison d'être of the group is lost in a sea of 'club-shit'. In other words, committee devoted so much of its time and attention to the routine of organisation and providing reading material and other services for consumption by the Moloch that vital campaigning work was neglected. After six years hard labour on the PIE committee I can only say that this was absolutely true.

Probably the only way ahead for paedophilia in the UK will be the emergence of two distinct groupings - though working in concert - attending to these differing needs. I for one did not wish to see the majority of paedophiles abandoned while the few activists diverted their attentions elsewhere, as some would have had us do, but equally I recognised that our political momentum had been retarded by a plague of part-time paedophiles - those who wanted to know what was going on without getting involved any deeper; who wanted to see changes made but not to help bring them about. PIE's committee did not comprise many

true activists anyway - it never did - so it alone did not have the capacity to diverge, and the very few paedophile activists who could be identified outside the group showed no interest in helping the metamorphosis come about.

Perhaps PIE's mistake was in tackling non-paedophile prejudice in the first place? Perhaps instead we should have operated under the most stringent security precautions as a kind of Masonic network through which paedophiles might have contacted one another in safety? I've heard this view from outsiders. I don't think that locking oneself in the closet would have been a terribly progressive move; by its nature such a network would have benefited only a tiny minority of those 'in the know', and the outside world would have been vindicated in its suspicions about us if we had behaved so furtively and were so indifferent to public opinion and the political imperative of children's liberation.

The most bizarre misconception about PIE was held by a guy who later joined the committee for a short while - Lee Edwards. He'd visualised PIE being as affluent and neatly-organised as the Mormon Church, with smoked glass offices in the City of London and a full-time secretariat. He was, let's say, a shade disillusioned by the reality. PIE *did* actually have an office in Westminster, only a snirk away from the desk of the Home Secretary, but more of that later. The group's silence in recent years had done nothing to dispel the illusions of people - friend and foe - about us, but then PIE itself had been undergoing an identity crisis of sorts, uncertain about which direction it should be taking. But one thing is quite certain - if we were none of the things people expected us to be, we were certainly none of the things the press had claimed us to be in their haste to deceive the British public.

Loaves and Fishes

I found PIE in 1978 entirely by accident through a classified ad in TIME OUT magazine. Many others came to us through a regular listing in

GAY NEWS. However, both sources of new blood had been closed off long before the trial.⁽³⁾ Occasionally, we would discover a listing in some unexpected place, inevitably giving an old address, but in general PIE was unable to get a listing in any gay or alternative paper in the UK. After the trial we attempted to retrieve this situation by a general approach to dozens of such papers here or abroad, asking for either free listings or concessionary advertising rates. A special appeal was made to the membership for donations to fund this advertising drive. MANCUNIAN GAY was the only paper in the UK willing to help us. Abroad, our ad was accepted without qualm by THE BODY POLITIC (Toronto) and GAY COMMUNITY NEWS (Boston) - both excellent gay papers whose unequivocally supportive stance on paedophilia put the faint-hearted GAY NEWS to shame - also by REVOLT (Sweden), CSC NUSLETER (California) and several others. But where we needed members most of all, where members were potentially of most value to the group, here in the UK, the drive got us nowhere. TIME OUT kept our hopes up for several months with repeated promises of a listing, but finally backed out with the feeble excuse that, as PIE wasn't *strictly* a gay group, it was inappropriate to include us in a gay listings column. The only option left to us - a rather desperate one - was to litter PIE's address around the streets by means of a sticker campaign, and this is what we did.

The sticker featured the silhouette of a standing child embracing a seated adult encircled by our name and address. We decided on this low-key format, foregoing bold and provocative slogans, as the object was simply to attract new members, not to outrage every parent that saw them. Even so, we were politely requested by one (prospective) London MP to desist planting them in his constituency (they had been discovered rather close to schools, you know!). Well, the campaign brought us just a handful of new people - too few members had been planting the stickers on a regular basis for fear of being caught red-handed and beaten up; those that *were* planted were being far too eagerly torn down; and worst of all one committee member made the terrible gaffe of not renewing the postal address on the sticker, so that later mail was never redirected to us at all. Perhaps the act of planting stickers, like writing political graffiti, is little more than a satisfying gesture of defiance

for the individual, but I think we made a mistake in not concentrating our efforts on a far smaller area - probably London itself - and perhaps, if there had been a next time, we should have gone for those bold, provocative slogans,

There were a number of projects in various stages of completion during this period - none of which had any significance to non-pædophiles. The PIE Press Service was revived, making available once more all PIE's early material (UNDERSTANDING PÆDOPHILIA and CHILDHOOD RIGHTS, for example) together with items like Tom's book PÆDOPHILIA: THE RADICAL CASE,⁴ which PIE subsidised to its members; the early US boylove magazine BETTER LIFE; and the celebrated BODY POLITIC article 'Men Loving Boys Loving Men'⁵ (which has been subjected to not one, but two trials of its own). We owe thanks to Julian Meldrum of the Hall Carpenter Archives for supplying us with much early PIE material. So many important documents were lost whenever Scotland Yard descended on the homes of committee members that arrangements were made with the Brongersma and Bernard Foundations in Holland to deposit copies with them for safe keeping.

A reading list of pædophile fiction was added to the press service, compiled by Lewis Grey, David Joy and Leo Adamson, and later a non-fiction list condensed by Tom O'Carroll from the copious bibliography of his book. Work was also begun on a film guide and on a survival guide for pædophiles in the UK.

A growing number of our members were captives in US prisons. Coping with the special needs of these people prompted us to set up a prisoner support scheme which, under Peter Bremner and later Tony Zalewski, found correspondents for these prisoners and sought sponsors to cover the expenses of their membership, mailing them recommended books and items from the press service. It hardly needs saying that our attempts to operate the scheme with inmates of British prisons were scotched by this country's Draconian censorship restrictions. Mail from US prisoners often carried an apologetic stamp on the envelope which read: "Prisoners' mail uncensored. Not responsible for contents." I

look forward to the day when British prisons need to be so apologetic - I had a long and fractious correspondence with the governor of Wormwood Scrubs over the confiscation of several letters of mine and other items sent to Tom O'Carroll. As with all things in the US, prison regulations vary wildly from state to state, so while some members were receiving regular visits from the boys for whose 'protection' they had been imprisoned, others were not even permitted to receive MAGPIE. NAMBLA was far better placed than we were to defend the interests of these people, and is now doing so. PIE was powerless to help prisoners in the UK without some referral arrangement with the social services, and the Home Office lifting restrictions on visits and correspondence.

Given the monstrous treatment of many paedophiles in prison, and the squalid, dehumanising conditions that prevail throughout the prison system, it is a marvel to me that people can emerge from this ordeal without a deep and burning animosity towards the society that abused them so. Imprisonment is the grossest indecency.

If there was one venture that I expected to be an unqualified success and firmly supported by the membership, it was the re-establishment of social meetings through local group organisers. This was the sort of freedom which other oppressed groups - blacks, gay men and women, and many more - took entirely for granted. Any attempt by PIE to arrange social venues (this applied equally to workshops, AGM's, marches and demonstrations of any kind) carried with it the implicit danger of press harassment, police observation, and physical attack from fanatics of every species. Accordingly, such precautions had to be taken to insulate these meetings from the hostile gaze that the people who had most need of them - frightened, solitary people with zero political awareness - were the last to be invited to them. Where possible, committee members attempted to meet new people in order to establish their bona fides, but there was always a substantial part of the membership who could not be directly vouched for, and we knew there was an agent of the NEWS OF THE WORLD among them.

Having an EC member in Birmingham, the first step was to organise

meetings in this area for members in the midlands. Several meetings took place, but then the host was arrested and sent to remand prison on an unconnected charge, and interest petered out. With my help, an Australian member attempted to generate support for a PIE branch in his country (we had more members in Australia than in Scotland and Wales together), but the majority of those approached preferred to keep the breadth of the globe between them and the kind of flak which PIE attracted. This was not too surprising when one learnt that an earlier bid to establish an independent Australian paedophile group - SYBOL - crashed when a conservative gay group threatened to hand the organisers' names and addresses to the police. Plans for a Canadian branch of PIE went awry also, but happily NAMBLA was able to establish a chapter there soon after.

Our greatest concentration of members had always been in London and the home counties. All but a handful of PIE's workers through the years had lived there. From August '82 we booked a private room one night a week in a series of West End pubs, inviting along all members who were known to us. The average attendance was very disappointing: always the same few faces. Presumably, everyone feared that a press plant would be present, as had in fact happened once before in 1979: A known freelance operating for the NDTW, had turned up half drunk at one pub meeting and begun asking those present to procure boys for him. "I know there are kids around who'll go with you for money," he said, "but *where are they?* Why don't we *do* something instead of just sitting here?" No such investigative journalist graced any of the more recent meetings. TIME OUT reporter, John Gill, came along once or twice, but he was there at our invitation, preparing a feature on the anxieties and expectations of paedophiles living in London (a feature subsequently suppressed by the magazine's editors). Other guests present at those meetings included many GYM members and one or two representatives from CHE - one of them a woman who was entirely supportive. Discussions with these people were on the whole constructive and stimulating, and made the meetings worthwhile for us on the EC, but the objective of a social forum for members outside the committee was never realised.

Babel Wasn't Built in a Day

In August 1980 PIE circulated an Open Letter among every known paedophile group in Europe, Scandinavia and North America, and also to prominent individuals such as Dr. Edward Brongersma, Dr. Frits Bernard, Drs. Theo Sandfort, and Valida Davila of CSC (Childhood Sensuality Circle). The letter outlined an ambitious, some would say grandiose, proposal for a new transnational paedophile federation through which member groups would collaborate on material projects and share resources at the same time as working towards a common philosophical platform. As I wrote in MAGPIE 15, "Much more than a simple mutual aid society, such a federation would be the consolidation of a coherent international paedophile and children's liberation movement out of the present chaos of tiny national groups working largely oblivious of one another". This initiative was very much a personal commitment of my own - my committee colleagues were not all so inspired by this euro-vision. I had learned through PIE that there were groups in Denmark, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, Belgium, yet we knew virtually nothing about these people and their organisations, what they were doing in their own countries, or how their political analyses differed from that of PIE. Any contact we had established had been of a token kind, genuine in spirit but superficial in practice, so it was safe to assume that these groups were in the same state of ignorance about us. It seemed important to me that a full and penetrating dialogue be established at least with the strongest of them.

Inevitably, there were language obstacles. We mustered a few members to translate from French, German and Dutch for us, but although our files were brimming with magazines from these groups we could hardly ask people to translate whole magazines, and in any case one could not always rely on forming an accurate view of a group's thinking merely by reading its general literature. (There had been no language barrier for Tom O'Carroll when he represented PIE at an Oslo conference 'Amnesty for Love and Affection' hosted by the Norwegian group, NAFFP, in 1979. There had even been discussions there on forming a new, broad-based international group called 'Amnesty for Child Sexuality', but nothing

had come of this.)

The Open Letter included a proposal for an early 'summit' conference of interested groups to discuss the general concept of an IGA-type alliance, and areas of practical collaboration between us. The most enthusiastic responses we received came from people and groups who had least to gain from the proposed alliance; "I am in complete agreement with your plans," wrote Valida Davila; "Some people are ruined by oppression and persecution, and others are fired to fight back. I see your committee has chosen the latter road." "We think the idea of an international association for paedophiles excellent," wrote REVOLT of Sweden; "If there is anything we can do to support, never hesitate to ask." Pasteur J. Doucé of the Centre du Christ Libérateur, Paris, wrote; "If I can be of any help in the formation of an international paedophile fellowship please let me know." An anarchist commune for young people in Nuremberg, the Indianner, said that although they had deep reservations about the German group, DSAP, they still wished to "join a basic forum" with us.

The groups themselves were not prepared to take a lead. They wanted to see PIE set up the conference itself. What better demonstration of the poor grasp our friends had on the political realities for PIE? We were possibly the only group among them which was unable to hold a general meeting for its own members without grave risk of injury to those attending, and prosecution of the organisers. After the events of 1977 for PIE, did anyone seriously expect an international paedophile conference to be permitted in the UK? NAMBLA chose to "wait and see what leadership develops on these concepts". The paedophile wing of the Dutch civil rights umbrella organisation, NVSH, felt that their priorities should be domestic, and that international co-ordination should be left to the auspices of the IGA itself. NAFF in Norway "sympathised" but wanted "more concrete ideas".⁽⁶⁾

The first months of the following year saw the emergence in France of a new paedophile organisation - the Groupe de Recherche pour une Enfance Différente - and four of us from PIE sped along to its

inaugural congress in November. Also present on that occasion were David Thorstad representing NAMBLA, Frits Bernard representing OSAP, and a member of the Belgian Pædophile Studygroup. The atmosphere at that opening day was something I had not experienced before even at PIE's 1978 AGM - an intensity, an electric urgency of expression that welled as much from the floor as from the platform. The strength of the GRED committee was plain to see, as one after another they all addressed the meeting with equal vigour and self-assurance, and everyone in that packed hall (including, to our delight, a handful of women pædophiles) was *involved*, not quietly receiving the transmitted wisdoms of the committee. With the promise of an imminent reduction in France's homosexual 'age of consent' from eighteen to fifteen, the liberation of children was for these people far from a remote utopian objective.

I came away from that conference profoundly frustrated, both with the inadequacy of PIE and my own inadequate French. I went to listen, but came away having understood little that I'd heard. I went to contribute my views, but came away without having said a word. I went to take part, but was obliged merely to observe. It's not entirely unreasonable, of course, that a French group meeting in France should conduct its meeting in French, but I had rather hoped that, at least in the workshop on international collaboration, some concession would be made to a humble Anglophone like myself. Unfortunately, GRED's English was only a little better than my French. One might think such a lesson in futility would have made me reconsider the practicality of collaboration on the level suggested by the Open Letter but, on the contrary, I felt all the more keenly how much we had to gain from a close dialogue and mutual co-operation with people such as GRED. If we left them with a rather poor understanding of PIE and what we had to deal with over here, that was entirely our own fault, of course, but even among the extrovert committee of GRED, and in its journal, PETIT GREDIN, there was a hint of the same parochialism displayed by the NVSH pædophiles and others, confining their analysis of the problems and solutions within national boundaries. Perhaps PIE was unique in this respect - that more than half our membership lived abroad, scattered among twenty or so countries, and it was plain to us that the ignorance

and intolerance of paedophilia knew no frontiers, as with the inhibitory myths of childhood. While the police and the agents of 'moral' conformity were concerting their efforts internationally against us, would we not even collaborate in our own defence, if for no better motive?

Another item under preparation for the PIE Press Service at that time was a comprehensive directory of paedophile/children's liberation groups - the first such guide ever to be published in the English language, filling in a little detail to that cold, unwelcoming expanse of acronyms: SAP, DAP, DSAP, PAC, AKP and so on. Questionnaires were distributed hot on the heels of the Open Letter, and the information that came back immediately helped to dissipate our own ignorance a little. We discovered, inevitably, that some of the groups had already collapsed. In Germany, for example, the Deutsche Studie und Arbeitsgemeinschaft Pädoilie had disintegrated over an ideological clash between anarchists, conservative reformists, and revolutionary socialists - notably about the nature and extent of freedom it wished to seek for young people. Blackmail threats had come into play here too, as with SYBOL in Australia, but this time one paedophile against another, to the utter damnation of those that made them. NAFF in Norway also, sadly, dissolved. And for each group that vanished another would suddenly appear elsewhere on the map - Stiekum in Belgium, for instance.

At the GRED conference it was agreed that the groups represented there would all follow NAMBLA's example in joining the IGA itself and through it lobbying the gay movement directly for firmer support. The extent of our links with the gay political scene was an essential aspect of PIE's strategy (insofar as PIE *had* such a thing) which I want to consider separately but, in the absence of a constructive dialogue with gays (or anyone else) in our own country about the radical means to accomplish our short and long term objectives, other paedophile groups abroad remained the only people from whom alternative strategies could be learned, our own analysis refined, different perspectives examined. Practical alteration to the law and its institutions is an objective necessarily specific to one's own country, but awakening a whole culture

to the living realities of sexuality and of youth is the promulgation of an *idea*, a new system of living, and is not confined to the arbitrary frontiers of states,

Prodigal Son? - Or A Cuckoo in the Nest?

1983 was the first time in PIE's nine-year history that a handful of members carried a PIE banner at the London Gay Pride march. The banner read simply: 'Adults Loving Children Loving Adults' - a bisexual extension of the famous BODY POLITIC caption. This bold initiative was largely due to the efforts of one EC member, Leo Adamson, who, in a very short time of involvement in PIE, had propelled the group a deal closer to the gay movement than it had been for a considerable while. As a member of GYM (Gay Youth Movement), Leo was able to speak for PIE at their annual conference 'Gym'll Fix It', and he also took an active role in the group's lobby of Parliament. In July '83 he represented PIE at the IGA conference in Vienna. One could say that PIE had waited a long time for individuals with Leo's stamina and conviction to come along and fulfil this vital liaison role.

Eric Presland, writing in CAPITAL GAY,⁷⁷ rejoiced in the appearance of PIE's banner at the Gay Pride march, and bade us a hearty 'Welcome back!' While there was no doubting the sincerity of Presland's support for PIE, nor his personal commitment to the liberation of children, there was an assumption behind his remarks that PIE had somehow drifted away from the gay movement in recent years, had now seen the error of its ways and returned - like the prodigal son - to its spiritual home. But it was not PIE that moved away from the gay movement in the UK, it was the gay movement that moved hastily away from *us* once the muck began to fly; and not because it viewed PIE as too reformist, sexist or reactionary - these tags were slapped on us much later - not because our proposals were insufficiently radical; they were *too radical by half* for the majority of gays. If we had concentrated, as NAMBLA had done in the US, simply upon sexual relationships between men and teenage boys, gays might have been rather more sanguine about solidarity with us. We were not prepared to barter away the interests

of so many paedophiles and of pre-teenage children to realise that support.

If anything, the political leaning of the EC had become further to the Left than ever before, though unfortunately there was no output from PIE to attest to this. Committee may have been radical in its sympathies, but was singularly reticent to express this thinking through MAGPIE or CONTACT.⁽⁹⁾ Repeatedly it was put to them that committee should buckle down and talk through some coherent policy positions on key questions - I prepared a discussion paper on pornography to set this process going - but there was no enthusiasm at all for the hard graft of policymaking. Little wonder then that PIE was seen as complacent and insular when it could not produce a single political position or line of analysis to promote wider debate. Those people who troubled to look for evidence of PIE's philosophy or political credentials were left to glean what they might from the tone and content of MAGPIE, or from documents published years ago by a very different EC - the 'Questions & Answers' booklet⁽⁹⁾ and our 'Evidence to the Home Office Criminal Law Revision Committee'.⁽¹⁰⁾ I don't think there was anyone active in PIE at this time who was happy with the proposals contained in the 'Evidence' paper; many would have liked to see them publicly rescinded. All in all, if gays regarded PIE with some suspicion as being an unknown political quantity we had no-one but ourselves to blame for that.

"I don't think the time is yet ready," wrote an editor of REVOLT in answer to our Open Letter, "for a great association that would support both gays and paedophiles. There are still too many prejudices in the various camps, and paedophile liberation has some very specific aspects which certainly would be overlooked (or neglected) in a general gay association." I entirely agree with that view. Whereas those paedophile groups that had sprung initially from the gay movement (PIE, NAMBLA, GRED) had tended to survive without the umbilical intact, those which tried to submerge back into the gay movement, becoming just one of several special interest groups within it, (NAFP for example) expired in the process. It is manifestly obvious that the struggles and obstacles faced by paedophiles in the UK today, and indeed the major arguments

marshalled against us, bear a striking resemblance to those which gays themselves were confronted with a scant few decades ago. Many of the tasks that face us are the same - combatting the monolithic heterosexuality of 'educational' propaganda, for one - and there is great scope here for joint action, but our demands of society are far from being identical, and nor are they at the same stage of accomplishment.

To pluck a metaphor from the mouths of our critics, in any relationship between paedophiles and gays, it is gays who are demonstrably the stronger partner, far greater in size and power, their social status much higher. In contrast, paedophiles are weak, vulnerable, and - as a political force - lacking in experience, our status just about the lowest there is. Can true equality ever be realised in such a relationship? Will gays not simply abuse their power advantage to silence or control paedophiles? Does the gay movement really care about the needs and aspirations of its younger protégé?

Well, you may be sure that PIE did not endorse that kind of negativistic approach. The assumption that the strong will tend inevitably to exploit the weak is true of fascists, not of sexual groupings. I believe that the gay movement in the UK neglected PIE's struggle to establish a discrete paedophile consciousness, as it has largely neglected the predicament of gay people younger than sixteen or seventeen. From its position of comparative strength it had much to offer us by way of philosophical analysis as well as options for positive action. Instead, we found ourselves forced consistently onto the defensive, perpetually having to *justify* our very sexuality, to avouch our responsibility as caring people. We were nothing beyond a coffee-table controversy to most gays, and our demands for acceptance and support were given barely more credence here than that which society gives to demands for gay equality. I'm afraid the movement itself has much to answer for the continuing misery and frustration gay children in this country are compelled to endure.

It was a measure neither of PIE's ineptitude, nor of the political vacuousness of British paedophiles, that so few radical activists

materialised among us. It was rather too facile to apply to us the logic of gay and feminist activism, as though the realities were no different for a paedophile coming out in a militant way. Every risk that a gay or lesbian accepts in entering a career of sexual politics, on whatever level, is multiplied many times for a paedophile doing likewise. It is a simple equation of greater risks equalling fewer volunteers. Beyond this rather elementary observation, it is in the nature of paedophilia that the greater number of us will channel their whole energies into working with and for children (however misguidedly), whether this be as youth workers, teachers, nurses or, yes, as scoutleaders. Individuals who would have been of immense value to a group such as PIE either never contemplated joining because their attention was squarely focussed on working with the young, or shied away from deeper commitment for fear the publicity would disable them from continuing such work. True, many of these people themselves inadvertently abet the social conditioning of youth, but they are sincere in the belief that their work is beneficial and constructive. The essential point is that a paedophile's natural first loyalty is to children - not to other paedophiles.

Unlike gays and feminists, who seek the company of people like themselves for social and sexual reasons, and then develop a political consciousness within that society, drawing strength from their community for 'coming out' and embarking on political work, paedophiles do not tend to gravitate so readily into one another's company, (those that *would*, have no means of doing so, of course) and the breeding medium for radicalisation is so much less fertile for this often-overlooked reason. In the company of a thirteen year old boy one can learn a good deal about the realities of powerlessness and dependence and the frustration of being thirteen in this society - all the more so from a girl - but this is a long way from assimilating a commitment to political struggle. The younger the children a paedophile seeks for company, the more this argument applies.

Thanks in large part to PIE, some paedophiles did befriend one another, but all too often in such meetings the differences of

perspective were more apparent than the congruences. There was a commonality of interest without a commonality of awareness. Therefore among paedophiles this consciousness has to be cultivated in an altogether more deliberate and artificial way. Those paedophiles who regard themselves (sometimes mistakenly) as the most revolutionary are generally those that move largely in gay circles. Undoubtedly, coming out as a paedophile via the gay movement increases one's exposure to radical thought - though anyone acquainted with CHE might laugh at this - but it may also leave one with a smug and false sense of security.

While my own sexual tastes extend to eighteen or nineteen year old guys, I confess I never had much inclination to join a gay group or frequent any gay clubs. I think my perspective might have been rather less parochial if I had, but this is to illustrate that there are many paedophiles like myself who wish to work in close harmony *with* gay society, not to join it. To those who say, "So why didn't PIE make more effort towards a rapprochement with radical gay groups?" I reply, "Why didn't the stronger, more numerous, and better-equipped gay groups approach PIE with advice, criticism, active support, even when we were reeling in the wake of an Old Bailey trial?" Why should we have had to make all the running? Let me cite one or two instances of the positive vibrations PIE was receiving from the mighty 'λ'.

At the 2nd annual conference of the IGA (Barcelona, 1980), the *only* group to abstain from a general motion calling on member organisations to support paedophile groups more vigorously was Britain's CHE, who insisted on their exception being noted for the record. At GYM's 1982 lobby of Parliament (which only twelve of some four hundred MPs felt obliged to attend), it was a vice-president of CHE, Martin Stevens, MP (Conservative, needless to say), who favoured the retention of the homosexual age of consent at twenty-one (for males), whilst others present were quite willing to negotiate an initial reduction to eighteen. Stevens' rationale - if we may dignify it by that term - was that if homosexual behaviour was legally sanctioned among teenagers, "teenagers might in later years regret their youthful flings". Similarly, at the IGA's 1983 Vienna conference, it was Michael Brown of

Britain's Conservative Group for Homosexual Equality who supplied the most stentorian opposition to every paedophile motion put before the conference. In this case, where one of the motions called upon PIE to urge all other paedophile groups to affiliate as we had done, Brown was joined by Denmark's F48, Norway's DNF48, and Lavender Left of New York, who had apparently determined by explicit resolution to vote against all paedophile-supportive motions. The excellent 'Gay Youth Charter' composed by GYM in 1982 was rejected by CHE's own conference until a reference to paedophilia had been expunged from it. A comparison between GYM's 'Gay Youth Charter' and CHE's 'Charter for Gay Rights', published in the same year, is extraordinary - the one is detailed, uncompromising, bold and lucid; the other bland, timid and cursory.

CHE's dilemma was summarised by their own Law Reform Committee thus: "CHE has hitherto directed its campaign towards achieving equality under the law relating to heterosexual and homosexual behaviour. The reasons for this, while in large part tactical, are nonetheless important. The argument for equality is much easier to explain to a prejudiced audience and can be forcefully advocated on grounds of simple justice." It goes on to ask, "Would adopting a position in favour of the abolition of all ages of consent laws risk appearing, in the eyes of the general public, to be so extreme as to make (CHE's) aims on other issues more difficult to achieve; or has it reached the position where no further significant advance can be made without working - in collaboration with other organisations - for reform of these and the other laws relating to sexual behaviour generally?"⁽¹⁾

It was the same dilemma which confronted broader civil rights groups like the NCCL (National Council for Civil Liberties) when the rights at issue were those of PIE. Any association with our particular cause threatened to undermine their own political credibility across the board. PIE was the hottest potato of all, and triggered off all kinds of atavistic terrors in more respectable reformist groups. We were therefore sacrificed on the altar of short-term tactical compromise.

Not to confine this criticism to gay and civil rights groups

however, the producer of London Weekend Television's 'Gay Life' programme (screened once a week in the late night horror slot) promised me there would be a programme on paedophilia in the second series to which PIE might be allowed to contribute. Alas, there was not. Among the helplines which consistently declined to give PIE's address to paedophile callers were Icebreakers, London Gay Switchboard, Brighton Gay Switchboard, and Friend. One of these told me their solicitors had advised them that by passing out our address it *might* be construed that they were acting as agents for the organisation.

The fact that PIE was not exclusively homosexual represented part of the reason for this moratorium. GAY NEWS and TIME OUT both quickly zeroed in on this objection, though as with the ubiquitous power argument, it often served as a radical justification from the mouth for a decidedly *un*radical prejudice in the mind. I think it stood to the credit of the PIE EC (whose most active members had always been *boylovers*) that we did not cave in under such pressure. No heterosexual paedophiles ever stepped forward to defend their own ground, and this made it rather difficult for us to answer the challenges of the gays and feminists with total conviction. Between gays and our heterosexual members the strand of mutual acceptance was very thin indeed (between them and feminists it did not exist at all).

David Thorstad, while still spokesperson of NAMBLA, expressed his own position all too clearly: "When Anita Bryant would say that gay men are child molesters, they would say 'Oh no, we don't do that; gay people are not molesters, it's the heterosexuals who are the molesters'. I've used that argument myself; I believe it's true."

Many heterosexual paedophiles are just as ready to swallow society's stereotype model of gays, their masculinity squirming uncomfortably at the prospect of too close an association with the world of such caricatures. This kind of stupidity is an obstacle we can all do without.

No-one will be astonished to hear that the facet of gay politics in

the UK for which PIE felt the closest affinity was gay youth, and that GYM came top of our list of groups to form an alliance with. The first meeting between members of our two committees only reinforced this feeling. As we sat about a table in a London pub, no more than a dozen of us, it was not a bunch of middle class, middle-aged liberal paedophiles confronted with a bunch of radical gay teenagers suspicious of our motives. In fact the majority of both committees were in their mid-twenties. The youngest PIE representative was twenty-one, the oldest GYM representative, twenty-six. Some suspicion was evident on GYM's part, or rather a wry scepticism about PIE's political soundness, but it was expressed with candour, not hostility. For our own part, the only major criticism of GYM was its arbitrary self-imposed age limit of twenty-six (a strange paradox in a group whose whole existence is a reaction against arbitrary age boundaries), in that this tasted a little of ageism in reverse - the idea being that, without an upper age limit, GYM would be taken over by older gays (older than the then committee guiding lights), or that gays would flock to it like moths to a flame in search of teenage boyfriends.

Strategically, so much more can be accomplished under the banner of gay youth than would ever be possible for an overtly paedophile organisation, but that apart, GYM has a freshness and directness which PIE lost long ago. Whereas we talked years back of producing a general information video, GYM have gone and made one. While PIE made ginger overtures to carefully-chosen MPs, GYM staged a general lobby of Parliament. While PIE agonised over whether or not we dared to call another AGM, GYM revels in mass meets.

It is time that gay society in this country woke up to the crucial role it has to play in the foundation of a stable, vigorous and *independent* paedophile movement which is committed to radical change. What emerges may not be PIE, nor will it be a clone of the gay movement itself, for paedophiles are more than simply gay and straight adults who like their partners particularly young. Ours is a whole different sexuality, our needs and priorities are very different. We are brothers with the gay world, not twins.

PIE in the Face of Fleet Street

Journalism is one of those unsavoury professions - advertising is another - in which an individual's potential for success is inversely proportional to that person's scruples. Note that I do not say there are *no* journalists of conscience or integrity in Fleet Street, only that such people had never been to the fore when the focus of attention was on PIE, or paedophile matters, or rights (in their totality) of people under sixteen, and that such exotic blooms must seem strange indeed in that arid, thorny habitat. Doubtless there remains *one* detective at Scotland Yard who really believes the police are the servants of the community, and not its warders; or doubtless Thatcher has *one* Cabinet Minister who genuinely believes in equality of opportunity. These are all, however, statistical freaks. If we find journalism itself to be venal and corrupt - as I believe it is - then this is a profound cause for alarm. As one American commentator observed succinctly, (but glibly), "The news media have become Orwell's Big Brother of '1984' - all pervasive, all influencing. The freedom of the press is eating away the freedom of the individual".

Television long ago supplanted religion as the opiate of the working class, and most of the criticisms I make here of the press apply with equal force to the broader media, notably television. There is a disturbing trend towards tabloid-style presentation in TV news programmes, with the same crass, superficial coverage, the same rampant sexism and imperious moral tone, and the same calculated imbalance. Recent reports, for example, of a mother seeking legal compulsion on doctors to inform parents before prescribing contraceptives to girls under sixteen were *invariably* followed or preceded by progress reports from police investigating the sexual murder of a five year old girl. Such judicious editorial juxtapositions are common. (A contemporary report in a local Harrow paper on similar demands from the 'Harrow Child and Family Protection Group' appeared on the same front page as an overtly sexist pin-up - of a *fifteen* year old girl.)

As to the quality of the coverage - in a Central TV news report on

the swelling number of teenage runaways in the midlands ('minors' voting with their feet?), it was emphasised throughout that the principal fear was not of physical, but 'moral' peril; that girls would be "drawn into drink, drugs and prostitution", and that boys would "fall into the hands of homosexuals". (TV journalists, like their Fleet Street counterparts, do not care to use the word 'pædophile', you may notice.) As always, the people who had most to say on the matter, the people most directly affected, whose anxieties and exasperations had driven them to take off in the first place, were the only people not consulted. It might have been a report on lost dogs or stolen cars. So much for the objectivity and impartiality of British television news.

Every year since PIE had come into being, during the slow news time of parliamentary recess, the minions of the soft-porn tabloids had scurried out with their indignation and their power-winder cameras to rake together another shock story about the group. We were a silly-season staple for the NEWS OF THE WORLD, the SUNDAY PEOPLE and the DAILY STAR. The danger with papers of this vulgar, facile kind is that they are widely dismissed as being of no consequence to significant trends in popular opinion. The NOTW is generally regarded as a joke, but without the implicit malevolence and cruelty behind the joke being fully appreciated, or the extent to which the paper's four million readers are being duped by the fantasies of its squalid-minded editor and staff. There is no room here to catalogue all the misshapen, libellous reports that have appeared concerning PIE over the last few years. An analysis of the coverage of the Old Bailey trial alone would require a full chapter, and in any case, such a virulent poison permeates this sea of press cuttings that the mere task of reading them all through is grossly offensive and unhealthy for one's state of mind. Confronted with such wholesale, indiscriminate hatred, a sense of proportion is difficult to maintain. There had been several major stories on PIE since Tom O'Carroll was convicted, each of which had repercussions far beyond the immediate distress inflicted on the committee members named, and illustrate well the harm which the gutter press can cause.

The first of these stories (NOTW, March 22nd., 1981) was occasioned

by PIE having to open a new Post Office box, the sponsor of our previous box, David Grove, having died. The Post Office leaked the home address of our new sponsor, Peter Bremner, to the NOTW so fast that the reporters were at his door before the box had even been used, and before the Executive Committee itself, let alone our members, knew where the P.O. box was located.

Inside, the paper ran a feature on PIE, and the child pornography industry, being careful to blur any distinction between the two. The reporters were Charles Sandell and George Edwards. 'The Dreadful Web of Child Corruption' began as follows: "The evil men of Britain's child sex organisation, the Pædophile Information Exchange, are just the tip of an iceberg. Behind them lies a web of pornography and degradation that spreads its tentacles worldwide - and even involves the Mafia." After another couple of paragraphs which could leave no doubt in the reader's mind that PIE was in fact a front for the manufacture and distribution of pornographic material, Sandell and Edwards went on; "The magazines... they produce do not stop at sexual abuse. Some show the systematic slow torture and even murder of children and young people." Now if that was not a cut and dried case of libel, what is? Who could blame the public for its outrage against PIE when such nightmarish tales could be published about us with complete indemnity?

Someone else who spreads his tentacles worldwide is Rupert Murdoch, the Jehovah of yellow journalism, and the essence of this NOTW story quickly resurfaced as far away as Australia and in Sri Lanka where, in the SUNDAY OBSERVER (April 5th), PIE was described as "the sick porn merchants of the West". Sri Lanka, like the Philippines, had long been celebrated among pædophiles and gays for its tolerance to homosexuality in general, and sudden government moves late in 1981 to curb sexual contact between local youth and Western tourists have been attributed in part to the scare campaign triggered by the NOTW. Perhaps this is overestimating the impact of that tawdry little paper, but the snowball effect of press hysteria was a very real phenomenon, as later stories demonstrated.

It was an open secret among anyone close to the EC that for four years I was employed by a firm of electrical contractors, Complete Maintenance Ltd., to monitor a control panel of alarm systems at the Home Office, Westminster. The job entailed practically no work on my part, beyond attending the panel, and in effect I had a furnished office completely to myself seven days a week on a rotating shift basis. Much of PIE's less sensitive file material was stored in locked cabinets there, where no police raid would ever have found them. Each year my security clearance was reviewed by Scotland Yard without my connection with PIE being discovered. I'd known from the start that such a marvellous snook could not be cocked forever, and sure enough the NOTW got hold of this information eventually. The paper contacted the Home Office immediately, of course, and gleefully drew this oversight to their attention. My security clearance was cancelled on the spot, my employers notified, and I found myself not *sacked* - but 'rendered without employment' - on the same day that reporter Alex Marunchak greeted me on my doorstep. 'Child Sex Boss in Whitehall Shock' ran the headline.

And what do you suppose? - "Home Office security chiefs knew all about Steven Adrian Smith's links with PIE", claimed the report; "A Home Office spokesman said, 'We're aware of Smith's background, and since the NEWS OF THE WORLD contacted us he has been told he's no longer acceptable to us. He no longer works here. It would be true to say that he would still be here if you hadn't been in touch.'" This silly bit of official face-saving apart, Marunchak went on to concoct a brief interview with myself. Instead of slamming the door in his face, which I seem to recall having done, I appear to have told him (with a swirl of my opera cloak), "Yes, I'm the chairman of PIE. So you've found out!" and so on. There was possible libel here too, for he alleged that at an EC meeting I had "bragged of (my) relationships with boys and urged members to organise a 'dirty weekend' with children at a south coast hotel." This is imputing to me a specific criminality, but nonetheless - we were advised by a solicitor - whether I won a libel suit or not, and I stood every chance of doing so, that the sympathies of the jury would be wholly against me, and any damages derisory.

Some of us had fondly hoped that my inevitable discovery would at least throw such egg on the face of the government as to oust the Home Secretary (then, Mr. Whitelaw), but in the event, this story was curiously *not* picked up by any other paper (obviously, the 'ruling class' had to be protected), and our own attention was diverted by a plague of visits from DAILY STAR reporters the very next week. (Incidentally, the extent of security chiefs' knowledge of my activities did not prompt them to investigate the contents of my filing cabinets, and a carload of PIE files was safely spirited from the building before it could occur to them to intervene.)

Once upon a time a reporter in the alternative press wrote (with just a hint of sarcasm) that it was about as difficult to 'infiltrate' PIE as to infiltrate Piccadilly Circus. He was absolutely right. One of the hazards of keeping our door wide open (as any counselling group must) is that all manner of creepy-crawlies are apt to find their way in along with more welcome visitors, and such a one was Charles Oxley, principal of two public schools, Christian fundamentalist, and wizened protégé of Mary Whitehouse.⁽¹²⁾ Under the name of David Charlton he joined PIE with offers of practical help in EC work. He was good enough to type out for us Tom O'Carroll's copious non-fiction booklist, and to photocopy at his own expense many other items for the PIE Press Service. As with anybody else who expressed a willingness to work, he was first met by an EC member to assess his character and reliability, then invited along to a couple of committee meetings. His sensational findings formed the basis of a four-page spread in the DAILY STAR ('Child Sex Spy Tells All' - August 21st, 1982) and many subsequent radio, press and police interviews. On the strength of just two meetings with the EC, Oxley had become the Establishment's trusted authority on PIE. Who was taken in the more by his fantasies, PIE or the Establishment, is open to question. STAR reporters Paul Henderson and Barry Gardner played Woodward and Bernstein to Oxley's 'Deep Throat'.

Four committee members were named - David Joy, Peter Brenner, Lee Edwards and myself, and photos appeared of three of us (my mother was later to comment that the STAR photo was one of the best of me she'd

seen!) It was no coincidence that the three committee members who were to be raided by the Obscene Publications Squad, almost exactly a year later, were David Joy, Peter Bremner and Lee Edwards. Not content with publishing our addresses, the DAILY STAR carried photos of our homes too, for greater ease of identification by neighbourhood vigilantes, mums' armies, and neo-fascist groups,

The text itself was rather lame, even amusing in comparison to the previous year's NOTW extravaganza, and only of interest for the crude, obvious manner in which colour was added. To convey the impression of PIE as a shifty, back-street organisation, our homes were variously described as "dingy", "seedy", and "an old mansion that comes straight from a horror movie". Meetings were arranged, it said, "through a complicated exchange of letters and coded telephone calls" using "secret codes and passwords". This was total fantasy and a familiar lie printed about the group - arrangements were far more mundane and prosaic than that, I'm afraid. Oxley knew that no pornography had been handed round at the meetings, but he was determined to create that *impression* at least; "Various paedophile books and magazines were mentioned and passed around" he hinted darkly. As I remember, Oxley took away one of these magazines himself for closer inspection, and never returned it - it was the latest issue of PAN (Paedo-Alert-News).

The news-gathering tactics of the DAILY STAR rate a mention here. We learned later that they had used menaces toward several children in Lee's home street who would not answer their questions (Lee was staying with a family at the time, and the two daughters were tailed by the press for several days). When this proved fruitless, they set up a couple of young boys to accost Lee in the High Street and make conversation just long enough for him to be photographed from a parked car across the road. (Even when he called on me, Henderson had attempted to force his way into my house.) It was a standard routine for reporters on this kind of story to make a point of visiting all one's neighbours and filling their heads with who-knows-what horrific yarns. There was a knife attack on Lee shortly after the story appeared, but as Lee is an ex-boxer he managed to send his assailant

away with a bloody nose, never to return. Another standard hurdle with these reports was the local press follow-up, a boringly predictable after-shock when your local paper contrives to regurgitate the story for those of your neighbours who missed it the first time around. In this particular instance the STAR itself ran a follow-up story a few days later ('Ban The PIE Men') in which glory-hunting Tory back-bencher, Geoffrey Dickens, vowed he would table a Private Member's Bill at the next session of Parliament which would proscribe PIE explicitly, and outlaw any other pro-pædophile organisations.^{'13'} Dickens was the same stalwart who named diplomat Sir Peter Hayman, under House of Commons privilege, as the PIE member whose identity had been concealed throughout the trial (some six months after Hayman had been publicly identified in PRIVATE EYE magazine). Dickens did not win the Private Member's ballot, as chance would have it, and nothing more was heard of *that* pledge, but it seemed to us a serious threat at the time. Even a bungling oaf of Dickens' calibre could hardly have failed with such an intimidatingly populist Bill, had he won the ballot.

By the winter of '82, the papers were full of the Geoffrey Prime affair. Prime was exposed as a Russian supermole who worked at the government's intelligence HQ at Cheltenham. Imprisoned for sex offences against young girls, as well as spying, it was alleged, unsubstantiated of course, that he either had links with PIE or was actually a member under an assumed name. As with the much earlier Sir Peter Hayman affair (he was the former British High Commissioner to Canada), and the later revelation that I myself and an EC colleague, Barry Cutler, were both employed on security at the Home Office, this latest scandal must have caused considerable embarrassment to the government. By now, PIE's name must have been truly hated in the corridors of power.^{'14'}

In June, 1983, the NDTW ran yet another of its regular silly stories, this time claiming that top TV stars and MPs were members of the Exchange. No names were mentioned, of course - except those of EC members. As a result of this and follow-up stories in such scandal sheets as the STAR and the SUN, committee members Mike Williams and Richard Travell lost their voluntary work as a scoutmaster and Sunday

School teacher respectively. Travell was later denounced by his father, a church minister, and forced to move out of his home.

It would be possible to go on and on about the shock/horror stories concerning PIE, but this would serve little purpose since the point has been made. Suffice it to say that press harassment of the group was real, and it seemed that reporters were prepared to use any means, fair or foul, to ensure the organisation was destroyed. The time is coming when something will need to be done about the press in this country - and the sooner the better.

Final Words

If paedophiles have little faith in the press, they have certainly got even less for the criminal justice system in this country, for being a paedophile is an invitation for every sort of injustice there is. While baby batterers walk away with derisory sentences after being slapped on the wrist and told not to do it again, people whose only 'crime' is that they love children can expect to have the book thrown at them and endure years of attacks in squalid prisons from real criminals. One can inflict horrendous physical suffering on a child, but if one is unfortunate enough to be a paedophile who has consensual sex - oh well, that's classed as worse than murder.

Similarly with 'corporal punishment' which is, in truth, nothing more than a euphemism for legal assault. This practice is widely supported in these isles, and it is no coincidence that the organisations and people who were most opposed to PIE were the very ones who endorsed it most. The message is clear; abuse is okay as long as it is socially approved.

Back in its earlier days, PIE itself initiated a campaign against this practice and received letters of support from such well-known people as Baroness Wootton, and Sir Alfred Ayer, the philosopher. But PIE, being a tiny organisation, could only do so much.

For PIE, the time has now run out; but the ideas behind it will continue to survive.

Editor's note: Soon after the above article was written, its author along with two other PIE EC members were arrested on incitement charges in connection with issue No.6 of the group's internal bulletin, CONTACT. Before the trial, Steve Smith fled to Holland where he still resides. The two other defendants were subsequently found not guilty of the incitement charges, but guilty of a lesser charge. After renewed threats to proscribe PIE, the group finally succumbed to political pressure, and the organisation disbanded in early summer, 1985. Because of this, all articles in this book referring to PIE, including the above, have had the tense changed from present to past.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *A journal of PIE.*
2. *Lee Edwards was later alleged (though unproven) to have given or sold confidential information about PIE and its members to the NEWS OF THE WORLD, which published the details, much of them erroneous, in a front page splash.*
3. *I refer, of course, to the notorious Conspiracy to Corrupt Public Morals trials of early 1981.*
4. *Tom O'Carroll (Peter Owen, London, 1980).*
5. *'Men Loving Boys Loving Men', by Gerald Hannon (BODY POLITIC, March/April, 1979).*
6. *It was Kenneth Clarke in CIVILISATION who said that "Nearly all the upward steps in the history of civilisation have been internationalist steps."*
7. *CAPITAL GAY (July 15th, 1983).*
8. *CONTACT! which was edited by myself, was the internal bulletin of PIE.*
9. *PEDOPHILIA; SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, (PIE, 1979).*
10. *EVIDENCE ON THE LAW RELATING TO, AND PENALTIES FOR, CERTAIN SEXUAL OFFENCES INVOLVING CHILDREN - FOR THE HOME OFFICE CRIMINAL LAW REVISION COMMITTEE, ed. by Keith R. Hose and Michael Burbidge (PIE, 1975).*
11. *THE LAW RELATING TO CONSENSUAL SEXUAL ACTS; A DISCUSSION PAPER (prepared By The CJE Law Reform Committee', 1980).*
12. *Oxley was, at the time of writing, chairman of the right wing National Campaign for Law and Order, which incidentally supports hanging and corporal punishment, and deputy chairman of Mary Whitehouse's Viewers' and Listeners' Association.*
13. *Even revelations that he was consorting with two other women, despite the fact that he was married, didn't stop Dickens attacking PIE. Hypocrisy has no bounds, it seems. I often wonder what the dickens the man would do if it weren't for paedophiles???*
14. *Well before the Hayman affair, another Establishment figure, Lord Bingham, had also been revealed as a PIE member.*

Appendix 2

THE 'URANIANS'

by TIMOTHY d'ARCH SMITH

In Britain, the birth of what could be called a politically conscious campaigning paedophile movement occurred around October 1974 with the inception of two groups; PAL - Paedophile Action for Liberation, and PIE - Paedophile Information Exchange. However, after a scurrilous SUNDAY PEOPLE exposé of PAL on May 25th 1975, the group went into a steady decline which, by 1977, resulted in both PAL and its magazine PALAVER being incorporated by the Exchange.

Until the emergence of PIE, never before in the history of this country had such a cohesive group of crusading paedophiles come together so openly to press for changes in the laws and public attitudes. Indeed, the nearest and only comparison one can make is with the Victorian literary clique known as the 'Uranians' (or Calamites) and its offshoot, the British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology, founded in July, 1914 by some of the group's leading lights.

The Uranians consisted largely of undergraduates who extolled the beauty of young boys in their poetry and prose, and much of their work is refreshingly outspoken for the period.

We are indebted to Timothy d'Arch Smith for bringing this remarkable and hitherto unsuspected literary phenomenon to public attention with his brilliantly researched study, LOVE IN EARNEST.

For the benefit of those not acquainted with this study, and because the Uranians were the forerunners of PIE, he was asked to expound a little about them for the present book. -ed.

The word 'Uranian' was coined by the nineteenth century Austrian jurist, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, before the word homosexual had been invented. Casting about for a term to embrace a group of poets who

celebrated in their verse the love of boys, for whom in any case homosexual would not do, I chose Ulrichs' word. My book appeared as long as sixteen years ago and yet the name appears to have stuck. Since alternatives - pædophile, pæderast - originally discarded as unfamiliar, are now so overloaded with opprobrium, synonymous these days almost with monster, perhaps semantical and, astrologers tell us - the word deriving from the planet Uranus - fatidical inexactitudes, it will continue to survive.

The Uranians flourished between 1850 and 1930: approximate but by no means arbitrary dates. Three influences were the cause of their ascension. Ulrichs' pamphlets, calling for revisionary views on homosexuality, began to circulate in the 1860s and 70s and their influence soon spread to England for propagation in the 90s by the sexual reformers, Havelock Ellis and John Addington Symonds. Attention was being directed to homosexuality by its incidence at the public schools whose traditional structure nurtured its existence as loving as it zealously stamped out its manifestations; and intense study by boys of the classics, read during the Victorian age as much for their content as for their syntax, directed sympathetic minds to Greek love. Further, as the century progressed, there arose a rebellious dissatisfaction with Victorian 'stuffiness' that would lead, in the nineties to the 'decadent' movement; a conscious, indeed a self-conscious desire to shock.

The movement, not intendedly one despite mutual ties but retrospectively observable as such, numbered about forty exponents, each the author of at least one volume of unmistakably pædophilic verse. The best of the British, the public school tradition - it must not be forgotten that the Uranian movement was quintessentially British and proud of it - was the Rev. Edwin Emmanuel Bradford (1860-1944).⁽¹⁾ With twelve books to his credit, he was the movement's most prolific writer. His cheerful verses, airily overlooking any sexual implications, tapped out in rollicking jingles the Uranian philosophy. Of the proselytisers, the campaigners for sexual reform who, in those days, saw no difference between homosexual and pædophilic attachments, or if they did see it,

advanced no reason for dissimilar compassion, we may single out Edward Carpenter (1844-1929), author of TOWARDS DEMOCRACY,⁽²⁾ and John Addington Symonds (1840-1893), who never missed a chance of bending classical and biblical themes to a homosexually allegorical advantage.⁽³⁾ If we exclude Oscar Wilde, the chief exponents of the decadent school were Wilde's catamite, Lord Alfred Douglas (1870-1945),⁽⁴⁾ and the fashionably shocking Theodore Wratishaw (1871-1933), whose two poems 'L'Éternel Féminin' and 'To a Sicilian Boy' were almost the only examples of Uranian poetry to have suffered censorship and suppression.⁽⁵⁾

Each of these sub-sections had, of course, its neurotics; obsessive paedophiles who spent their lives thinking of very little else. John Gambril Nicholson (1866-1931),⁽⁶⁾ arguably the best poet of them all, friend to his recurrent disadvantage of Fr. Rolfe ('Baron Corvo'),⁽⁷⁾ fell into this category. Ralph Nicholas Chubb (1892-1960), attempted to raise paedophilia to a religion, and his prose-poems, issued in stringently limited editions from his own hand-press, were examples of fanaticism run riot.⁽⁸⁾ A late runner in the decadent stakes, Philip Gillespie Bainbrigg (1890-1918), with his smutty pastiche, ACHILLES IN SCYROS, provided the best example of unashamedly erotic verse.⁽⁹⁾

Love of boys - or girls come to that, although there is no similar sub-literature - raises the acutest problems, and although Uranian poetry was, for the most part, not very good, it raised psychologically interesting points. Shot through with simple yearnings - analogy with the negro blues not too far-fetched, both reflecting the discontents of an outcast people - it was permeated with longings for the poets' lost boyhood; with regrets for the briefness of boyhood's span; with declarations of the supremacy of Uranian love over other manifestations of affection; its, as it were, rightness.

As might be expected, dissatisfactions outweighed euphoria. Celebrations of untroubled and untrammelled love affairs were few and far between. With admirable stoicism, however, the Uranians were able to console themselves with very little: a boy seen in the street, the

sound of a treble voice, glimpses of bare flesh at a bathing place, and on occasions, a kiss. Hard won, of rare occurrence, these to the Uranians were riches indeed. Almost all of the group were quick to assimilate the catachrestic lessons of Symonds, and Uranian poetry abounded with reiterations of the legends of Achilles and Patroclus, Zeus and Ganymede, David and Jonathan.

The most striking curiosity of their verse was an almost unanimous obsession with class distinctions. This slightly reprehensible 'snobisme' took the form of the poet (the lover's) desire for lads of the lower orders. Guttersnipes, lift-boys, oil-begrined stokers on the knife-edge of puberty bowled over, like so many skittles, are Uranian poets. One wonders why this should have been.

The uniqueness of the Uranians' ideal lay in their single-minded tenet that society should discard the socially acceptable prerogative of parenthood and allow them to take from a boy such love as he has had, in the past, to reserve for his father and mother at a time in his life when he most needs a trusted adult guide outside the confines of home and school.

That a man may take from a boy the kind of physical donation he should reserve for a girl may present us with a problem of the gravest kind, or it may not; for the Uranians maintained that the very nature of male-to-male experience of sex, with its unwritten code of impermanence, was not callous or immoral but altogether harmless. It was their bravery in throwing down this challenge which demands our attention.¹⁰

I will conclude this appendix with two poems, the first by Alan Stanley, the second by E. E. Bradford, both of which typified the work of the Uranians.

August Blue

Silver mists on a silver sea,
And white clouds overhead
Sailing the grey sky speedily
To where the east turns red,
And one lone boat her sails has spread,
Sails of the whitest lawn,
That seem to listen for the tread
Of the tender feet of dawn.

The risen sun now makes the sky
An arching roof of gold,
Amber the clouds turn as they fly
Uncurling fold on fold;
The sun a goblet seems to hold
A draught of fervid wine,
And the young day no longer cold
Glow with a fire divine.

Stripped for the sea your tender form
Seems all of ivory white,
Through which the blue veins wander warm
O'er throat and bosom slight,
And as you stand, so slim, upright
The glad waves glow and yearn
To clasp you circling in their might,
To kiss with lips that burn,

Flashings limbs in the waters blue
And gold curls floating free;
Say, does it thrill you through and through
With ardent love, the sea?
A very nymph you seem to be
As you glide and dive and swim,
While the mad waves clasp you fervently
Possessing every limb.

King of the Sea, triumphant boy,
Nature itself made thrall
To God's white work without alloy
On whom no stain doth fall,
Gaze on him, slender, fair, and tall,
And on the yearning sea
Who deigns to creep and cling, and crawl,
His worshipper to be.

(From *Love Lyrics*, 1894)

Boyish Beauty

See the lad, of late a child
Irresponsible and wild
Now look up with earnest eyes
Tender, passionate and wise!
Love has lent him for an hour
Beauty's holy, awful power:
When he's ripe for toil and pain,
Love will take it back again,

Boyish beauty comes and goes,
Like a rivulet that flows;
Woman, as a placid pool,
Long is fair if clean and cool,
Yet the running waters shine
With a splendour more divine;
So the fairest woman's grace
Fades before a boyish face!

(From *Boyhood*)

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Among Bradford's best known works, all of which were published by the London firm of Kegan Paul, were, *THE NEW CHIVALRY AND OTHER POEMS* (1918); *RALPH RAWDON: A STORY IN VERSE* (1922); and *THE KINGDOM WITHIN YOU AND OTHER POEMS* (1927).
2. Carpenter's *TOWARDS DEMOCRACY*, which was heavily influenced by Whitman's *LEAVES OF GRASS*, first appeared in four parts at various dates, but the complete edition was published in 1905. Carpenter was also the author of many other works, among them, *IOLÄUS: AN ANTHOLOGY OF FRIENDSHIP* (Sonnenschein, London, 1902), which was nicknamed 'The Bugger's Bible'.
3. Symonds was a noted classical scholar who wrote many books, among them, *MANY MOODS; A VOLUME OF VERSE* (Smith, Elder, London, 1878), and *ANINI FIGURA* (Smith, Elder, London 1882).
4. Douglas' best known boylove poems appeared in his *SONNETS* (Rich & Cowan, London, 1935), and *LYRICS* (Rich & Cowan, London, 1935).
5. These were included in his extremely rare book, *CAPRICES; POEMS* (Gay & Bird, London, 1893).
6. Nicholson, a schoolmaster, was author of the paedophilic novel, *THE ROMANCE OF A CHOIRBOY* (privately printed by F. E. Murray, London, 1916) and four books of boylove poems, including, *A CHAPLET OF SOUTHERNWOOD* (Ashover Derby, Frank Murray, Mayday, 1896), and *A GARLAND OF LADSLOVE* (F. E. Murray, London, 1911).
7. Corvo, the genius who died in penury in Venice, was the writer of the well known *HADRIAN THE SEVENTH: A ROMANCE* (Chatto & Windus, London, 1904), and the scandalous *THE DESIRE AND PURSUIT OF THE WHOLE; A ROMANCE OF MODERN VENICE* (Cassell, London, 1934). He was also the author of the notorious 'Venice Letters'.
8. Poet and artist, Ralph Nicholas Chubb (Blake's Mantle), was the author of several limited volumes of poems which were decorated with beautiful hand paintings of boys. Among the best were *THE HEAVENLY CUPID; OR, THE TRUE PARADISE OF LOVES* (Newbury, the author, 1934); *WATER CHERUBS; A BOOK OF ORIGINAL DRAWINGS AND POETRY* (Newbury, the author, 1937); and *FLAMES OF SUNRISE; A BOOK*

- OF THE MANCHILD CONCERNING THE REDEMPTION OF ALBION (Newbury, the author, 1954).
9. *ACHILLES IN SCYROS; A CLASSICAL COMEDY* (Cayme Press, London, 1927).
10. For those wanting to know more about the Uranians, and see some of their works, read; *LOVE IN EARNEST; SOME NOTES ON THE LIVES AND WRITINGS OF ENGLISH 'URANIAN' POETS FROM 1889 TO 1930*, by Timothy d'Arch Smith (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1970), *FEASTING WITH PANTHERS; A NEW CONSIDERATION OF SOME LATE VICTORIAN WRITERS*, by Rupert Croft-Cooke (W. H. Allen, London, 1967), *SEXUAL HERETICS; MALE HOMOSEXUALITY IN ENGLISH LITERATURE FROM 1850 TO 1900*, by Brian Reade (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1970), *ERDS; AN ANTHOLOGY OF FRIENDSHIP*, by Patrick Anderson & Alistair Sutherland (Anthony Blond, London, 1961), *THE PENGUIN BOOK OF HOMOSEXUAL VERSE*, ed, by Stephen Coote, Penguin, Middlesex, 1983), *GREEK LOVE*, by J. Z. Eglinton (Neville Spearman, London, 1971), *MEN AND BOYS; AN ANTHOLOGY* (revised edition - the old Coltsfoot Press, New York, 1978).

* * * * *

THE CONTRIBUTORS

CLIVE COLIMAN

An ardent supporter of the children's rights movement, Clive graduated BA from the London School of Economics. He also holds the Certificate of Education and was for a time a language teacher at a grammar school. Clive is unmarried but has, in the past, had a close association with several families where problems with incest had arisen. He was therefore able, in a number of cases, to observe these problems at first hand, thereby gaining a valuable insight into the phenomenon.

RICHARD GREEN

Richard is a fully qualified pilot who once ran his own flying school. A born traveller, his work has taken him to most parts of the globe. His beautiful artwork depicting children has appeared in numerous publications, including the now-defunct MAGPIE and PEED-ALERT-NEWS. Under the name 'Dominik', he will also be remembered as the artist of the lovely 1981 calendar, 'Children of the World'.

LIZ HOLTOM

Liz graduated BA from Nottingham University and came from there straight to PEACE NEWS which, until recently, she co-edited. She is heavily involved in both the peace and women's rights movements. Liz, who is unmarried, grew up in a Quaker family and now spends much of her spare time playing in a women's band.

KATHY CHALLIS

A former editor of SCRAM ENERGY BULLETIN, Kathy was, until some months ago, a co-editor of PEACE NEWS. As with her colleague, Liz Holtom, she is heavily committed to both the peace movement and the campaign for women's rights. Kathy enjoys listening to music and used to be a piano teacher. She remains unmarried.

ERIC PRESLAND

Formerly a columnist on London's CAPITAL GAY newspaper, Eric is one of England's best known and loved gay rights activists. A writer by profession, he runs his own gay theatre group and his plays have appeared in several books, including CRACKS IN THE IMAGE. He was also one of the contributors to Dan Tsang's THE AGE TABOO.

TUPPY OWENS

A former research administrator with the National Environmental Research Council, Tuppy is now editor and publisher of THE SEX MANIAC'S DIARY, an invaluable source of information for people with almost every known variety of sexual enthusiasm. She also founded and directs 'The Outsiders' Club', a society devoted to helping handicapped people.

TOM O'CARROLL

The ex-secretary and chairperson of PIE who almost single-handedly put the group on the map back in the late seventies. A graduate in Social History from Leicester University, Tom went on to become a teacher, then a reporter with the LEICESTER MERCURY. After this, he was for a time, a press officer with the Open University, until an outcry ensued over his membership of the Exchange. He is the author of the highly acclaimed PÆDOPHILIA; THE RADICAL CASE, and has contributed scholarly articles to numerous journals, including the old GAY NEWS, GAY LEFT, and OUTCOME. In 1981, he was one of the defendants at the notorious PIE conspiracy trial, a trial which saw him unjustly imprisoned for two years.

MICHAEL INGRAM

Fr. Ingram is a Catholic priest who has studied child counselling as an associate student at the Tavistock Clinic. He has also practised child counselling at the Dept. of Child Psychiatry, St. Thomas' Hospital, London; with the former Camden Children's Moral Welfare Committee; with Leicester Family Service Unit; and in his parishes at Kentish Town and Leicester. In addition, Fr. Ingram has worked for the International Catholic Child Bureau and has completed extensive research on children - mainly boys - who have had sexual encounters with adults. His findings have appeared in various works and journals, including the BRITISH

JOURNAL OF SEXUAL MEDICINE, LIBERTARIAN EDUCATION, and CHILDREN AND SEX (eds. Constantine & Martinson). His paper to the 1979 conference on 'Love and Attraction', Wales, was subsequently published in M. Cook and G. Wilson's book of the same name.

BEATRICE FAUST

Beatrice Faust was born in Melbourne, Australia, in 1939. She completed a BA (Hons.) from Melbourne University in 1963, majoring in English, history and psychology. She did her Master's thesis in hospital after the birth of her son in 1965. Beatrice has been involved in social reform organisations for many years, including being a founding member of the Victoria Council for Civil Liberties; serving as secretary of the Council for Civil Liberties of Western Australia; as president of the Abortion Law Repeal Association of Victoria; and as founder of the Women's Electoral Lobby of Australia. She is the authoress of the book, WOMEN, SEX AND PORNOGRAPHY and has written numerous other academic tracts for newspapers, literary journals and educational magazines.

PETER TATCHELL

Former gay rights and student activist, Peter Tatchell, originally came to England from Australia. Since then, he has lived and worked in Britain for a number of years and is now secretary of the Bermondsey Labour Party. In 1983, at the constituency election for a new Member of Parliament, he was the party's official Labour candidate, but was run into second place in what has been called "One of the dirtiest by-election campaigns in modern history." Despite his defeat, he is still an avid supporter of socialism, and his book, THE BATTLE FOR BERMONDSEY, is now a recognised minor political classic.

ROGER MOODY

Roger, a former co-editor of PEACE NEWS, is well known as one of the most outspoken advocates of children's rights in Britain. But his interests do not rest there. He was a pioneer of libertarian adventure playgrounds; has worked with CIMRA - a radical support group for indigenous peoples which he co-founded in 1977; and has helped to organise non-violent direct action projects around the world, including

Non-Violent Action in Cambodia (1966-7), Operation Omega to Bangladesh (1971-3), and Operation Namibia (1976-9). Now editor of NATIVE PEOPLES' NEWS, he is, in addition, the author of many books and articles, among them UNLIVED LIFE, an international manifesto against factory farming (1966); HANDBOOK ON HUNGER (1976); INDECENT ASSAULT (1980); and 'Gay/Boy Love and The Left', in THE AGE TABOO (1981).

JOHN LINDSAY

John is a member of the Socialist Workers' Party of Gt. Britain who, as an ardent supporter of children's rights, has written several articles and news items for the SOCIALIST WORKER and other socialist publications. He has also been active in the gay rights movement and in education for a number of years.

JEFF VERNON

Jeff Vernon, in his early twenties, and by far our our youngest contributor, has been active in the gay movement for five years. In that short space of time he has accomplished much. At the time of writing, he was a member of the management group of the British Gay Youth Movement, and an EC member of the Campaign for Homosexual Equality. He is also a regular contributor to GAY YOUTH (the organ of the GYM). Jeff admits to having been sexually attracted to older males, from the age of four, and had his first gay relationship, which he describes as "very pleasant", at thirteen. His greatest wish: "To see a society where no-one is automatically judged on the basis of their age."

STEVE A. SMITH

A former chairperson of PIE, Steve was editor and co-editor, respectively, of its now-defunct journals CONTACT! and MAGPIE. For four years, he was employed on security at the British Home Office, until his membership of the group was revealed. Steve, who now resides in Holland, had in his time, done much to try to organise an international paedophile fellowship on similar lines to the International Gay Association. He now hopes to become active in the Dutch crusade for children's rights.

TIMOTHY D'ARCH SMITH

An antiquarian bookseller by profession, Timothy is a world authority on the Victorian literary clique known as the 'Uranians'. His study, *LOVE IN EARNEST*, concerning their lives and writings, is now justly regarded as *the* classic in its field. He is also the author of several other books, including *ENGLISH PRIVATE PRESSES, 1757-1961*; *JOHN DRINKWATER, 1882-1937*; *CATALOGUE OF AN EXHIBITION*; *A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WORKS OF MONTAGUE SUMMERS*; and (with G.Handley-Taylor) *C. DAY-LEWIS, THE POET LAUREATE; A BIBLIOGRAPHY*. He has recently completed another book, concerning the Fortune Press.

A POTTED BIOGRAPHY OF THE BOOK'S EDITOR

37 year old Warren Middleton has been called "one of the founding fathers of the paedophile movement in Britain". Formerly vice-chairperson of PIE (1975-8) and editor of its now-defunct journal *UNDERSTANDING PÆDOPHILIA*, he was, until his resignation in 1981, one of the group's longest-serving EC members. He is the author of several articles for journals such as *MAGPIE*, and has given numerous interviews to magazines and papers like the old *GAY NEWS*, *TIME OUT* and *SOCIALIST CHALLENGE*. He was also instrumental in providing some source material for Tom O'Carroll's momentous *PÆDOPHILIA; THE RADICAL CASE*, and was one of his co-defendants at the much publicised PIE conspiracy trial of 1981, though acquitted on all counts. Warren, whose hobbies include reading, listening to music, and collecting antiquarian books, has studied the issues of paedophilia and childhood sexuality since he was seventeen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Although approximately 290 book and feature titles have already been referred to in this anthology, it was decided to include a separate list of selected titles on the areas discussed which, it is hoped, will satisfy the interest of the more inquisitive reader.

- Alston, J. & Tucker, F. - 'The Myth of Sexual Permissiveness' (JOURNAL OF SEX RESEARCH, Vol.9, No.1, Feb., 1973).
- Amir, M. - 'The Role of the Victim of Sex Offences' (SEXUAL BEHAVIOURS; SOCIAL, CLINICAL AND LEGAL ASPECTS, by H. L. P. Resnick & M. E. Wolfgang [eds.], Little, Brown, Boston, USA, 1972).
- Apfelberg, B. et al - 'A Psychiatric Study of 250 Sex Offenders' (AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY, Vol.100, No.7, 1944).
- Ayer, A. J. - 'The Concept of Freedom' (HORIZON, Vol.9, No.52, April 1944).
- Bakwin, H. - 'Erotic Feelings of Infants and Young Children' (MEDICAL ASPECTS OF HUMAN SEXUALITY, Vol.8, No.10, 1974).
- Beigel, H. G. - 'Children Who Seduce Adults' (SEXOLOGY, Vol.40, No.7, 1974).
- Bell, A. P. & Weinberg, M. S. - HOMOSEXUALITIES: A STUDY OF DIVERSITY AMONG MEN AND WOMEN (Mitchell Beazley, London, 1978).
- Berg, L. - RISINGHILL: DEATH OF A COMPREHENSIVE (Pelican-Penguin, Middlesex, 1968).
- Berg, L. - LOOK AT KIDS (Penguin, 1972).
- Berger, B. - 'Child-Rearing Research in Communes: The Extension of Adult Sexual Behaviour to Young Children' (THE SEXUAL AND GENDER DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG CHILDREN, ed. by E. & J. Dremland, Ballinger, Camb., Mass., 1977).
- Berger, N. - RIGHTS: A HANDBOOK FOR PEOPLE UNDER AGE (Penguin, Middlesex, 1974).
- Bermant, G. & Davidson, J. - BIOLOGICAL BASES OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR (Harper & Row, NY, USA, 1974).
- Bernard, F. et al - SEX MET KINDEREN (NVSH, The Hague, 1972).
- Bernard, F. - PEDOFILIE (Aquarius, Bussum, Netherlands, 1975).
- Blishen, E. - THE SCHOOL THAT I'D LIKE (Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1969).

Bibliography

- Brady, J. P. & Levitt, E. E. - 'The Relation of Sexual Preferences to Sexual Experiences' (PSYCHOLOGICAL RECORD, No.15, 1965).
- Brake, M. - THE SOCIOLOGY OF YOUTH CULTURE AND YOUTH SUBCULTURES (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1980).
- Brecker, E. - THE SEX RESEARCHERS (Panther, London, 1972).
- Bremner, H. et al - CHILDREN AND YOUTH IN AMERICA; A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY (Camb., Mass., 1970).
- Bremner, R. H. - THE LEGAL RIGHTS OF CHILDREN; AN ORIGINAL ANTHOLOGY (Arno Press, NY, USA, 1974).
- Blum, J. D. & Smith, J. E. - NOTHING LEFT TO LOSE (Sanctuary Press, Camb., Mass., 1972).
- Bock, R. & English, A. - GOT ME ON THE RUN (Sanctuary Press, Camb., Mass., 1973).
- Brongersma, E. - 'From a Morality of Oppression to Creative Freedom' (CIVIS MUNDI, Vol.17, The Hague, May, 1978).
- Carmichael, C. - NON-SEXIST CHILDRAISING (Beacon Press, Boston, 1977).
- Cassidy, J. H. - 'Psychological Considerations of Pædophilia' (PSYCHO-ANALYTIC REVIEW, Vol.17, 1927).
- Charlie, Ralph, Pauli, & Eddie - STREET KIDS (Grossman, NY, USA, 1970).
- Children's Legal Centre - IT'S MY LIFE NOT THEIRS (CLC, London, 1985).
- Children's Legal Centre - CHILDREN IN CARE; THE NEED FOR CHANGE (CLC, London, 1985).
- Clark, T. - THE OPPRESSION OF YOUTH (Harper, NY, USA, 1975).
- Cohen, S. et al - THE LAW AND SEXUALITY (Grass Roots Books, Manchester, England, 1978).
- Coigney, V. - CHILDREN ARE PEOPLE TOO; HOW WE FAIL OUR CHILDREN AND HOW WE CAN LOVE THEM (William Morrow, NY, USA, 1975).
- Cole, L. - OUR CHILDREN'S KEEPERS; INSIDE AMERICA'S KID PRISONS (Grossman, NY, USA, 1972).
- Constantine, L. L. - 'Open Family; A Lifestyle for Kids and Other People' (THE FAMILY CO-ORDINATOR, Vol.26, 1977).
- Cooper, D. - THE DIALECTICS OF LIBERATION (Penguin, Middlesex, 1968).
- Cory, D. H. - HOMOSEXUALITY; A CROSS CULTURAL APPROACH (Julian Press, NY, USA, 1956).
- Cottle, T. J. - THE ABANDONERS; PORTRAITS OF LOSS, SEPARATION, AND NEGLECT (Little, Brown, Boston, USA, 1972).

- Craft, M. - 'Boy Prostitutes and Their Fate' (BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY, Vol.112, No.1, 1966).
- Davidson, J. - (see Bermant, G.)
- Davies, C. & Dhavan, R. [eds.] - CENSORSHIP AND OBSCENITY (Martin Robertson, London, 1978).
- Decter, M. - LIBERAL PARENTS, RADICAL CHILDREN (Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, NY, USA, 1975).
- Deisher, R. W. & Johnston, C. M. - 'Contemporary Communal Child-Rearing' (PEDIATRICS, No. 52; 319-326, 1973).
- Denzin, N. K. - CHILDREN AND THEIR CARETAKERS (E. P. Dutton, NY, USA, 1973).
- DeRougement, D. - LOVE IN THE WESTERN WORLD (Anchor, NY, USA, 1957).
- Dhavan, R. - (see Davies, C.)
- Divoky, D. & Schrag, P. - THE MYTH OF THE HYPERACTIVE CHILD (Pantheon Books, NY, USA, 1975).
- Dodson, V. - SEX BETWEEN MEN AND BOYS (Barclay House, N. Hollywood, USA, 1968).
- Downsborough, N. - PÉDDMORPHS (Kirudo Publishing Company, Taipei, Taiwan 106, Republic of China, 1979).
- Ellis, A. - THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE INCEST TABOO (Lyie Stuart, NY, USA, 1963).
- English, A. - (see Bock, R.)
- Erikson, E. - IDENTITY: YOUTH AND CRISIS (W. W. Norton, NY, USA, 1968).
- Eysenck, H. J. - SEX AND PERSONALITY (Open Books, London, 1976).
- Figes, E. - PATRIARCHAL ATTITUDES (Fawcett Publications, Greenwich, USA, 1971).
- Finch, S. M. - 'Sexual Activity of Children with Other Children and Adults' (CLINICAL PEDIATRICS, Vol.6, No.1, 1967).
- Finnegan, F. - POVERTY AND PROSTITUTION (Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- Fisher, G. M. - 'Psychological Needs of Heterosexual Pédophiliacs' (DISEASES OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM, Vol.30, No.6, 1969).
- Fisher, G. M. - 'Psychological Needs of Homosexual Pédophiliacs' (DISEASES OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM, Vol.31, Sept., 1970).
- Forer, L. G. - NO ONE WILL LISSEN [*sic*]; HOW OUR LEGAL SYSTEM BRUTALISES THE YOUTHFUL POOR (John Day, NY, USA, 1970).

- Foucault, M. - THE HISTORY OF SEXUALITY (Allen Lane, London, 1979).
- Freedman, A. - (see Langsley, D. J.)
- Freud, S. - 'Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality' (THE STANDARD EDITION OF THE COMPLETE PSYCHOLOGICAL WORKS OF SIGMUND FREUD (Hogarth Press, London - first pub. 1905).
- Freund, K. - 'Erotic Preference in Pædophilia' (BEHAVIOUR RESEARCH AND THERAPY, Vol.5, 1967).
- Friedenberg, E. - THE VANISHING ADOLESCENT (Beacon Press, Boston, USA, 1959).
- Friedenberg, E. - THE DIGNITY OF YOUTH AND OTHER ATAVISMS (Beacon Press, Boston, USA, 1965).
- Gadpaille, W. J. - 'Research into the Physiology of Maleness and Female-ness' (ARCHIVES OF GENERAL PSYCHIATRY, 26:193, 1972).
- Gay Activist Alliance - 'A Submission to the Royal Commission on Crininal Procedure Concerning Pædophilia and Homosexuality' (GAA, April, 1979).
- Glover, E. - THE PSYCHOPATHOLOGY OF PROSTITUTION (Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency, London, 1969).
- Glück, B. C. - 'Pædophilia' (SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR AND THE LAW, by R. Slovenko [ed.], Charles Thomas, Springfield, Illinois, 1965).
- Gochros, H. L. & J. S. - THE SEXUALLY OPPRESSED (Association Press, NY, USA, 1977).
- Golsmith, I. E. & Moor-Jankowski - 'Early Somasensory Deprivation as an Autogenetic Process in the Abnormal Development of the Brain and Behaviour' (MEDICAL PRIMATOLOGY, Karger, NY, USA, 1971).
- Gottlieb, D. - CHILDREN'S LIBERATION (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA, 1973).
- Gough, J. - 'Free Childhood, Free Sexuality' (MINOR PROBLEMS, Nos.1,2&3, 1983).
- Greene, S. & Hamilton, R. - WHAT BOTHERS US ABOUT GROWNUPS (Avon Books, NY, USA, 1973).
- Greer, G. - THE FEMALE EUNUCH (MacGibbon & Kee, London, 1970).
- Gross, R. & B. - RADICAL SCHOOL REFORM (Simon & Schuster, NY, USA, 1970)
- Guyon, R. - SEXUAL FREEDOM (Bodley Head, London, 1939).

- Haeberle, E. J. - 'Children, Sex and Society' (THE SEX ATLAS; A NEW ILLUSTRATED GUIDE, Seabury Press, NY, USA, 1978).
- Hamblin, A. - 'The Suppressed Power of Female Sexuality' (SHREW, 1972).
- Hamilton, R. - (see Greene, S.)
- Harmon, D. - THE BOY-LOVERS; FOUR SOCIOLOGICAL CASE HISTORIES OF MEN WHO LOVED BOYS (Jumeaux Publishers, NY, USA, 1969).
- Harris, M. - THE DILLY BOYS; MALE PROSTITUTES IN PICCADILLY (Croom Helm, London, 1973).
- Haskins, J. - CHILDREN HAVE RIGHTS, TOO (Hawthorn Books, NY, USA, 1975).
- Hefner, K. - CHILDREN'S RIGHTS HANDBOOK (Youth Liberation Press, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1979).
- Henderson, D. - 'Incest; A Synthesis of Data' (CANADIAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, Vol.17, 1972).
- Henry, S. & Robinson, D. - SELF-HELP AND HEALTH; MUTUAL AID FOR MODERN PROBLEMS (Martin Robertson, London, 1977).
- Herndon, J. - THE WAY IT SPOZED TO BE (Pitman, London, 1970).
- Hite, S. - THE HITE REPORT; A NATIONWIDE STUDY OF FEMALE SEXUALITY (Macmillan, NY, USA, 1976).
- Hoch, P. - WHITE HERD, BLACK BEAST (Pluto Press, London, 1980).
- Howe, F. & Lauter, P. - THE CONSPIRACY OF THE YOUNG (World Publishing, NY, USA, 1970).
- Hughes, D. - PERSPECTIVES ON PORNOGRAPHY (St. Martin's Press/Macmillan, NY, USA, 1970).
- Hyde, H. M. - A HISTORY OF PORNOGRAPHY (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, NY, USA, 1965).
- Ingram, M. - 'A Study of 92 Cases of Sexual Contact Between Adult and Child' (BRITISH JOURNAL OF SEXUAL MEDICINE, Part 1; Vol.6, No.44, 1979; Part 2; Vol 6, No.45, 1979).
- Jersild, J. - DE BORNEELSKESE (Copenhagen, 1964).
- Jersild, J. - BOY PROSTITUTION (G.E.C.GAD, Copenhagen, 1966).
- Johnson, V. E. & Masters, W. S. - HUMAN SEXUAL RESPONSE (Little, Brown, Boston, 1966).
- Johnson, W. R. - CHILDHOOD SEXUALITY; THE LAST OF THE GREAT TABOOS (S.I.E.C.U.S., NY, USA, 1977).
- Johnston, C. M. - (see Deisher, R. W.)

- Karlen, A. - SEXUALITY AND HOMOSEXUALITY (Macdonald, London, 1971), USA, 1965).
- Kelly, B. - 'On Woman/Girl Love' (GAY COMMUNITY NEWS, Boston, USA, March 3rd, 1979).
- Kemph, J. - 'Children Not Severely Damaged by Incest with a Parent' (JOURNAL OF AMERICAN ACADEMY OF CHILD PSYCHIATRY, Vol.5, 1966).
- Keniston, K. - YOUTH AND DISSENT: THE RISE OF THE NEW OPPOSITION (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, NY, USA, 1971).
- Kirkendall, A. L. & Whitehurst, R. N. - THE NEW SEXUAL REVOLUTION (D. W. Brown, NY, USA, 1971).
- Klein, C. - THE MYTH OF THE HAPPY CHILD (Harper & Row, NY, USA, 1975).
- Kronhausen, E. & P. - PORNOGRAPHY AND THE LAW (Ballantine Books, NY, USA, 1959).
- Lambert, R. - THE HOTHOUSE SOCIETY (Wiedenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1968).
- Langfeldt, T. - 'Psychobiological Aspects of Sexual Development and Sex Differences in Children' (Paper presented at the 3rd. international conference on medical sexology, Rome, 1978).
- Langsley, D. J. et al - 'Father/Son Incest' (THE COMPREHENSIVE TEXTBOOK OF PSYCHIATRY, by A. Freedman et al [eds.], Williams & Wilkins, Baltimore, 1975).
- Lauter, P. - (see Howe, F.)
- LeShan, E. J. - THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST CHILDHOOD (Atheneum Publishers, NY, USA, 1973).
- Levitt, E. E. - (see Brady, J. P.)
- Lukianowicz, N. - 'Incest I: Paternal; II: Other Types' (BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY, Vol.120, 1972).
- Maisch, H. - INCEST (Stein & Day, NY, USA, 1972).
- Makarenko, A. S. - THE ROAD TO LIFE: AN EPIC OF EDUCATION [3 vols.] (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1951).
- Marcuse, H. - EROS AND CIVILISATION (Sphere, London, 1969).
- Marmor, J. - (see Opler, M. K.)
- Marshall, D. S. & Suggs, R. C. [eds.] - HUMAN SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR; VARIATIONS ACROSS THE ETHNIC SPECTRUM (Basic Books, NY, USA, 1971).
- Martinson, F. M. - INFANT AND CHILD SEXUALITY; A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE (The Book Mark, Gustavus Adolphus College, Minn. USA, 1973).

- Martinson, F. M. - THE QUALITY OF ADOLESCENT SEXUAL EXPERIENCE (The Book Mark, Gustavus Adolphus College, Minn, USA, 1974).
- Masters, R. E. L. - FORBIDDEN SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR AND MORALITY (Matrix House, NY, USA, 1966).
- Masters, W. S. - (see Johnson, V. E.)
- Mead, M. - 'Cultural Determinants of Sexual Behaviour' (SEX AND INTERNAL SECRETIONS by W. C. Young [ed.], Williams & Wilkins, Baltimore, MD, 1961).
- Mirthes, C. & the children of P.S.15 - CAN'T YOU HEAR ME TALKING TO YOU? (Bantam Books, NY, USA, 1971).
- Mitchell, J. - WOMEN'S ESTATE (Penguin, Middlesex, 1971).
- Mitzel - THE BOSTON SEX SCANDAL (Glad Day, Boston, USA, 1980).
- Money, J. & Wolman, B. - HANDBOOK OF HUMAN SEXUALITY (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA, 1980).
- Nash, J. - 'The Parental Relationships of Male Homosexuals' (AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY, No.17, 1965).
- Nedona, K. - 'Homosexuality in Sexological Practice' (INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY, No.4, 1951).
- Nedona, K. - 'Sexual Behaviour and its Development in Pedophilic Men' (ARCHIVES OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR, Vol.1, No.3, 1971).
- North, M. - THE OUTER FRINGE OF SEX (Odyssey Press, London, 1970).
- Oakley, A. - SEX, GENDER AND SOCIETY (Harper & Row, NY, USA, 1972).
- Offer, D. - THE PSYCHOLOGICAL WORLD OF THE TEENAGER (Basic Books, NY, USA, 1969).
- Opler, M. K. - 'Anthropological and Cross Cultural Aspects of Homosexuality' (SEXUAL INVERSION, by J. Marmor [ed.], Basic Books, NY, USA, 1965).
- Dremland, E. J. - (see Berger, B.)
- Pepper, W. - THE SELF-MANAGED CHILD: PATHS TO CULTURAL REBIRTH (Harper & Row, NY, USA, 1973).
- Piaget, J. - THE CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY IN THE CHILD (Basic Books, NY, USA, 1954).
- Pogrebin, L. C. - GROWING UP FREE; RAISING YOUR KIDS IN THE '80s (McGraw Hill, NY, USA, 1980).
- Policy Advisory Committee on Sexual Offences - 'Working Paper on the Age of Consent in Relation to Sexual Offences' (HMSO, London, 1979).

Bibliography

- Pomeroy, W. B. - BOYS AND SEX (Delacorte, NY, USA, 1968).
Pomeroy, W. B. - GIRLS AND SEX (Delacorte, NY, USA, 1969).
Postman, N. - THE DISAPPEARANCE OF CHILDHOOD (W. H. Allen, 1983).
Querlin, M. - WOMEN WITHOUT MEN (Mayflower Books, London, 1965).
Rawson, P. - EROTIC ART OF THE EAST (G. P. Putnam's, 1968).
Reich, W. - THE MASS PSYCHOLOGY OF FASCISM (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, NY, USA, 1970).
Reifen, D. - 'The Child as Victim of a Sexual Offence: A New Method of Investigation in Israel' (BRITISH JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRIC SOCIAL WORK, Vol.4, 1958).
Resnick, H. L. P. - (see Amir, M.)
Rist, R. C. [ed.] - THE PORNOGRAPHY CONTROVERSY (Transaction Books, NJ, USA, 1975).
Robinson, D. - (see Henry, S.)
Rowbotham, S. - HIDDEN FROM HISTORY (Pluto Press, London, 1973).
Rushdoony, J. R. - THE POLITICS OF PORNOGRAPHY (Arlington House Publishers, NY, USA, 1974).
Sagarin, E. - 'Incest: Problems of Definition and Frequency' (JOURNAL OF SEX RESEARCH, Vol.13, No.2, 1977).
Sandford, J. - PROSTITUTES (Abacus, London, 1977).
Schrag, P. - (see Divoky, D.)
Sherfey, M. J. - THE NATURE AND EVOLUTION OF FEMALE SEXUALITY (Random House, Vintage Books, NY, USA, 1973).
Simons, J. - DOES SEX MAKE YOU FEEL GUILTY? (Sphere, London, 1972).
Smith, D. - EARLY CHRISTIANITY AND THE HOMOSEXUAL (Quantum Jump, London, 1977).
Smith, J. E. - (see Blum, J. D.)
Snodgrass, J. - FOR MEN AGAINST SEXISM (Times Change Press, CA., USA, 1977).
Socarides, W. C. - BEYOND SEXUAL FREEDOM (Quadrangle, NY, USA, 1975).
Soman, S. C. - LET'S STOP DESTROYING OUR CHILDREN (Hawthorn Books, NY, USA, 1974).
Sontag, S. - ON PORNOGRAPHY (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, NY, USA, 1977).
Spada, J. - THE SPADA REPORT (New American Library, NY, USA, 1979)
Society of Teachers Opposed to Physical Punishment - CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN SCHOOLS; THE UNACCEPTABLE FACE OF BRITISH EDUCATION (S.T.O.P.P.,

- Croydon, England [date ?]
- Suggs, R. C. - (see Marshall, D. S.)
- Symonds, D. - THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN SEXUALITY (Oxford University Press, 1979).
- Teitelbaum, M. S. - SEX DIFFERENCES: SOCIAL AND BIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES (Anchor Press, NY, USA, 1976).
- Tolston, A. - THE LIMITS OF MASCULINITY (Tavistock, London, 1978).
- Tucker, F. - (see Alston, J.)
- U.S. Government Printing Office - 'U.S. Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography' (REPORTS ON OBSCENITY AND PORNOGRAPHY, USGPO, Washington, DC, 1970).
- Vanasek, F. J. et al - 'Patterns of Affective Response in Two Groups of Pædophiles' (PSYCHOLOGICAL REPORTS, Vol.22, 1968).
- Watson, D. - 'Do Children Have Rights?' (THE PHILOSOPHICAL JOURNAL, Vol. 13, No.2, 1976).
- Weeks, J. - COMING OUT; HOMOSEXUAL POLITICS IN BRITAIN FROM THE NINETEENTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT (Quartet, London, 1977).
- Weininger, D. - SEX AND CHARACTER (G. P. Putnam's, NY, USA, 1975).
- Whitehurst, R. N. - (see Kirkendall, A. L.)
- Whiting, B. B. & J. W. - CHILDREN OF SIX CULTURES: A PSYCHOCULTURAL ANALYSIS (Harvard University Press, USA, 1975).
- Wilson, C. - THE ORIGIN OF THE SEXUAL IMPULSE (Panther, London, 1966).
- Winnicott, D. W. - THE CHILD, THE FAMILY, AND THE OUTSIDE WORLD (Penguin, Middlesex, 1965).
- Wolfgang, M. E. - (see Amir, M.)
- Volman, B. - (see Money, J.)
- Young, W. C. - (see Mead, M.)
- Youth Liberation of Ann Arbor - CHILDREN AND SEX: A YOUTH LIBERATION VIEW (Youth Liberation Press, Ann Arbor, USA, 1978).
- Zeeegers, M. - 'Punishable Love and Dangerous Protection' (PROCES, July/August, Arnhem, Netherlands, 1978).

Forthcoming:

- Bernard, F. - PÆDOPHILIA: A FACTUAL REPORT
- Weeks, J. - SEXUALITY AND ITS DISCONTENTS