We were

NOT

abused!

David L. Riegel

SafeHaven Foundation Press
Philadelphia

E-book version, 12/08

Riegel, David L. (1931 -)

We were NOT abused!

ISBN 0-9676997-3-8

Library of Congress
Control Number: 2007906090

We were NOT abused!

Table of Contents

This book is dedicated to Simon, to Tommy and Riley, to Dylan, to all the other present and future boys of the world, and to the memory of Dr. Frits Bernard and Dr. Vern Bullough, two giants upon whose shoulders I have respectfully attempted to stand.

Chapter 1: Absolutism and Demagoguery

The twin malignancies of absolutism and demagoguery have haunted humanity from time immemorial. Ethnocentricity, religion, and other superstitions have utilized ignorance, fear, and xenophobic hatred to create self-serving absolutist lies, and demagoguery has codified these lies into draconian and repressive laws.

Over time, and around the world, almost every minority – and some majorities – has thus been criminalized, if not demonized, by such lies and laws. There have been laws by Romans against non-Romans, by Catholics against non-Catholics, by Christians against "infidel" Muslims, by Muslims against "infidel" Christians, by Nazis against Jews, by Western civilization against Blacks, Asians, homosexuals, etc. What all of these have in common is that enlightenment of one form or another eventually revealed them for the lies they were, and most such laws have long since properly been consigned to the trash heap of history.

For the past several decades the claimed intrinsic harm of any expression of childhood sexuality with older partners increasingly has been the target of absolutism and demagoguery. But consider the words of world renowned psychiatrist Dr. Karl Menninger, who was one of the founders of the clinic that bears his family's name:

> The horror with which some parents learn of their children's interest in various forms of experimental sex play is a reflection of the ambivalence in adults' attitudes toward sexuality, especially to their own children's sexuality. … The assumption is, of course, that children are irreparably ruined by such experiences. … [I] point out that in the cold light of scientific investigation no such devastating effects usually follow. Two psychiatrists

> recently made a careful follow-up study of such cases and concluded that children exposed to premature sexual experiences with adults frequently turn out to be "distinguished and unusually charming and attractive in their outward personalities" (Bender and Blau, 1937).
>
> The conclusions to be drawn from such observations … simply bear out our contention that sexuality is not the evil and horrible thing it is generally conceived to be. … [W]hen the experience actually stimulates the child erotically, it would appear from the observations of the authors cited just above that it may favor rather than inhibit the development of social capabilities and mental health in the so-called victims. (1942, p. 283-284)

Because boyhood sexual contacts with girls or women are of an entirely different nature that requires unrelated analyses, and the sexual encounters of girls with peers or older persons likewise evoke dissimilar reactions and must be considered in a different light, this discussion will be limited to the absolutist assumptions that sexually expressed relationships between boys and older males invariably cause "harm, that this harm is pervasive …, that this harm is likely to be intense, and is an equivalent experience for boys and girls…" (Rind, Tromovitch, & Bauserman, 1998, p. 22). Besides Rind et al's refutation of these assumptions, there has been study after study, decade after decade, going back at least to 1937 as noted above, and continuing to the present, which have shown negligible support for this "harm" hypothesis, and instead have demonstrated benign, and even positive, effects. One must keep in mind that these investigations have been conducted in the context of a misopedic culture that demonizes such relationships and does its best to brainwash both boys and adults into accepting that the lie of intrinsic harm does, in fact, constitute truth.

One of the beauties of true science is its self-correcting nature. In the objective physical sciences, experiments and claims must be based on hard empirical data, and must be able to be replicated and verified by other investigators. If such replication is not possible, an assertion, such as the "cold fusion" claims by Pons and Fleischmann in 1989, will soon be disavowed by the mainstream scientists in its respective field, although, like cold fusion, it may continue to be defended by a marginal minority. However, in the more subjective social sciences, investigative data collection is subject to a host of vagaries, including the way questions are asked and the population sample that is the subject of the investigation. Thus the process of replication and verification becomes much more difficult than, say, repeating the chemical process of adding A to B and measuring the resultant change in ph. So, unlike physical science, social science investigations can be severely compromised by the intent, prejudices, and methodology of the investigator. It therefore becomes the task of the community of scientists in that discipline to attempt diligently to ascertain if the methods employed in any given investigation were appropriate, if the chosen sample was likely to produce representative, unbiased, and useful data, and if the analyses and conclusions are logical and applicable to the issues being investigated.

After the scapegoat of adult male homosexuality was exculpated by the American Psychiatric Association and the American Psychological Association, a subset of the "gay" community – which, for political expediency, was soon excommunicated by newly empowered gay activists – became the new scapegoat in a targeted vendetta which began to emerge in the late 1970s. "Victimology," and more specifically sexual victimology as it applies to boys, developed not from science, but from the ideologies of a few opportunistic individuals. David Finkelhor (1979; 1981; 1984, etc.) was one of the originators and principal proponents of victim-

ology, and a major progenitor of the lucrative "child sex abuse industry" which emerged to profit from the treatment of these "victims" (Dineen, 2000). Using data that has been described as having a "near-fatal skew," Finkelhor made the absolutist claim that sexual encounters between boys and older males, consensual or not, were invariably and universally harmful. In other words, if a boy has such an encounter, he is indisputably harmed, the only legitimate question being to what degree. And if that boy insists he has not been harmed – as many do – then he is diagnosed as deluded. Either way, he is in need of extensive and expensive treatment by a qualified practitioner from the child sex abuse industry resources.

The spread of victimology and its acceptance – in spite of its lack of scientific basis and validity – by the academic and professional communities and the public is difficult to understand except in its demagogic appeal to the aforementioned triad of ignorance, fear, and hate. Consider the evaluation of victimology by the late Dr. John Money:

> The new specialty of victimology is a science only in the etymology of its name. In practice it is a branch of the sexosophy of the judicial and punishment industry, not of sexology, the science of sex and sex research. Victimologists are, de facto, the new social-science police. Social-science practitioners have never before been accorded the prestige of having so much power over people's lives (1988, p. 9).

Consensual sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males no doubt have existed since before the dawn of history, usually unobtrusively and with little objection as long as they were not flaunted. But society seems to have a pressing need for a "scapegoat," and with adult homosexuality "officially" no longer a legitimate target for per-

secution, boyhood sexuality, and specifically boyhood sexual encounters with older males, has been increasingly demonized, a malicious oppression that, sadly, continues to this day.

It was stated earlier that the sexually expressed boy/older male relationships which are the focus of this book are "consensual," and it must be noted that sexual consent in boys is, to say the least, controversial. Although it is discussed in detail in a later chapter, in this book the general term "consensual" will include both simple mutually agreed upon activities as well as those consisting of an offer and subsequent acceptance. Our sexually repressive Western culture teaches boys from infancy that they can not, should not, and absolutely MUST not, initiate, agree, or consent to engage in exploratory sex play with older males. This is counter-intuitive to the boy, he is curious about his genitals and the sensations he is discovering, he wants to know more, and an older and more experienced male is the logical person of whom to inquire and from whom to learn. So boys are conflicted from an early age, and those who are not inclined to be questioning and independent will accept these admonishments and prohibitions as valid, and thus decide to reject any opportunities to explore their sexuality. However, the bright and more adventuresome boys will see through these obvious lies and treat them as something to be ignored and gotten around in one way or another, and will thus come to a mutual agreement of one form or another with their chosen partners.

But not all boy/older male sexual encounters are consensual. Just as there are heterosexual males who force their unwanted attentions on females, there are pedosexual males who, out of repression, frustration, or psychopathology, try to seduce or even compel boys to submit to sexual intrusions from touching to anal rape. While these truly despicable assaults are actually quite rare, they make the headlines and

are portrayed by the media as the "norm" for all boy-attracted pedosexual males. As we will see in later chapters, this is just one more lie.

John Mattick (2004), writing about genetic research, states:

> Assumptions can be dangerous, especially in science. They usually start as the most plausible or comfortable interpretation of the available facts. But ... assumptions often graduate to articles of faith, and new observations are forced to fit them. Eventually, if the volume of troublesome information becomes unsustainable, the orthodoxy must collapse.

The contradictory "troublesome information" presented in this book adds to the considerable volume already in the literature, and the shaky orthodoxy of victimology must, indeed, at some point collapse. In order to replace this degenerate orthodoxy with a realistic and truthful picture of the effects of consensual sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males, as well as to restore the integrity and credibility of the social sciences in this area, researchers must undertake substantial new and unbiased research based not on theories and assumptions, but on the self-reported detailed perceptions of large numbers of those who have actually experienced such relationships. Two such investigations will be presented in later chapters.

Chapter 2: Here There be Dragons

The Sexuality of Boys

> Although the frontiers of knowledge have been steadily advanced in the field of human sexuality, the area of the sexuality of children lies mostly in that territory at the edges of our psychological maps bearing only the legend, "Here there be dragons." As their ancestors centuries ago faced the unexplored regions of the earth with terror and fascination, so today's adults seem to fear to approach issues of child sexuality and therefore are reluctant to attempt discovery of its truths. (Constantine, 1981, p. 3)

It has been a quarter century since Larry Constantine made these insightful observations, but the dragons are still with us, as the cartographers of the social sciences have not yet found either the courage or the methods to conduct rational and unbiased explorations in these regions. Even worse, the boundaries and contours of child sexuality, and especially the sexuality of boys, have been preempted by false maps, created not on the careful observations of empirical science and rational logic, but on the concept of "sexual victimology" that sprang forth almost overnight in the late 1970s and 80s (Finkelhor, 1981), and based on the uncertain landmarks of ideology, religion, superstition, political agendas, advocacy, and moral panic (Jenkins, 1998).

In the real world, there are two persistent but erroneous assumptions concerning the sexual nature of boys. First, that boys up to some arbitrary age have essentially no sexuality, and second, that the sexual attitudes and experiences of boys may be equated with those of girls, a misconception that has been dealt with by Rind (1998).

Anyone who has been around a reasonably intelligent, communicative, and uninhibited small boy knows that by the time he is about 4 or 5 years old he already has a very active interest in the functions and sensations of his genitals. In too many cases this curiosity is quietly discouraged by his parents or other adults who still labor under the misbelief that a boy that young cannot, or at least should not, have sexual urges or feelings. In the worst cases the boy is threatened or punished for having "bad" thoughts and ideas, and occasionally this even degenerates into brutal beatings.

But this only creates a fear and distrust of those who would shame the boy; it does nothing to change his basic nature. In most cases he will sooner or later search out other sources of information, and will experiment either alone, with his peers, or perhaps even with older boys or men, to satisfy his curiosity and find pleasure and gratification. This is his very nature, yet for centuries most boys in western cultures have been cajoled, threatened, and punished for engaging in such normal activities as masturbation and "sex play" with other boys. And if a boy should happen to seek out and find an understanding and compassionate older boy or man who will answer his questions and not turn away his requests for physical exploration, the current societal climate makes it necessary that they maintain absolute secrecy. Otherwise, both are likely to find themselves dealing with the wrath of parents, police, and the child sex abuse industry.

This is not to say that every boy has the same amount of interest or intensity of desire, or that this manifests itself at the same early age in all boys.. But it <u>is</u> to say that no boy should be denied the right at any age to explore and learn about his own body to whatever degree suits him. Nor should he be denied the right, with the caveat that he do no real – as opposed to imagined or culturally created – harm to himself or others, to choose those of whom he wishes to inquire and

those with whom he wishes to share himself, without fear of interference or recrimination. But it takes an unusually enlightened adult to have the wisdom to realize that repressing a boy's desire to investigate and explore his sexuality is to deny him an essential part of himself, and that such repression will most likely result in distrust and alienation. Mary Calderon (1979) notes:

> Imagine, if you can, something you experience often and intensely as real and present being accorded no recognition of its existence whatsoever by the world around you. Or imagine this real and intense experiencing of yourself being subjected over and over to severe, totally bewildering disapproval and punishment. *What kind of silently tormenting existential hell is this to which we consign our children from their earliest memories?* Do any ever manage to live through it with their ... sexuality undistorted? (p. 6, italics in the original)

Girls by nature view sex much differently, to them it is a matter of allowing or inviting their bodies to be penetrated, and, when they are old enough, impregnated, an invasion justified in their minds only by what they perceive as love, commitment, and promised support. Girls are sociobiologically programmed to use their sexuality to capture and control a male, and there are endless stories of little girls using every trick in their book to entice little boys to participate in "playing house", to join their "tea party", to push their doll carriage, and to otherwise give evidence, long before there is any heterosexual inclination or activity on the part of the boy, that he can be "domesticated" into becoming the dependable and controllable provider and protector that the girl feels she must have. There are feminists who will try to say that young boys can and should be taught to think and act like girls, but they are fighting a losing battle when they try

to replace hundreds of thousands of years of sociobiological evolution with a decade or two of revisionist rubbish.

To boys, sexuality initially is just another one of life's many adventures, a thrilling physical sensation to be tried in every form and manner conceivable. A boy, if he knows something feels good, will do his utmost to find a way, time, and place to enjoy it, be it bicycling, baseball, swimming, or sex play. If he doesn't know for sure that a given act is pleasurable but thinks it may be, he will again set out to find a way, time and place to try it out, either alone, with his peers, or, if he dares, with an older boy or man of his choosing.

Moreover, when a boy passes through the threshold of puberty and enters into the turmoil of adolescence, his sexuality tends to become a major preoccupation. This subject, which is then so much in the forefront of his mind, is the very thing that he finds that he cannot freely and openly discuss with his family or other adults, because of the prevailing sexophobia. His primary source of real and practical knowledge then becomes limited to a few of his peers, who are no more experienced or informed than he is. Sadly, pernicious cultural phobias deny him the privilege of seeking out and being open with any older boy or man who could knowledgeably answer his questions and encourage him, or even join with him, if requested, in his explorations. He is thus left sadly adrift on the sea of his own inexperience, and is essentially forbidden to seek out the only people he might be willing to trust to be his chart and compass.

Every generation of boys reinvents the same sexual experiments and exploits that their older brothers, fathers, and grandfathers invented, tried, and enjoyed. The ludicrous aspect of this is that those same older brothers, fathers, and grandfathers, having had more years to be brainwashed into conformity with societal norms and taboos and inculcated

with sexual phobias, will more often than not ignore or try to deny that they ever even thought of such things, much less engaged in them.

Most boys will want to conduct their sexual experiments and seek pleasure and gratification with those peers, older boys, and/or adults that they know well and with whom they feel comfortable and confident. But there are other more daring and adventuresome boys who will volunteer to engage in sexual pleasures with total strangers, other boys will do so out of frustration. Some of these boys even offer themselves in exchange for money. But there is no convincing reason to believe that intrinsic emotional harm invariably, or even commonly, results from any of these liaisons, as long as they are initiated and controlled by the boy himself. The danger today, of course, is from sexually transmitted diseases, especially AIDS. So the question must be asked if it might not be better to remove the temptation, or the fear and apprehension, that may drive a boy to seek sexual intimacy in secret with a total stranger, and instead allow him to fulfill himself openly with those he knows and trusts?

There is no evidence to support the idea that all boys are invariably psychologically harmed by consensual sexual experiments and activities with other boys and men. On the contrary, various publications (e.g. Rind et al., 1998) demonstrate that such harm is very infrequent, almost to the point of being nonexistent. Emotional trauma can and does occur when coercion is involved, and in rare cases physical harm can result from such things as forced anal penetration. But the vast majority of emotional and psychological harm that occurs is caused not by the relationship itself, but by the interference of outsiders who feel that they must create a punishable perpetrator/victim situation out of a perfectly consensual and benign relationship.

Society would do a monumental service to boys by discarding these artificial restrictions on their right to investigate and enjoy their own sexuality at their own pace, on their own terms, and with companions of their own choosing. It is time to do away with the "ethical", "moral", and "religious" sexual fetters that have shackled boys for far too long, and to allow them the freedom in this area that is their birthright. Boys most certainly need love, understanding, and guidance in areas that they cannot figure out for themselves, but they do not need denial and repression of their most elemental needs and instincts. The present level of hysteria regarding boyhood sexuality, and the resultant confusion, insecurity, and social rebellion of boys whom society has cut adrift from the older boys and men who could and would give them the companionship and guidance they so desperately need and seek, is perhaps one of the most significant factors in the anger and unrest that permeate the adolescent male world (Prescott, 1975; Wilson., 1981).

Chapter 3: The Convoluted Conundrum of Consent

The concept of the abilities and rights of boys to withhold or give sexual consent is a hodgepodge of claims and counter-claims about cognition, information, harm, Western morality, and a host of other factors. One camp holds that males under some arbitrary and highly variable chronological age lack the cognitive ability to make "proper" – as defined by any given societal criteria currently in vogue – decisions about the exercise of their own sexuality. Others claim that boys have insufficient information about sexuality in general to make these proper decisions – which is a damning indictment of society's deliberate concealment and withholding of that information. Some are convinced – without any apparent specific reason – that boys are irreparably harmed by any sexual contact with another male, and especially an older male. Yet others appeal to ethnocentric and egocentric "morality." Consider the absolutist pronouncement of prominent victimologist David Spiegel: "I consider it inconceivable that a child [i.e., anyone under 18] can meaningfully consent to sexual relations with an adult, and I believe it to be a moral outrage to put forward such an idea"(2000, p. 66).

For more than two centuries, the nearly universal boyhood practice of masturbation was condemned by self-proclaimed "experts" as ignorant, uninformed, harmful, and grossly immoral (Hare, 1962). It has only been a few decades since this onerous Onanism house of cards collapsed, but most informed people now realize that not only is boyhood masturbation normal, but is in reality beneficial.

If self-masturbation is now acceptable, how should boyhood peer mutual masturbation be viewed? Are two boys satisfying their curiosity and enjoying the sensations of masturbation in any way harming each other? Is there some form of "consent" involved, or should this be seen as simply an

agreement? Claims of harm or lack of consent would be very difficult to support empirically or logically. But suppose a boy seeks further information, instruction, demonstration, or mutual experiences from an older male. Does the difference in ages somehow create harm or require consent which is not a problem with peers, or is this likewise an intrinsically benign contact validated by a simple agreement? What possible rationale could be advanced for either harm or a failure to consent? Why does our culture insist on requiring such an exaggerated degree of consent for simple physical acts? Is it because our society deludes itself into pretending that these simple, mutually agreed upon, and benign acts are soul-searing, gut-wrenching, psyche-damaging trauma for the sole purpose of justifying its vendetta against boys and their older male friends?

While most people will at least reluctantly grant that fellatio is an acceptable private practice between adults, they like to pretend that boys are not even aware of its existence, much less that they would experiment in this area with their peers. But real or pretended ignorance of facts does not change the facts, and the facts are that in this information age the vast majority of boys become aware of fellatio while still of single digit ages. So if two uninhibited and adventuresome boys mutually decide to take turns receiving and providing fellatio, why should any real – as opposed to culturally imagined – harm occur? And in the presence of simple agreement, what need is there of any further degree of consent? And once again, if a boy seeks out or otherwise willingly encounters a cooperative older male, why should the age difference change the status of the experience?

Note that in the preceding two paragraphs, only mutually willing relationships are considered, a situation that can be thought of as “simple” consent. On the other hand, if one party unilaterally proposes an activity to the other, the

acceptance of that offer by the other party can be seen – for lack of a better term – as "active" consent. But neither of these shades of consent should be thought of as absolute or permanent, as either person has the right to change his mind at any point and withdraw his consent. Furthermore, if coercion or force is employed, or even excessive attempts at persuasion, there can be neither simple nor active consent, and the issue becomes physical assault, with appropriate prohibitions and statutes having nothing to do with sex coming into play. Another concern is sexually transmitted disease, but there is no evidence that this is anything but extremely rare in this type of relationship. The pressing problem today is that a perverse society refuses to recognize the right of boys to agree in, and/or consent to, sexual exploration and play with peers and older males, and instead criminalizes and demonizes almost all such relationships.

Anal intercourse involving peers or an older male partner is, according to published research (Riegel, 2005), much less common than fellatio or mutual masturbation. From these relative frequencies it could be inferred that anal intercourse usually develops from one of the other activities, and the same research indicates that the boy(s) involved are somewhat older and physically able to be penetrated without harm or injury. If there were preexisting agreements for the previous activities, it follows that there would be similar agreements for the anal sex, and that there would be no intrinsic harm. In the case of a unilateral proposition, some form of consent would be involved, but so long as the recipient was aware of the physical issues and the possibility of discomfort, and had the right to withdraw his consent, there is still no reason for the experience to be intrinsically harmful. Only the interference of outside parties would be likely to introduce iatrogenic harm, as Larry Constantine (1981) noted: "Negative reactions of parents [and other adults] ... to a child's sexual encounters, aside from their function of

inducing guilt, can be ... the most psychonoxious aspect of the entire experience. (p. 241).

It is interesting to note that parents and other adults are concerned with a child's consent only when a non-approved behavior is the issue. The child's consent is not felt relevant when such things as Victorian sexophobia, current homophobia, religious dogma, etc., are being forced upon the child. Nor is the child "informed" about the possible negative consequences of these and other superstitions. But if a child may possibly gain understanding about his own sexuality, then all sorts of roadblocks are thrown up. Apart from cultural brainwashing, would the average 10-year-old boy have any problem with, say, sharing mutual masturbation with his 15-year-old cousin? Or accepting fellatio from his 35-year-old neighbor? Unless and until his mind has been poisoned, he would probably not assign these experiences much lasting importance, except possibly to look for opportunities to repeat them.

The presumed basis for all decisions, agreements, or consent regarding sex is cognitive ability, and there are those who hold that this ability is not sufficiently developed until the so-called "age of consent;" indeed, this age of consent is supposedly predicated on the attainment of "adult" cognitive ability. But some of the self-designated "experts" in this area see cognitive development as adequate for significant and meaningful decisions much younger. No less prestigious an organization than the American Psychological Association filed an Amicus curiae brief to the United States Supreme Court (1989) supporting the ability of children as young as 11 to give "legally competent consent" regarding abortion:

> Developmental psychologists have built a rich body of research examining adolescents' capacities for understanding, reasoning, solving problems and making de-

cisions... . Research consistently supports the conclusion that there is a predictable development during late childhood and early adolescence of the capacity to think rationally about increasingly complex problems and decisions. (p.18)

The concern that a minor have adequate information ... as opposed to the capacity to choose based on such information, is less a component of the adolescent's competency than of the ... legal and ethical duty to provide all material information... . (p. 18, footnote)

The specific reasoning abilities that develop during early adolescence are closely akin to the capacity to consent, and include the capacity to reason abstractly about hypothetical situations; the capacity to reason about multiple alternatives and consequences; ... and the capacity for systematic, exhaustive use of information. ... In fact, by middle adolescence (age 14-15) young people develop abilities similar to adults in reasoning about moral dilemmas, understanding social rules and laws, and reasoning about interpersonal relationships and interpersonal problems... . Thus, by age 14 most adolescents have developed adult-like intellectual and social capacities including specific abilities outlined in the law as necessary for ... considering risks and benefits, and giving legally competent consent. ... [T]here are some 11-to-13 year olds who possess adult-like capabilities in these areas. (pp. 18-20)

There has been substantial empirical research testing adolescents' decisionmaking performance when faced with various types of practical problems involving ... decisions. Some of these studies specifically compare the performance of adolescents to that of adults in making such decisions. The evidence does not support the as-

> sumption ... that adolescents lack an adult's capacity to understand and reason about problems and decisions... . (p. 21)

Additionally, Deborah Waber et al.(2007) reported:

> … childhood is characterized by improvement on tasks of cognitive and motor function, [but] this progress levels off at around age 11 or 12, just prior to adolescence. … "[W]hen children are in elementary school, they may be learning "basic building blocks" of cognition and that after about 11 years of age, "children take these building blocks and use them."

It is interesting to note that the research reported in chapter 4 finds that the median age for the beginning of sexually expressed boy/older male relationships is 12, which, according to the above two citations, agrees with the attainment of "adult-like capabilities" and the active employment of the "basic building blocks" of cognition.

From a very pragmatic and real-life perspective, anyone who holds to the idea that a young boy cannot make informed decisions has never taken such a boy shopping for new sneakers. He is well informed from his schoolmates and from TV as to the status and desirability of various brands, with or without flashing lights, and, unless he is unhappily repressed, he will not willingly accept what is in his opinion less desirable. This ability of a boy to choose what he wants and does not want is present even at birth, as any mother who has not immediately fed a hungry baby will testify. Granted, this expression of informed preference is frequently overruled, but this in no way negates the fact that the boy has his own opinions, nor that he is quite capable of expressing them. The problem lies, again, in the parents' or guardians' "chattel

property" concept of boys, and that the boy has no "right" to choose either shoes, companions, or activities.

If it were possible to bring all those who consider themselves "experts" on the subject of the ability and rights of boys to withhold or give consent – and especially sexual consent – for a bare-knuckle, no-holds-barred debate on their views, it might be well to have the riot police and an ambulance or two standing by. There would be vigorous contention about "simple consent," "meaningful consent," "informed consent," "legal consent," "competent consent," and on and on and on. Warring camps would form on the so-called "age of consent," plus which – if any – of the forms of consent is acceptable for a given age. And in the end, as been the case for decades, about all that would be agreed upon would be to continue to disagree. Yet these "experts" continue to enslave boys – and all children – while their vacuous arguments continue, and parents and other adults continue to be complicit in this enslavement.

Much has been made over the perceived imbalance of power between a man and a boy. It is obvious that a man is usually bigger, stronger, and has economic resources and social status that boys generally do not. So in ordinary man/boy relationships, i.e., school, civil and social situations such as sports, etc., there is no question that a man can quite easily impose his will on a boy and force him to pretty much do the man's bidding. This can even be carried to an extreme in a situation where a boy is coerced into participating in sexual activity, and then threatened with dire consequences if he tells anyone. The powerlessness that a boy feels in these circumstances usually causes him to keep quiet, and these are the cases where severe emotional trauma may take place. Fortunately, these cases are also vanishingly rare.

But in a potential consensual sexually expressed boy/older male relationship, the scales tend to tip the other way. Even if the boy has initiated the relationship, which is frequently the case, he soon realizes that his older friend wants very much to maintain and continue their friendship. If the boy is appreciative of his older friend, this creates no problem. If not, a boy thus empowered can take advantage of his friend by making unreasonable demands on his finances, time, actions, and emotions. Not only can he use the threat of withdrawal of affection, but also, even though there has not yet been even the slightest hint of sexual contact, make a public accusation of such that most likely will destroy the man.

If the older friend allows the relationship to progress to sexual activity, the balance of power shifts even further in favor of the boy. Now the boy not only can use the older friend's desire to maintain the friendship and the threat of exposure to assert power, but he also has engaged and activated his friend's sexual desires, which he can now threaten to thwart. Thankfully, most relationships that progress this far have developed into a state of mutual respect and love, so that neither partner is inclined to exercise his power over the other. This type of advanced partnership is the acme and epitome of what such relationships are really all about, it is a beautiful and fulfilling thing for both parties, and neither wants to do anything to disrupt their happiness.

From the above, it should be obvious that the balance of power is usually in equilibrium, and when the balance of power does shift, it tends to shift in the favor of the boy. Although some of the reasoning in the previous two paragraphs is based on the current climate of societal disapproval, there are good reasons for the older partner in such a relationship to ensure that the balance of power will remain biased in the favor of the boy, regardless of public opinion.

Responsibility and choice are two sides of the same coin, and boys are held responsible for their actions from a very early age. Requiring a boy to answer unconditionally for everything he does, while concurrently insisting that he is not capable of making his own decisions, sexual or otherwise, is both illogical and grossly unfair. In this Internet age, boys have many sources of reliable information about sex, and therefore should not be dismissed as not having the background to make rational decisions in this area. A boy of 12 currently cannot legally agree to what he judges to be harmless sexual activities with an older boy of 17, but he can be held fully accountable, tried, and convicted of, for example, "sexual assault" of a younger boy. Denying to a boy his right to make choices about his sexual activities, arbitrarily based on chronological age, is an anachronism sorely in need of reconsideration.

The basis of the ability to make meaningful choices lies in having sufficient information to understand the intrinsic – as opposed to culturally inflicted – consequences of those choices. Admittedly a younger boy may not have all that information, although a surprising amount, unbeknown to the adults around him, is obtained from his peers, from older boys and men, and in some cases from the Internet. The problem that crops up, however, is that he far too often is given false and conflicting information, either in good faith by his peers, or maliciously by his elders. One only has to remember that not too many years ago, masturbation was represented as causing everything from acne to insanity (Hare, 1962). So anyone answering a boy's questions must be careful to tell him the truth, because deliberate misinformation that is discovered by the boy will make him doubt anything further that he hears from the person who lies to him. He needs truth and facts, not foolish fables, and then the decisions he makes will be based on an understanding of the real, rather than imagined, consequences.

Until a boy becomes contaminated with cultural sexophobia, he will typically approach sexual exploration and experimentation as essentially physical sensations with no particular emotional consequences, although pleasant sexual experiences with another person are likely to contribute to a closeness or bonding with that person. Unfortunately, however, society has created an immense and unreasonable amount of emotional baggage and presumed consequences which it attaches to what a boy sees as simple bodily pleasure. "Priests, doctors, psychiatrists, and others have invested sex with magical powers ... [but boys] ... saw sex as being no more than just a game... ." (Wilson, 1981 pp. 129-130). Consequently, the boy is considered to be unable to make meaningful decisions regarding sexual activity, especially with an older boy or man, because he has not yet become properly aware of all these culturally imposed mythologies, false and imagined implications, and taboos. The problem lies not in the intrinsic and factual consequences of a boy's personal sexual activities, but in the false and artificial consequences imposed by a misguided society. The obvious solution, then, is not to continue to attempt to warp boys' thinking into conformance with so called moral, ethical, or religious standards that have no basis in reality, but to begin the long overdue process of dismantling these inanities and replacing them with information, rationality, and freedom.

Chapter 4: We were NOT abused!

Reports from former loved boys.

Selected representative comments from respondents to the survey described in this chapter:

> Boys should have the freedom to make their own decision if they clearly feel that they know what they want. If a boy desires sexual contact with another male and the feeling is mutual, then there should be no issue. A healthy relationship with another male can be very beneficial to both parties.

> I don't find anything wrong with sexual contact with boys and males if the boys are willing and eager participants. Boys should be allowed to explore their sexual identity, the same as with any other relationship.

> I strongly believe sex is a healthy part of our lives, grossly deformed and laden with guilt by a prejudiced and sick society, and sadly misled by the bigotry of hypocritical leaders, both religious and political.

The logical way to find out how boys feel about sexually expressed relationships with older males is to ask them. This is what Dr. Theo Sandfort (1984) did, and the resultant victimological uproar over his positive findings eventually caused him to abandon his professorship in the Department of Clinical Psychology at Utrecht University in the Netherlands. He is currently Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry at Columbia University in New York City, but for obvious reasons of self-preservation no longer conducts research or publishes on the issues of boyhood sexual contact with older males. Another researcher, Paul Okami (1991; 1997), published research along these lines, but recent at-

tempts to engage him on these subjects have been curtly rebuffed. It would appear that he, also, has concluded that it is more prudent to abandon this type of research than to suffer the same fate as befell Dr. Sandfort at Utrecht. Since these rancorous incidents, no other researchers, so far as is known, have attempted real-time investigations which inquire into boys' sexual activities with older males.

Since research with boys is no longer possible, perhaps the next best procedure is to inquire of adult males who as boys had sexually expressed relationships with older males. However, openly attempting to locate and contact such men is a near impossibility, as a tenured professor at a major west coast university found out recently when he innocently started such a project and barely escaped with his job when the victimologists got wind of it. Additionally, many – perhaps almost all – men who had such experiences refuse to discuss them out of fear of ridicule or persecution. Another factor is that a significant percentage of men who felt that their experiences were consensual, pleasant, and non-traumatic at the time they occurred become the victims of societal brainwashing and allow their initial positive feelings to be subjugated to more politically correct negative feelings.

Fortunately, the development of the Internet and World Wide Web offers a way around these roadblocks. Various researchers (e.g., Duffy, 2002; Rhodes, Bowie, & Hergenrather, 2003, etc.) have endorsed the validity and usefulness of Internet based behavioral investigations, and therefore this avenue was chosen for an anonymous survey.

The Internet, while having potential for behavioral science investigations, is not without its problems. Those who have not attempted such research tend to think that sampling any population should be easily accomplished, requiring only that one create a web site, and then sit back and watch the deluge

of responses pour in. Reality is otherwise. When one is trying to ferret out useful and meaningful data on issues that society has harassed into hiding for decades, neither establishing contact with potential respondents nor obtaining their cooperation is easily or quickly accomplished. From previous experience in Internet research projects in the area of boy/older male sexual contacts, there was little doubt that obtaining a sufficient number of detailed responses concerning boyhood sexually expressed relationships with older males from an even remotely unbiased and random sample of this markedly uncommunicative population would pose a serious challenge.

The solution that presented itself was an acquaintance who volunteered to post solicitations for the survey to a broad spectrum of "Usenet" "newsgroups," taking care to avoid any such groups that would have an obvious bias either for or against boy/older male sexuality. With this one self-imposed caveat, this individual was given free rein, and persevered posting on a somewhat irregular weekly basis for an entire year, from mid 2005 through mid 2006, with, as we shall see, moderately acceptable results at best. His services would prove to be indispensable; nevertheless, as far as the actual research was concerned, he was simply a facilitator, not a principal, and had neither input nor control over the design or administration of the instrument, the web site itself, or the resulting data. Enough of the respondents identified the news group from which they were solicited to make it obvious that a very large selection of news groups had in fact been addressed, and the spacing over time of these responses also indicates a significant degree of separation between respondents.

The questionnaire for this project used concepts developed in several previous investigations, and was designed to gather various data on multiple aspects of the sexual experiences of

minor males with older males. No indications were given as to the type of experiences being sought in terms of positive or negative – the respondents were free to report either. Visitors were simply advised that the study was "An empirical investigation into the effects on males of a boyhood relationship with an older male that included a sexual component." The questions inquired about general demographics, self-perceived mental health, adult sexual attraction, sexual background and experiences, the nonsexual and sexual aspects of the primary relationship with an older male, and the perceptions of the negative and positive effects of that relationship. Five to seven options, ranging from negative to positive or vice versa, were provided for most questions, and conscious efforts were made to avoid "steering" the respondent, as some have done in the past. Several text boxes also provided for optional unstructured comments.

The entry page on the Internet web site advised the reader of the nature of the project, while the subsequent page informed the prospective participant that he must be of legal age. It also emphasized that participation would be totally anonymous and that, beyond a date, time, and optional newsgroup identification, no identifying information would be attached to the data or otherwise recorded. This second page also provided a disclaimer in accordance with the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct, and advised the respondent that by proceeding on to the questionnaire on the third page, he was agreeing to the terms and conditions of the research project.

As can be expected when throwing such a survey open to an anonymous public, there were a few submissions that were transparent frauds and had to be rejected, but a total of 103 responses were judged to be legitimate. In research parlance, this is a "non-random convenience sample," and as such is subject to many limitations. It is obviously skewed in that

most of the participants were computer knowledgeable and either active on the particular Internet group which was solicited or were referred to the questionnaire by participants from that Internet group. It is further skewed in that the proportion of exclusively and primarily homosexual and bisexual respondents (33 of 103) would seem to be out of line with customarily accepted percentages in the general population. But experience in this type of Internet investigations has shown that homosexual, bisexual, and pedosexual individuals tend to be much more responsive, whereas heterosexual adult males, perhaps because of their greater anxiety over the stigma that society attaches to sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males, are much less likely to respond. But with all its limitations, this survey, so far as is known, is of greater depth and detail than anything else that has been done to date, and hopefully the results presented and the issues raised and discussed will encourage other researchers to continue to enlarge this area of inquiry.

Results will be discussed in reference to various tables. In all tables, N=103 indicates the total number of respondents, F=66 shows the number of respondents whose primary sexual attraction is to peer females, M=25 is the number of respondents whose primary attraction is to peer males, and O (other)=12, which for simplicity includes bisexual and minor attracted respondents. Further fractionalization was not felt to be either necessary or helpful. Because N is so close to 100, actual numbers are presented and discussed rather than percentages.

Table 4-1 presents the demographic and other characteristics of the participants. Sexual attraction uses the well known Kinsey classifications, with categories collapsed to 5 and categories for attraction to minors added. Except for the

Table 4-1: Demographics

Age	N	F	M	O
18 – 21	9	7	2	0
22 – 29	11	8	1	2
30 – 39	24	14	8	2
40 – 49	32	21	6	5
50 or more	27	16	8	3
Race				
White	94	59	23	12
Black	0	0	0	0
Asian	1	1	0	0
Latino	2	1	1	0
Other	6	5	1	0
Residence				
United Sates	64	41	15	8
Canada	10	5	4	1
United Kingdom	11	7	3	1
Europe	7	6	0	1
Australia/NZ	6	4	2	0
Other	5	3	1	1
Education				
< 12 years	3	2	1	0
High School Diploma/Equiv	20	7	9	4
Some college	22	14	5	3
Undergraduate degree	29	21	5	3
Master's or Equivalent	23	19	2	2
Doctorate	6	3	3	0

Marital status	N	F	M	O
Single	46	30	12	4
Long term hetero.	28	23	1	4
Long term homo.	13	1	10	2
Separated	3	3	0	0
Divorced	10	7	2	1
Widowed	3	2	0	1
Religion				
Protestant	30	21	4	5
Catholic	28	16	9	3
Other	12	10	1	1
None	33	19	11	3
How religious				
Very	7	6	0	1
Moderate	18	12	3	3
Nominal	22	14	5	3
Minimal	14	9	4	1
Not at all	42	25	13	4
Sexual attraction				
Exclusively peer female	36			
Primarily peer female	30			
Equal peer female/male	8			
Primarily peer male	8			
Exclusively peer male	17			
Prepubescent female	0			
Adolescent female	1			
Prepubescent male	0			
Adolescent male	3			

Table 4-2: Consent

Initial Willingness	N	F	M	O		Capable of Simple Consent	N	F	M	O
Not at all	1	1	0	0		Not at All	9	6	2	1
Not very much	2	2	0	0		Only a little	11	8	2	1
I was unsure	19	12	5	2		Moderately	18	13	3	2
A little bit	27	21	4	2		Very Much	28	19	7	2
Very Much	54	30	16	8		Completely	37	20	11	6
Willingness to Continue						Capable of Informed Consent				
Only had one or two experiences	11	5	3	3		Don't under-stand concept	11	8	2	1
I objected strongly	0	0	0	0		Not at all	13	7	4	2
I objected a little bit	1	1	0	0		Minimally	14	11	1	2
I was passive	8	6	2	0		Moderately	20	13	6	1
I expressed consent	22	17	3	2		Very much	21	13	6	2
I initiated the activities	61	37	17	7		Completely	24	14	6	4
Physically forced						Nature of Consent Given				
Entirely	1	0	1	0		Don't understand concept	8	7	0	1
Very much	0	0	0	0		I objected	2	0	1	1
Moderately	2	1	1	0		I was passive	21	15	4	2
Only a little	8	7	1	0		Entirely simple	12	9	2	1
Not at all	92	58	22	12		Mostly simple	22	12	8	2
						Equal informed and simple	16	10	6	0
Had right to Consent						Mostly informed	6	5	1	0
Explicitly denied	4	2	2	0		Entirely informed	16	8	3	5
Felt did not have	6	4	1	1						
Never came up	38	26	8	4						
Felt did have	49	30	12	7						
Explicitly given	6	4	2	0						

previously noted sexual attraction distribution, there is nothing unusual in the characteristics of the participants. The age distribution is quite broad, but, as is typically the case in

Internet surveys, the racial participation is heavily skewed toward Whites, and there were no Black respondents. Geographically, North America, continental Europe, and the UK account for almost all the respondents. Educational levels also appear to be somewhat above the ordinary.

In Table 4-2, some degree of initial willingness to participate in the sexual aspects of the boyhood relationships was reported by 81 respondents, and some degree of willingness to continue by 83. The presence of some degree of physical force, mostly minor, was reported by 11, whereas 92 reported none. Moderate to complete capability to understand and give simple consent was reported by 83, and moderate to complete capability to understand and give informed consent (as defined in the question) by 65. Active simple and/or informed consent was considered to have been given by 72 of the respondents, while 21 did not object.

Table 4-3 presents the responses to questions pertaining to the quality of the relationship. 13 of the respondents felt that no "bonding" took place, but of the 90 who reported any level whatsoever of emotional connectedness or bonding with the principal older male, there were 67 that characterized this factor as "some" or greater. There were 75 relationships which lasted more than one year. Although not shown in the table, average age at the beginning of the relationships was 12.14 and median was 12.

Reported activities (not shown in a table) with the principal older male included being touched on the genitals (103, a minimum requirement for participation in the survey), touching the older male's genitals (97), receiving masturbation (100), performing masturbation (92), receiving oral sex (78), performing oral sex (76), receiving anal sex (50), and performing anal sex (28).

Table 4-3: Relationship

Age at beginning	N	F	M	O
<7	0	0	0	0
7	6	6	0	0
8	8	6	0	2
9	5	3	1	1
10	4	3	1	0
11	13	10	2	1
12	21	12	8	1
13	17	8	6	3
14	6	3	1	2
15	13	8	4	1
16	6	3	2	1
17	4	4	0	0
Length of relationship				
Less than 6 months	17	10	4	3
> 6 months, < 1 year	11	8	3	0
1 through 2 years	27	19	6	2
3 through 5 years	26	13	8	5
6 through 10 years	8	4	2	2
> 10 years	3	3	0	0
Ongoing	11	9	2	0
Bonding				
Not at all	13	9	3	1
Very little	23	15	6	2
Some	35	21	8	6
Quite a bit	23	13	8	2
Great deal	9	8	0	1

Shared hobbies	N	F	M	O
Not at all	39	26	11	2
Only a little	25	16	6	3
Some	23	15	5	3
A lot	11	5	2	4
Main common interest	5	4	1	0
Help with education				
Never	55	36	13	6
Rarely	18	12	5	1
Fairly often	17	12	4	1
Quite often	12	5	3	4
Extensively	1	1	0	0
Personal development				
Never	35	26	8	1
Rarely	27	14	9	4
Fairly often	24	17	3	4
Quite often	14	8	3	3
Extensively	3	3	0	0
Who chose N/S activities				
Relationship never developed	19	13	4	2
He did	13	11	2	0
He did, considered me	15	10	3	2
Mutual	48	26	16	6
I did, considered him	3	3	0	0
I did	5	3	0	2

Table 4-4: Effects

Importance	N	F	M	O
Only slight	23	19	4	0
Somewhat	13	8	1	4
Moderate	23	15	5	3
Very	31	16	13	2
Extreme	13	8	2	3
Relative importance				
Non-sex major	7	7	0	0
Non-sex much more	4	3	1	0
Non-sex some more	10	6	1	3
Non-sex equal to sex	23	13	7	3
Sex some more	20	11	7	2
Sex much more	22	16	4	2
Sex major	17	10	5	2
Power				
All his	17	11	5	1
Most his, considerate	40	28	8	4
Shared equally	37	21	10	6
Most mine, considerate	8	6	2	0
All mine	1	0	0	1
Child Sexual Abuse				
Not at all	78	50	19	9
A little	18	12	4	2
Some	1	1	0	0
A lot	2	2	0	0
Completely	4	1	2	1

Overall effect	N	F	M	O
Very negative	5	1	3	1
Somewhat negative	8	2	6	0
Neither neg. nor pos.	31	22	6	3
Somewhat positive	34	22	8	4
Very positive	25	14	7	4
Influenced orientation				
Not at all	58	42	12	4
A little	20	17	3	0
Some	12	6	1	5
A lot	8	1	6	1
A whole lot	5	0	3	2
Validity of decision				
Objected	1	0	1	0
Passive	10	6	2	2
Bad decision	4	2	2	0
Reasonable – need more info	17	14	2	1
Good – need more info	22	12	6	4
Good – had sufficient info	17	13	4	0
Good – no misgivings	32	19	8	5
Interference				
None	77	52	17	8
Minimal	16	9	3	4
Some	3	1	2	0
Considerable	3	2	1	0
Excessive	4	2	2	0

In Table 4-4, moderate or greater importance was ascribed to their relationship by 67 respondents. ”Child sexual abuse” of some degree was reported by 25, 18 of whom minimized it as “a little,” whereas 78 completely rejected the idea. Non-negative overall effects were reported by 90, and some degree of positiveness by 59. Little or less influence on adult sexual orientation was reported by 78, and the validity of the decision to engage in sex was characterized as reasonable or better by 88, although many reported that they would have preferred to have had more information available to them. Interference from outside parties was reported as minimal or none by 93.

When considering the results and implications of this investigation, it is necessary to keep constantly in mind that the prevalent victimological “harm” model of sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males has no doubt pervaded the socialization of most – if not all – of the respondents. If this harm model reflected the intrinsic nature of boys, it would seem that these data would consistently support the assumptions and predictions of that model, but this is not the case. Each respondent who views his experiences as other than harmful is, within the anonymity provided in this survey, questioning and essentially rejecting that which society has attempted to infuse into him regarding his sexuality as a boy. It is unlikely, however, that this individual could be convinced to give his testimony in a public venue.

While there were a few very negative and abusive relationships reported, and one text response described being forced to perform oral sex at knifepoint, the data reported herein indicate that most of the respondents entered into their relationships willingly, and many continued them willingly over 2 or more years. Under the guise of “protecting” children, in most western legal systems boys under some arbitrary and variable “age of consent” are considered incom-

petent to make decisions about their own sexuality. Mirkin (1999a) has observed that "...laws seemingly designed for the protection of the young are really intended to control them" (p. 503), but as noted in a previous chapter, legal and theoretical arguments about "willingness" and "simple" versus "informed" consent have and most likely will continue to rage. In addition to these violations of boys' human rights, society attempts to perpetuate ignorance by imposing a blackout of realistic information concerning sexually expressed relationships with older males, but the Internet now provides ways around that blackout and it is very likely that boys are becoming more and more knowledgeable. These repressions and arguments are rendered irrelevant in the case of these respondents, however, by most of them testifying that as boys they not only were quite aware of their sexuality and felt capable of giving or withholding simple and/or informed consent, but that they did, in fact, give such consent and willingly engage in such sexual activity, all in the face of varying degrees of societal hostility and condemnation.

Furthermore, while the older partner was perceived to have somewhat more "power" in the relationship, the respondents reported that this power most generally was used responsibly and benignly. The concept that their relationships constituted any significant degree of "child sexual abuse" was soundly repudiated, and the majority reported that the overall effects of the relationships were positive. There was negligible support for the shopworn myth that such relationships have large influences on adult sexual orientation, although male attracted respondents indicated a somewhat higher effect. The majority felt that their decision to engage in sexual activities was at least reasonable, but a significant number indicated that they would have preferred to have had better access to pertinent information.

Interference in the principal relationship by outside parties was reported as “none” by 77, “minimal” by 16, and “some” or greater by 10. This would seem to infer that even as boys most of these men grasped the desirability and necessity of being very discreet about their sexually expressed relationship with the older male, and were successful in doing so. Furthermore, considering the reported levels of consent and the absence of force, it is logical that this prudence was the result of their own informed decision, and not from pressure from the older male.

Much of what we read in victimologically oriented writings as well as the media concerns men who retrospectively view their sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males as negative and abusive. It is desirable to look into various possibilities for these reported perceptions:

> (a) The complainant may have had no misgivings at the time of his boyhood experiences, but as he became older the pressure to conform to politically and religiously correct social attitudes became overwhelming. It is not at all unusual, as demonstrated by Asch (1955) and Baron, Vandello, & Brunsman (1996), for someone to abandon his own perceptions in order to be seen as normal and acceptable by his associates, friends, and family. This is paralleled by the pervasive brainwashing practiced by various religions which is intended to create acceptance of their particular negative dogma regarding boyhood sexuality. Since most of these religions, with their mutually exclusive mythologies and other world views, hold that all other religions are erroneous or even heretical, it is obvious that they can’t all be right. This leads to the inescapable conclusion that none of these religions can reasonably be expected to have the correct answers to questions about either eternity or boyhood sexuality.

It is also interesting to note that it is not necessary to teach boys that it is inappropriate, for example, to physically hurt another person or to steal that person's property, these concepts are sociobiologically ingrained. But the Boy Scout program (*Scouting*, 2006), as just one example of an apparent trend, finds it necessary to specifically teach boys "to recognize sexual abuse," which is a *de facto* admission that the perception of supposed harm in consensual boyhood sexual contact with other males is not at all intrinsic in human nature, but is a cultural artifact created and promulgated primarily by Western civilizations and religions.

(b) In order to try to obtain monetary compensation from the "abuser," there are those who claim that their boyhood sexual contacts – which some may simply "invent" (Martin, 2003) – were "abuse." This is especially likely if the "abuser" is wealthy, or if the supposed abuse took place in the context of an organization that has resources to pay a substantial settlement, such as the Catholic church.

(c) The complainant may have underlying and unrelated emotional and/or psychological issues, and, perhaps at the suggestion or even urging of his professional mental health consultant, he has seized upon his boyhood sexual contacts as a convenient excuse for all of his other problems. This defense mechanism of blaming others instead of accepting responsibility for one's own problems is well recognized.

(d) The relationship may, in fact, actually have been unwanted, forced, or even severely traumatic, although the data in this study find that to be infrequent.

In a yet unpublished scientific paper based on these data, academic protocol and politeness required that the investigation and data be presented as "supplementing" previous investigations and "balancing" the opposing victimological data. But the facts of the matter are that no known previous unbiased research of this depth has ever been done with nearly as many subjects, and unbiased victimological research simply does not exist. The assumptions of invariable and universal harm in consensual sexually expressed boy/older male relationships come not from reputable scientific investigations and data, but from religiously and politically driven ideologies. And as a faulty and discredited ideology, this "harm" concept deserves to be dumped forthwith on the trash heap of history and replaced with scientifically based and replicable facts and truth.

With only a few exceptions which point to ambiguous or non-consensual experiences, the majority of these men, whose experiences were consensual, have emphatically told us regarding their sexually expressed relationships with older males: "**We were NOT abused!**" It is now time for society to stop abusing boys and their older friends who mutually agree to engage in consensual sexual activities.

Chapter 5: We are NOT abusers!

Reports from boy-attracted pedosexual males

Selected representative comments from respondents to the survey described in this chapter:

> There seems to be precious little research done on what boylovers are really like. I suppose that's because it is so hard to find subjects. ... Most people are more than willing to lump us in with child rapists, and not even try to understand who we really are. I also feel like a [non-boylover] wouldn't even be able to understand how we feel or empathize with us because there is no common frame of reference….

> … the punitive, hysterical, iatrogenic attitudes of society and its victimologists make me believe that … a consummated sexual relationship with a boy might well destroy his life as well as mine, … I am disgusted at … the psychological community classifying boy lovers in the same category as those who rape and murder little girls. I am fearful that things will get worse instead of more rational, and that society will continue to deny that young adolescents (let alone children) have any valid sexual desires or rights to engage in activity without punishment or disgrace.

> When I was young, boys who participated in sex play were not taught to think of themselves as "victims," … and, in my opinion, suffered few if any adverse effects from sexual contacts. Now, in this period of "New Puritanism," I would not have sex with a boy because of the potential adverse consequences for him, not for me. I do not think those adverse consequences arise from the

> sexual activity *per se*, but from the way those activities are regarded in the context of contemporary culture.
>
> As I've gotten older, my respect for the emotional security of boys has become paramount and I won't create situations where a younger person feels coerced, encouraged or pressured to engage in behavior they may not voluntarily enter into. Sexual activity is secondary to my desires to form strong bonds with boys and to help them become healthy happy adults.
>
> I want to say that this [survey] is a most wonderful thing. It's a great relief to be able to say to people "I'm a pedosexual," and that for once people's right-wing morals aren't influencing their making of this survey. I can't change what I am or what I'm attracted too, but at least now I can be more honest and open about who I like.
>
> Who would make the best teachers, the best caregivers, the best coaches, the best parents for boys but those people that adore them, that live for them, and that love them more than anything else in this world? That, you see, is our purpose, to help boys; [sex] of any nature is so rare, and so unusual, and so limited it is hardly of any consequence at all to either party.

The difficulty in finding and communicating with appropriate Boy-attracted Pedosexual Male (BPM) research subjects is much different than the problems locating former loved boys that were described in the preceding chapter. A simple Google search of the Internet will turn up multitudes of websites as well as several discussion forums with names like BoyChat.org, Boylover.net, etc. But while some of the websites seem to be the work of rational and intelligent people, many are otherwise. And each site generally represents the views of only one person, so for research purposes,

and especially statistically based research, such sites are not very useful. There are many participants in the various forums, but it doesn't take much reading to figure out that the vast majority of them represent only the loose cannons and lunatic fringes of BPM, although there are occasionally transient sprinklings of rational and intelligent people and discussions in these venues as well.

However, over a decade of searching and evaluating has determined that "http://www.boylinks.net" is one point of contact where a researcher can interact with a much more diverse population of males who recognize their sexual attraction to boys, many of whom in past investigations (e.g., Riegel, 2004) have shown themselves to be intelligent, educated, introspective, and articulate. These people rarely, if ever, put up websites or post on forums, they just, to use Internet slang, "lurk" on the periphery. But, given the opportunity to express themselves with complete and guaranteed anonymity, they will come forward in statistically significant numbers, as they have done on various occasions in the past, and as they did for this current survey.

The origins of this survey are rather unusual, in that it began with a request from a member of the victimologically oriented "Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers." The request included evaluating a proposed classification system which essentially consisted of "bad, worse, and worst." That scheme, of course, was completely unacceptable, and a counterproposal was made, which, after a long series of email exchanges, resulted in the "typology" which follows. Amazingly, the parties that made the request actually presented and discussed this typology in their state meeting, and one of them made an unsuccessful attempt to present it at their national convention. So there are at least one or two victimologists who are capable of seeing the "other" side of this issue. Here is that typology, which has

now been published in various places, including a Spanish translation (Riegel, 2006):

> It is a given in all of the proposed classes that the subjects are Boy-attracted Pedosexual Males (BPM), i.e., males who are, in fact, sexually attracted to prepubescent and/or early to mid adolescent boys who are a minimum of about 3 years younger than the subject. Attractions to older adolescents with whom sexually expressed relationships would be better described as homosexuality are excluded. The classes are not meant to be absolute or exclusive, but to constitute a continuum where one class grades into the next. Behaviors may be either isolated or recurring, and not all characteristics are required for inclusion in a given class. Any given individual may have concurrent or consecutive relationships in different classes.
>
> Class 1: Sexual attraction may be self-recognized, or it may be repressed or otherwise rejected. Either way, typically there is an absolute belief that any degree of sexual contact with a boy is "wrong," often on the basis of cultural attitudes of morality, religion or other values. While there may be realization that a boy may have a desire for sexual experimentation, it is assumed that such activity is inherently harmful under any circumstances, and such overtures are summarily rejected. However, a form of respect may be present, and a degree of bonding and/or a mentoring relationship may develop.
>
> Class 2: Sexual attraction is probably self-recognized, and there is a desire to respect a boy's wishes. But out of fear of the consequences, engagement in any level of sexual experimentation, exploration, and/or play with a boy is rejected. However, regardless of the absence of sexual expression, respect for the boy is high, and a degree of

bonding and/or mentoring may develop. If the fear of consequences somehow were to be mitigated, this individual might find himself in one of the classes from 3 though 6.

Class 3: Sexual attraction is most probably self-recognized, and, if there is enticement or solicitation by a boy, sexual experimentation, exploration, and/or play may take place, depending on all pertinent circumstances. Typically, a significant degree of bonding and/or mentoring develops, the boy's sensual pleasure and well-being are of overriding concern, and the desire for physical gratification by the BPM, while variable, tends to be minimal. The boy's decisions are respected, and occurrences are limited to those times and activities which are initiated or approved by the boy. There is an awareness of potential consequences, but either a spontaneous or calculated decision is made to proceed.

Class 4: Sexual attraction is self-recognized, and, if a boy is perceived to be showing any degree of interest in consensual sexual experimentation, exploration, and/or play, such activities may be suggested or promoted by the BPM, depending on all pertinent circumstances. Typically, a moderate degree of bonding and/or mentoring may develop, the boy's sensual pleasure and well-being are of major concern, and the desire for orgasmic gratification of the BPM, while variable, tends to be secondary. The boy's decisions are respected, and occurrences are limited to those times and activities which are acceptable to the boy and within his level of comfort. There is an awareness of potential consequences, but a calculated decision is made to proceed.

Class 5: Sexual attraction is self-recognized, and, given any reasonable opportunity with a boy who is perceived

not to be actively opposed to the idea, sexual experimentation, exploration, and/or play of a consensual nature may be promoted or initiated, depending on all pertinent circumstances. Typically, a minor degree of bonding and/or mentoring may develop, the boy's sensual pleasure and well-being are of concern, but orgasmic gratification of the BPM may be a significant factor as well. To a large degree the boy's wishes are taken into consideration, and occurrences are limited to those times and activities to which the boy does not object. Emotional pressure and verbal cajoling are at most minimal, but monetary or other inducements may be offered. There is an awareness of potential consequences, but a calculated decision is made to proceed.

Class 6: Sexual attraction is self-recognized, there are blatant attempts to seduce or entice any available boy into sexual activities, or a boy prostitute may be sought. Typically, any degree of bonding and/or mentoring is minimal, the emotional and/or orgasmic gratification of the BPM is primary, and the boy's willingness, sensual pleasure, and well-being are of lesser concern. Emotional pressure, verbal cajoling, and monetary or other inducements may be employed to achieve the desired ends, and to assure that the boy will not report the incident(s) to others. Playful touching intended to stimulate arousal may occur, but the use of any significant degree of physical force to obtain acquiescence is absent. There is an awareness of potential consequences, but a calculated decision is made to proceed.

Class 7: This class encompasses those who use gross physical force to obtain gratification that to some degree may be sexual, but which also may be just as much, or more, based on a need to exercise malevolent power over another person, and to derive pleasure from their suf-

fering. Kidnappers, rapists, torturers, and murderers would be classified here.

After the presentation at the state meeting mentioned above, it was suggested that the typology should be validated by a survey of those to whom it applies, and the results of that survey form the basis for this chapter. Other than the method of recruiting respondents, the same protocols and procedures described in the preceding chapter were used, and thus will not be repeated here.

Since this survey was shorter and simpler than the one in the previous chapter, and was "advertised" on a link site that is also watched by those who are prone to attempt disruption of any such investigation, a larger number of responses were rejected because the respondents were under 18 or the responses were chaotic. However, of the 572 responses received, 517 were judged to be valid. This relatively high response may have been encouraged by the brevity of the questionnaire, by the rare opportunity for the respondents to express themselves openly on these very personal and controversial issues to an ostensibly qualified researcher, and/or by the credibility the researcher has developed over the years with this population through previous research and publications.

Participants, as shown in Tables 5-1 & 5-2, varied widely in age from 18 to over 60, but nearly half were under 30. Over 50% of the responses originated in the United States, but there is good representation from other areas of the English speaking world as well. Participants reported being generally psychologically well-adjusted as well as well-educated, with nearly half holding an undergraduate or higher degree. Over half of the respondents were rarely or never influenced by religious beliefs. Even though this is an anonymous

Table 5-1: Demographics

Age		Education	
18-21	16.8%	<7 years	0.2%
22-25	13.9%	7-9 years	0.8%
26-30	15.3%	10-11 years	5.2%
31-40	23.4%	High School Dip./Eq.	26.9%
41-50	16.1%	13-16	17.2%
>50	14.5%	Undergraduate Degree	29.6%
		Advanced Degree	20.1%
Race			
White	90.5%	Economic Status	
Latino	5.8%	Poverty	3.1%
Asian	2.3%	Below average	22.8%
Black	0.8%	Average	47.0%
Other	0.6%	Above average	24.6%
		Wealthy	2.5%
Location			
United States	52.4%	Marital Status	
Continental Europe	19.7%	Single	72.7%
United Kingdom	8.7%	Long term Hetero.	13.5%
Australia/NZ	5.6%	Long term Homo.	6.4%
Canada	3.7%	Separated, divorced	6.8%
Asia	1.9%	Widowed	0.6%
Other	7.9%		
		Children	
Religion		None	84.7%
Protestant	21.9%	One	7.4%
Catholic	19.7%	Two	5.0%
Jewish	2.7%	Three	1.6%
Muslim	0.4%	Four or more	1.4%
Other	22.1%		
None	33.3%	Political and social views using US definitions	
		Very conservative	6.0%
Influence of religion		Mildly conservative	17.0%
Strong	4.8%	Moderate	20.7%
Frequent	18.8%	Mildly liberal	25.9%
Occasional	20.9%	Very liberal	30.4%
Rare	14.9%		
Never	40.6%		

Notes: In this and other tables, totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 5-2: Mental Health, Coping, Feelings, Stress

General Mental Health		Cope with everyday problems
Extremely poor 0.2%		Poorly..... 1.4%
Very poor..... 3.1%		Not very well 9.7%
Less than average..... 15.9%		Fairly well 40.8%
Average..... 23.8%		Very well..... 37.5%
Above average 17.0%		Extremely well 10.6%
Very good 23.4%		
Excellent 16.6%		
Comfort levels about BPM		Degree of stress of being BP
Completely comf..... 25.0%		Not noticeable 10.1%
Moderately comf..... 23.6%		Minimal..... 22.2%
Somewhat comf..... 12.6%		Minor 22.4%
Mixed feelings 21.1%		Moderate..... 18.2%
Somewhat uncomf..... 7.4%		Considerable 19.3%
Moderately uncomf..... 5.8%		Functionally impaired 5.0%
Extremely uncomf..... 4.6%		Dysfunctional..... 2.7%

convenience sample and is subject to self-selection biases and other limitations thereof, the broad age and geographical bases and the relatively large sample size would seem to indicate an acceptable degree of representativeness.

Table 5-3 reports the self-classification of the respondents at the seven reported age levels. Reports of attraction under age 18 offered the option “I do not feel that, at under age 18, I understood my attraction, motivations, or behaviors well enough to select a class,” and respondents at the other age groups over 21 were able to report “I am not yet this old.” The “N” for each reporting age is the number who selected one of the seven classes.

While not discussed in this book, seven specific traits were selected that vary in a more or less linear and parallel manner through the seven classes of the typology, and the respondents were asked to rate themselves for each of these traits. When these traits were statistically compared to the self-

classifications, in most cases there was a very significant positive level of correlation. The minor exceptions in correlation were the result of a few nonlinear issues.

Table 5-3: Self-reported classifications (%) at indicated ages

Age/Class	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<18	419	12.9	12.2	26.5	22.9	16.2	7.4	1.9
18-21	517	13.9	19.5	26.9	22.4	13.7	3.3	0.2
22-25	423	10.4	23.6	29.3	23.6	10.6	2.4	0.0
26-30	356	8.7	26.1	27.3	25.6	10.4	2.0	0.0
31-40	275	8.7	24.0	29.8	26.6	9.5	1.5	0.0
41-50	156	7.1	28.2	23.7	28.9	9.6	2.6	0.0
>50	77	3.9	29.9	28.6	22.1	11.7	3.9	0.0

Table 5-4: Reported number (not %) of contacts with boys

Class of Contact		0	1	2-3	4-6	7-10	>10	PNA
1	Non Sexual	294	30	58	35	8	61	31
2		266	38	70	39	17	57	30
3	May be Sexual	255	59	90	41	19	23	30
4		302	45	62	33	21	25	29
5		370	31	37	17	13	21	28
6		434	15	15	7	7	12	27
7		475	7	4	1	1	2	27

Note: “PNA” indicates the respondent preferred not to answer.

Table 5-4 reports the lifetime number of boys with whom the respondent had contacts. Columns show the number of contacts, while rows show the class which best characterizes each of those contacts. A report in classes 3 through 7 does not necessarily mean that sex actually took place, only that the conditions and situation were such that sex could have occurred. Respondents were instructed “Multiple experiences with a given boy only count as one, and each boy should only be included in one class, the one that best typifies the relationship.”

Because some of the contact number definitions cover a range, and the ">10" definition is open ended, a specific total of contacts cannot be derived. An approximation could run from a low of 4,400 to a high of 5,400 or greater. Generally speaking, however, those reporting contacts in the "7-10" plus ">10" columns in the sexually active classes comprise some 25% of the total number of respondents, but account for over 35% of the total sexual contacts. Those reporting contacts in the "1" through "4-6" columns in the sexually active classes average in the vicinity of 3 contacts each.

While very few respondents identified themselves at Class 7, and these only in the younger two age groups, there is a significant number of reported contacts in that class. This suggests, as has been mentioned elsewhere, that any given individual on occasion may exhibit behaviors outside his self-defined class.

Table 5-5 describes the respondents feelings "about the laws, enforcement, and punishments that society currently employs." Impressions regarding classes 3, 4, and 5 were combined in one question, since these classes are rather similar, varying only in the degree of initiation and willingness on the part of the boy.

Table 5-5: Views of laws, enforcement, and punishments.

Behavioral Classes:	3, 4, &5	6	7
Completely fair and appropriate	6.7%	33.1%	71.9%
Moderately fair and appropriate	6.9%	24.2%	12.5%
Somewhat fair and appropriate	9.4%	12.1%	4.9%
Mixed feelings	24.7%	15.3%	5.8%
Somewhat unfair and inappropriate	16.5%	4.8%	1.0%
Moderately unfair and inappropriate	15.5%	5.9%	1.5%
Completely unfair and inappropriate	20.4%	4.7%	2.5%

These respondents are heavily in favor of the current punishments handed out for Class 7 behaviors, but somewhat less rigidly in favor of those for Class 6. However, for Classes 3, 4, and 5, over half feel they are "unfair and inappropriate" to a greater or lesser degree, while another one quarter have mixed feeling, which may revolve around the specifics of any individual situation.

Table 5-6 reports encounters with law enforcement experienced by respondents.

Table 5-6: Law enforcement encounters.

I have had no problems whatsoever.	70.6%
I came under suspicion, but I was never contacted.	10.7%
I was questioned but not arrested	7.2%
I was arrested but released without going to trial	1.5%
I was tried but acquitted`	1.0%
I entered into a plea bargain, but was not imprisoned	2.6%
I was convicted but not imprisoned	2.5%
I entered into a plea bargain, and was sent to prison	1.8%
I was convicted and sent to prison	2.1%

Considering the sample as a whole, some 88% of the respondents have never been arrested, 9% have entered into a plea bargain or been convicted, and less than 4% have actually been imprisoned. However, when separately considering the "sexually active" classes 3 through 7, such percentages cannot be derived in as precise a manner because respondents' self-designation may vary into or out of the sexually active classes from one reporting age to another. Nevertheless, an overview of relevant cross tabulations indicates that more than 9 out of 10 of these sexually active BPM have never been incarcerated, and nearly 4 out of 5 have never had judicial encounters with the law. If, as the analyses of Table 5-3 seem to indicate, a sexually active BPM typically has contacts with 3 different boys, and if the 1 out of 5 who has legal problems is charged with contact with

only one boy, then roughly 14 of 15 such contacts remain free from outside interference.

Although they have intensified in the last few years, the present inquisitorial societal attitudes concerning sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males have been with us for well over a decade, covering the period when more than half of the respondents were 15 or more years of age. But in spite of this aggressive probing and pursuit by the authorities and the media, it appears that some 14 of 15 such relationships are known only to the two principals. It would seem to be a reasonable conjecture that boys, as they embark upon their instinctive exploration of their developing sexuality, become cognizant early on of social disapproval of such activities. Consequently, and in all probability out of desire to avoid conflict and punishment rather than as a result of an artificial "shame" some would postulate, they quickly learn to refrain from disclosing their sexual involvements – especially those with BPM – to anyone who might react negatively. Over 2,500 boys chose to engage in such relationships with Clarence Osborne over a twenty year period (Wilson, 1981), and not one of them ever lodged a complaint on his own.

The current media witch hunts and the state of "pedophile panic" (Levine, 2002) create a climate in which conducting rational scientific investigations into sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males is very difficult, and the combining of many divergent and factually unrelated issues under one heading exacerbates the problems. Such boy/older male relationships deserve to be considered separately from "pedophilia," a label which was never adequately or accurately defined as a scientific term in the first place, and which has now degenerated into a pejorative epithet. There also needs to be an awareness that all BPM are not alike, and an even greater emphasis that so-called "pedophilia" and "boy-

love" are essentially completely different issues. Real child sexual abuse does exist, and when it occurs it is reprehensible and indefensible. Most Class 7 behaviors and some Class 6 behaviors may legitimately constitute such abuse, and these incidents are usually the ones trumpeted by the media as defining all BPM relationships. But both academia and the public need to recognize that such misconduct cannot properly be assumed to be representative of all, or even most, BPM behaviors, any more than the occasional rapist is representative of all heterosexuals.

The 517 respondents to the current survey cannot be dismissed as psychopathic misfits; they tend instead to be generally well-adjusted, educated, employed, and otherwise ordinary everyday citizens who recognize their sexual attraction to boys, and who were sufficiently informed and concerned about these issues to participate voluntarily in this research. As noted before, most do not see consensual sexually expressed relationships between boys and older males as intrinsically harmful, and many are puzzled and frustrated in trying to comprehend how what they intuitively see as normal and beneficial relationships are somehow misperceived by society as abnormal, harmful, and criminal.

There always have been – and always will be – those who obstreperously cling to an outmoded and superceded past, who resist demythologization and social progress, and who summarily reject the results of any scientific investigations which they find to be inconvenient (e. g. Lilienfeld, 2002; Schlessinger, 1999; Spiegel, 2000, etc.). Nevertheless, in the last several decades most sexual norms have become much less restrictive and condemnatory as ethnocentric "moral" positions, "wrongness" based on religion, obsolescent political ideologies, etc., have been found to lack credibility when critically examined by both academia and an enlightened public. Boyhood intermale sexuality is one of the few re-

maining taboos in which these anachronisms have not yet been supplanted by some measure of rationality and reason; therefore careful and in depth academic and professional investigations (Oellerich, 2000), as well as both academic and public discussions based on empirical facts, are essential in order to develop realistic norms which more accurately reflect intrinsic human nature. Furthermore, scientific integrity requires that past prejudices be put aside and that open-minded consideration be given to the possibility that consensual sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males, if they were to be freed from what Constantine (1981) described as "psychonoxious" societal iatrogenic influences, might in fact be found to be benign, or even positive, rather than harmful as currently assumed. There have been many descriptive, analytical, cross-cultural, and historical studies (e. g. Ford & Beach, 1951; Rind et al., 1998; Percy, 1996; Sandfort, 1987; Tindall, 1978; etc.) which suggest this positivism.

Chapter 6: Media Mania, Mythology, and Pedophile Panic

Contemporary values are embodied in "conventional wisdom," "public opinion," and "public perception," which are similar, perhaps to some degree interchangeable, concepts, all of which, however are both reported and driven by the media. In the case of sexually expressed boy/older male relationships, the media seems to understand only one paradigm, i.e., that of a "pedophile" who has "molested" a boy "victim" who is terribly "harmed" by the experience, and who is in dire need of aggressive "treatment." This stereotypical monster of a pedophile who has molested this boy must, of course, be severely punished if justice is to be achieved and society protected. And, since this paradigm excludes as well as includes, there is no consideration given to the possibility that the encounter might have been consensual, that the boy saw himself not as a victim but as a willing participant or even initiator, that he did not see himself as having been harmed, that he did not welcome outside intervention, or that he might not have felt any need of treatment.

Newspapers, TV, and other media also leave much to be desired in diligently searching for and reporting objective truth and factual reality when it comes to individual incidents of boyhood sexuality. The "harm" theory of consensual boy/older male sexual contact, which is claimed by a wide range of essentially radical and self-serving factions to be universally accepted, is given journalistic priority in order to conform with the perceived preferences of advertisers and subscribers. Social critic Philip Jenkins (1998), in describing the victimological model of "child sex abuse" lists "therapists and psychiatrists, criminal-justice administrators, women's groups, sexual reformers and libertarians, and moral traditionalists and conservatives" as those who promote this notion, and further implicates "the news media and

popular fiction or academic or professional sources" as the means by which this doctrine is promulgated (p. 5).

Nowhere is this stereotyping more openly expressed than on the American television network NBC in its popular series *To Catch a Predator.* In this series, those who are entrapped by adults posing as teens while attempting to make contact through the Internet with younger teenage boys or girls are exposed as generally unstable, out-of-control, and highly dangerous psychopaths (Salkin, 2006). The series' portrayals offer no qualifications or cautions that these victims may not be typical, implying that all men attracted to minors in general and underage boys in particular can be so characterized. The lack of differentiation and any semblance of balance in these media portrayals can be understood as a product of the moral panic that has surrounded this issue over the last three decades, along with the media's attempt to capitalize upon this panic through sensationalism.

One examination of some 600 media articles about boy/older male sexual encounters on a web site which no longer exists indicated that a few appear to report genuine predation and molestation, but a majority give little convincing evidence that the contacts were seen as other than willing and consensual by the boys themselves. It is generally the unwanted intrusion of adults into a boy's relationship through a chance discovery or inappropriate snooping into his private affairs that precipitates an investigation. But once police and other agencies get wind of a "pedophile," their well known strong-arm tactics for extracting "statements" come into play, and boys are pressured to say, under the most odious of duress and in a desperate effort to get out from under the merciless pressure, whatever their tormenters want to hear. Another tactic used on boys who resist surrendering is the covert threat of public exposure of their willing "homosexual" activities with an older male, i.e., that they are "gay." The

police and media then tend to come up with the spin that the boy(s) "came forward" and "told" about the relationship(s) when it is much more likely that they made admissions – or repeated what they had been told to say – simply to escape from further intimidation.

Therefore one rarely sees the words "willing" or "consensual" in a news story, instead, an assortment of pejorative terms such as predator, molester, victim, assault, etc., are paraded before the readers, and the older partners in these relationships most often are portrayed as depraved "monsters" (Wilson, 1981). Nevertheless, these older partners seem to be motivated by a high level of empathy with boys, an understanding, appreciation, and acceptance of boys' sexual curiosity, and a willingness to accommodate such inquisitiveness. Little or no evidence is reported that indicates they are otherwise exceptional, although educators, youth workers, and other professionals do tend to be disproportionately represented. But even with the omissions, pejorations, and obfuscations employed by the media, careful and critical reading "between the lines" can usually sort out the few "predatory" incidents from those which are of a primarily consensual nature.

But the claimed universal acceptance of the harm theory is suspect; in as yet unpublished data from research conducted in a manner similar to that described in chapter 4, there are indications that significant percentages of people do not agree with many of the assertions of victimology. In this survey, 125 males and 49 females responded to the invitations which were posted on randomly chosen newsgroups to participate in this questionnaire. The format was a series of hypothetical sexual encounters between boys and peers, or boys and significantly older males, with various combinations of younger and older partners, as well as initiation of the activities by either the younger or the older. Participants

responded to multiple choice questions about each scenario, evaluating their perception of various aspects of the hypothetical encounters, including level of consent, likelihood of intrinsic harm, and need for parental involvement.

From 62 to 85% of the respondents endorsed the concept that consent at least on a "meaningful" level as defined in the questionnaire (3, on a scale of 1 through 5), was in fact given by the younger partner, the percentage varying with the age of the older partner and the age differential. Also depending on situations and ages, from 22 to 65% felt that intrinsic harm could be described as minimal (2, on a scale of 1 through 5) or less within the pairings with at least a 5 year age difference, rising to 88% when both partners were minors within 1 year of each other. Once again depending on situations and ages, the need for parental or other involvement was seen as less than "probable" (4, on a scale of 1 through 5) by 22 to 81% where one partner was legally an adult, 86% when both partners were minors, and 87% when they were peer minors. In view of these findings, the victimological assertion of omnipresent harm cannot be considered in any way to be universally accepted, and the media are not reporting the truth when they make the claim that "everybody" accepts the harm theory.

A model of how people think about their world is proposed by Tetlock, McGraw, & Kristel (2003) in which they posit that people act as intuitive scientists trying to understand their world, or as intuitive economists trying to figure out how to get the most benefit out of a given situation. They then go on to suggest that sometimes people dismiss rational scientific or economic thinking in favor of moral conformance:

> Ordinary people often resist the normative prescriptions of models anchored in the intuitive scientist-economist

> frameworks, even when these prescriptions have been carefully spelled out for them. We argue here that this resistance should not always be written off as incorrigible closed-mindedness. In some situations, people are better thought of not as intuitive scientists or economists but rather as intuitive theologians who are trying to protect sacred values from secular encroachments. ... According to this sacred-value-protection model, certain categories of mental operations are anathema and off-limits because they require us to assign explicit finite valuations to values that our moral communities tell us should be treated as absolute, unquestionable, and unqualified commitments. People are just not supposed to think in certain ways, and as soon as one senses that others have broken the taboo, they become targets of moral outrage (as, indeed, so do those members of one's moral community who fail to censure those who violate the taboo – there is a meta-norm to enforce norms). And, as soon as you sense that you yourself have started to stray down a proscribed mental pathway and begun to think the unthinkable, you are supposed not only to stop but to morally cleanse yourself: to reaffirm your commitment to shared values and your status as a member in good standing of the moral standing of the community (p. 248)

The moral-based belief that certain sexual behaviors are sinful, deviate and sick is a man-made sociological construct with no basis in biology or nature. Behaviors that are considered immoral and deviate in one culture are practiced and encouraged in another (Ford and Beach, 1951). The real issue is whether certain behaviors are intrinsically physically or psychologically harmful to the individuals involved – not whether the behavior conforms to some sex-negative absolutist code that was arbitrarily established millennia ago.

The misopedic sexophobia that currently is manifested in the hysteria over so-called “child sex abuse” has a long history, beginning with the waning of the relatively sexophilic Greco-Roman eras and the subsequent ascendancy of the sexophobic Christian mythology, which in turn evolved from the sexophobic Jewish mythology. Beginning with Paul/Saul of Tarsus, this mythology took the position that sexuality was an evil to be tolerated only in adults for the purpose of reproduction. These negative sexual attitudes of Western culture were reinforced by the teachings of Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo, North Africa, who around 400CE created the myth of sex as “original sin” and included the notion that sin is transmitted from generation to generation by the act of procreation (Crompton, 2003). He believed that all sex was sinful and evil because it was of the physical world, not the spiritual world. Only sex for procreation was tolerated out of necessity, but even married people, however, were not supposed to enjoy themselves. This extremely sex negative belief system became an integral part of Christian mythology, with even protestant reformers such as Calvin and Luther drawing their ideas from Augustine, and the perverse war on human sexuality by the church has continued to this day unabated.

With antisexuality firmly established as a principal tenet of Christian beliefs, a whole range of sexual myths were imposed on society over the following centuries by the church and various social institutions in an effort to stamp out humanity's polymorphic sexual proclivities outside of procreation. For instance, it was once believed that childhood masturbation caused mental illness and physical disorders in children. Americans spent over two hundred years trying to stamp out this behavior by employing various forms of mental and physical punishments before finally realizing that teaching sexual guilt was psychologically harmful. Allowing children to fantasize about sex and play doctor is actually

beneficial, for it establishes a healthy psychological foundation for a guilt free and happy sex life based on love and mutual respect.

Even with the fragmentation of the adherents of Christian mythology into uncounted sects, almost all maintained the inherent evil of sexuality in any form, and even more so in children. These delusions have only grudgingly yielded to enlightenment beginning slowly in the early 20th century, and accelerating through the latter half. The concept that sex outside of legally and/or religiously sanctioned marriage is monstrous sin is now held only by the most unenlightened and regressive; consensual adult homosexuality, while still covertly – and sometimes overtly – persecuted, is no longer formally considered either a psychopathology or a crime, and even boyhood masturbation has emerged from demonization. The last vestige of two millennia of gross sexual repressions, the relict "last taboo" that is yet to be extirpated, is that of childhood sexuality, and more explicitly sexually expressed boy/older male relationships.

Between the superstitions, religions and other various mythologies, the pseudo sub-discipline of victimology, the profit motivated "child sex abuse industry," fawning politicians grubbing for votes, and money-hungry media both promoting and pandering to the lynch mob mentality, it is little wonder that the present hysterical "Moral Panic" (Jenkins, 1998) is so entrenched. Judith Levine (2002), in her chapter on "Manhunt: The Pedophile Panic," notes:

> Hear the word *pedophile* and images and ideas flood to mind. Pedophiles are predatory and violent … insatiable and incurable … [they] abduct and murder children … [and] are legion, well organized, and cunning. (pp. 22-23)

> The problem with all this information about pedophiles is that most of it is not true, or is so qualified as to be useless as generalization. (p. 24)
>
> Pedophiles are not generally violent … [and] very rarely use force or cause physical injury… (p. 25)

When considering all the widely diverse elements that are indiscriminately lumped together under the pejorative heading of pedophilia, one is prone to think of the tongue-in-cheek description of a camel as a racehorse designed by a committee. In the jargon which currently seems to be in vogue, let's "deconstruct" that camel and examine both its components and its creators, i.e., those like Finkelhor (1981) who originated victimological theory and the basis for the "child sex abuse industry."

First, even the word itself is corrupted and misused. "Pedophilia" (or "paedophilia" if one happens to be under the spell of the Queen's English), comes from the Greek *pais* (παίς, child or youth, not gender specific, the combining form is *paedo* or *pedo*) and *philia* (φιλία, friendly love or affection – it would be *eros* (ερως) if it meant physical or sexual love) (Liddell, 1888). So pedophilia is by etymology the non-sexual love of a child or youth – not sexual lust after a minor, as it has been corrupted in today's usage. Every parent, grandparent, uncle, and aunt is – or at least should be – a pedophile.

Now let's look at the incredibly broad and indiscriminate brush which is used to paint the picture of pedophilia and the pedophile as these terms are currently abused. Consider the following two scenarios:

> (1) A father has forced vaginal intercourse with his eight-year-old stepdaughter. The little girl attempts to resist,

she screams but either is not heard or is ignored, she is in pain, and she is bleeding. She desperately tries to get away, but she is unsuccessful in escaping her torment, and this trauma is repeated time and again. She is only able to bring this very real abuse to an end several years later when she leaves home. This is a composite of various incidents of which I have heard and/or read.

(2) A fully clothed boy insistently rubs his genital area against his significantly older cousin's knee, and the cousin impulsively tickles the boy's crotch in return. The boy smiles and giggles, and later returns to ask "Do it some more, I like it!" At the boy's coaxing this continues over time, and he eventually succeeds in persuading his cousin to masturbate him to orgasm. These and other related consensual sexual activities continue over the next several years, but gradually draw to a close by mutual agreement in the boy's mid-teens. The boy finishes university, marries, and now has a profession, a family and a happy, stable life. He and his cousin have remained close friends, and both retain fond memories of their "secret." Some details have been changed and others omitted in order to protect the subjects, but this is essentially a story which is known to be true.

In the eyes of the victimologists, the "child sex abuse industry," and, regretfully, the law, both of these men are "pedophiles," and both of the scenarios involve a "perpetrator," a "victim," and "child sexual abuse." Both cases would be prosecuted with equal vigor in most – if not all – jurisdictions, and both would result in draconian sentences. In the first scenario, such punishment would, from a cursory examination of the stated facts, seem to be quite justified. However, in the second case, interference undoubtedly would have been traumatic for the boy and destructive for his extended family. It would have probably sent the cousin to

jail for decades, if not for the rest of his life, adding even further guilt trauma for the boy and possibly derailing his educational, career, and marital hopes.

More than one older boy or man involved in nothing more – and often considerably less – than the second scenario is presently serving a substantial prison term that, apart from questionable societal wrongfulness, has absolutely no justification in that actual harm caused by the relationship was never demonstrated, only assumed. Evidence from study after study (e.g., Bernard, 1985; Rind et al., 1998; Sandfort, 1987; Wilson, 1981; etc., etc.) indicates that there is minimal, if any, harm to a boy from his consensual sexual relationships with an older male. So if the boy is harmed, it is most probably from the inappropriate and overblown reactions of parents, teachers, law enforcement personnel, counselors, etc., rather than from the relationship itself (Constantine, 1981).

In previous chapters, we have heard from men who had boyhood sexual experiences with older males, and the vast majority reported these experiences as benign or positive. We have heard from men who recognize that they are sexually attracted to boys, and the majority of them are completely celibate for personal reasons or because of societal taboos, and most of those who do – or would – cooperate with a boy in sexual exploration and play only do so at the boy's invitation or active cooperation. We have heard from people who in significant percentages do not accept the universal harm theory. So why, in the context of these empirical facts, and if people like Levine and so many others have demonstrated the harmlessness of consensual sex between children and older people, does the media-mediated state of lynch mob hysteria about childhood sexuality still prevail?

Chapter 7: Plato's Shadow

The relationship of adult male homosexuality to boylove.

This chapter is not an attack on the "gay" community, nor is it in any sense a condemnation of sexual practices between adult males. Neither bigoted politicians, religious radicals, nor other homophobes will find any support herein for their campaigns of hate and hysteria against gays. What is to be investigated are the underlying principles of homosexual practices and their source and derivation.

Up until the middle of the twentieth century, overt and active homosexuality was relatively unheard of throughout most of the world. There were a few glimmerings here and there, but it was only in the late 1950s and 1960s that homosexuality burst upon the public consciousness. But since that time, some aspect of gay culture – the latest being gay "marriage" – has been constantly in the news. The true size of the "gay community" is nearly impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy, but there are enough energetic activists to at least give the impression that large numbers of practicing homosexual males exist in the nation and in the world. Another difficult question is if the gay movement has passed its peak, if the number of new "converts" is decreasing, and if the movement itself is beginning to wane. Gay activists will assert that the movement is alive and growing, but a recent unsuccessful attempt to gather empirical data resulted in only a few respondents, and found a preponderance of older people.

If male homosexuality is, as is claimed by gay activists, a separate and common sexual orientation, how did it go from almost complete obscurity to social prominence in the few short decades since World War II? Or to put the question another way, if this is a sexual orientation that evolved with

the human race, why and how has it apparently been almost totally invisible until the last half century? Where has it been hiding? If we apply only the smallest estimate of the percentage of males who are claimed to be homosexual to national or world populations, the numbers run into the tens of millions. Even under the most repressive of religious and cultural regimes, it would seem impossible that these multitudes could exist nearly completely unnoticed in generation after generation, century after century.

There are books and web sites devoted to subjects such as "Gay Men ... who Enriched the World" (Cowan, 1966) and "Gay American History" (Katz, 1976). But in actuality, the general historical record has relatively little to say on the subject of adult male homosexuality, and the vast majority of proposed examples turn out to have been relationships between a prepubescent or adolescent boy and an adult male, not two adult males. Conversely, however, history does abound in sexually expressed relationships between adolescent and younger boys with older males; there are numerous well documented examples from classical Greece (Percy, 1996) through Wilfred Owen (Hibberd, 1986), and right up to modern times (Davidson, 1988), just to mention a few.

When considering the gay experience, one must understand that there are an infinite number of variables, and that only the widest of generalizations are possible. The passing, "one-nighter" gay sexual encounter is not the focus of this discussion, but rather relationships that at least have the potential for some measure of permanence. One issue is that of "equality," i.e., is this to be a relationship of equals, or is there to be, at least to some degree, a "dominant" partner and a "submissive" one in a relationship that is essentially unequal, but nevertheless acceptable to both parties, and more importantly to the one who accepts the submissive role.

While most sexually expressed relationships by nature are not egalitarian, they can still be complementary and workable. Each partner assumes a distinct function, plays a particular part, and these hopefully complement one another. But even within this paradigm, there can be extremes varying from near egalitarianism to almost total dominance of one partner by the other. The extent to which each partner understands and accepts his role is important, as is whether the more dominant expresses his power benignly or arrogantly.

Heterosexuality has the obvious purpose and end of the reproduction which is necessary for the continuance of the human race. But the fact that adult male homosexuality does not seem to address a generalized social need or purpose is one more reason to inquire into the explosion of gay visibility in the last half century. Is it possible that the capacity for adult male homosexuality has been present for all of recorded history, but until recently rarely has been expressed? This seems highly unlikely, for the other major sexual options – heterosexuality and pedosexuality – have been visible to a greater or lesser degree in all cultures and societies throughout all of recorded history.

One hypothesis is that adult male homosexuality is in reality sublimated and longitudinally displaced male pedosexuality, or "boylove," wherein one party assumes the role of "loved boy" and the other that of "mentor/lover." Such essentially non-egalitarian and vicarious – one wag has called it "fossilized" – boylove would provide each of the parties with a proxy for the bonding type of sexually expressed relationship they either wanted in their boyhood and failed to realize, or would like to have in the present but are denied by current legal restrictions. These hidden motivations might not even be recognized, and/or might be denied or repressed. In this light, is it possible that adult male homosexuality is only

Plato's shadow, and sexually expressed boy/older male love is the true substance behind that shadow?

In evolution, physical or sociobiological changes in an organism are instituted by chance mutations; however, the ways these changes are expressed in that individual, or "phenotype," are also affected by environment. For a physical or sociobiological trait to persist in the overall population, or "genotype," it should have advantages which increase the likelihood of the bearers to successfully reproduce, i.e., it must be "adaptive" to be "selected." At the very least, such a trait must not be disadvantageous when it comes to reproduction.

Male homosexuality, whether one holds that it is a genetic or sociobiological trait, has no such reproductive advantages. In fact, since it is a physical impossibility for two males to reproduce, this trait would be strongly "selected against," and should be eliminated from the gene pool in short order. Male homosexuality then, while it is held by some to be a legitimate orientation which provides emotional and sensory benefits to its practitioners, would largely seem, like the proverbial mule, to be "without pride of ancestry or hope of posterity" in an evolutionary sense.

Of course, it is also possible that some extremely recessive gene for homosexuality exists that only rarely shows up in an individual. There has been some discussion in scientific circles about physiological differences in "gay brains" and of the possibility of there being one or more "gay genes." But this would indicate that, regardless of repression or persecution, there should be a reasonably stable percentage of homosexuals in the adult male population over the millennia. However, historical evidence that this has been the case does not seem to exist, with the exponential expansion apparently having taken place in only the last half century.

It could also be posited that adult gay males and gay couples somehow contribute in ways that allow their society to survive and be more successful, even though they consume resources while producing no offspring. But no such contributions are apparent; what could a gay individual or couple do toward the basic needs of a culture that could not be done equally well by one or more heterosexual males or heterosexual couples? Some note that gays tend to be overly represented in theater and other performing arts, but could this not simply indicate that gays have a propensity for "pretending," just as their supposed homosexuality may well be a pretense?

Conversely, however, an evolutionary case can be posited that the tendency for boys to be sexually attracted to older males is adaptive (Feierman, 1990). In prehistoric times it is likely that many children, due to violence, disease, poor nutrition, and life spans that were considerably shorter than what we have considered "normal" for the past couple of centuries, found themselves without adequately functioning parents or guardians. A boy in this situation who was bright, attractive, and sexually androphilic (Vanggaard, 1969) would have a higher probability of connecting with an older male whose sexuality included a pedosexual component, and who would protect, provide for, and teach the boy the skills necessary for survival. Studies have identified such secondary boy-attracted pedosexual tendencies in 20 to 30% of self-identified heterosexual adult males (Freund, 1970; also cf. Briere & Runtz, 1989;' Quinsey, 1984; West, 1980; etc.), and these tendencies would not be selected against so long as the bearers were primarily heterosexual, and only secondarily pedosexual. There is no reason to believe that these percentages were not similar in prehistoric times, and in the absence of our modern day taboos, such beneficial boy/older male relationships could develop unimpeded. This boy's juvenile androphilic sexuality would typically be supplanted

by heterosexuality as he matured, he would then pass on his genes, and thus both of these traits would be maintained in the gene pool.

If such sexually expressed boy/older male relationships were not stigmatized through human prehistory, as hypothesized in the preceding paragraph and as evidenced by their acceptance in ancient history (Percy, 1996) and more recent cross cultural studies (Ford & Beach, 1951), and if such boys and older males suffered little or no loss in reproductive potential, the continuing presence of these traits in the human genotype can be understood. Only when cultural and religious disapproval, criminalization, and demonization had forced such consensual relationships underground would there have been cause for the development of a sublimated and longitudinally displaced form of this "boylove," which may be the source of what we know today as homosexuality. Older males would have a better ability to keep the sexual aspects of their substitutional relationship invisible, which, coupled with the invisibility of most of the remaining sexually expressed boy/older male relationships, would have created the illusion that boylove was rare and adult male homosexuality was nearly nonexistent. It was only in the sexual revolutions of the latter half of the 20th century that what may well be nothing more than a vicarious form of boylove exploded upon human consciousness, and the "gay liberation" movement was born.

Nevertheless, as far as gay life style and gay aspirations for civil recognition are concerned, the awareness and acceptance of this origin should not be a problem. No matter the degree of rationalization or outright delusion one may assign to frustrated "boylovers" or unfulfilled "loved boys" who view themselves as "homosexuals," there is no excuse for denying these people the right to live whatever lifestyle they

choose, so long as it has no real – as opposed to culturally imagined – negative effect on other people.

Likewise, however, there is no acceptable rationale for continuing the disproved myth that consensual sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males are intrinsically harmful, or that such relationships will or are intended to cause homosexuality as an adult. Would it not be a reasonable hypothesis that if the present hysteria about sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males did not exist, there would be far fewer frustrated boylovers and unfulfilled loved boys, and the incidence of supposed adult male homosexuality would decrease significantly?

Chapter 8: Righting the Wrongs

Toward truth, understanding, and acceptance.

For some seven years the “SafeHaven” Internet forum hosted serious and thoughtful discussions on the issues of sexually expressed relationships between boys and older males. Regretfully, that forum was discontinued in 2005 after the current public and media hysteria took its toll on participation. One of the projects of that forum was the dialectical generation of the following statement of philosophy:

The Philosophy of Responsible Boylove

> Responsible boylove is the premise that in any relationship between a boy and an older male, whether sexually expressed or not, the legitimate interests of the boy must take precedence over the interests of his older friend.
>
> Responsible boylove is a relationship between a boy who has a desire for a close and intimate friendship with an older male, and an older boy or man whose love for that boy encompasses enjoyment of the boy's companionship and a desire to provide a mentoring and nurturing environment. The nature, vitality, and duration of the relationship, as well as the extent of nurturing and mentoring, are determined by mutual consent, with the boy's wishes taking precedence. The relationship also includes a definite pedosexual attraction on the part of the older, and may include a desire for sexual experimentation, exploration, play, and gratification on the part of the younger. It is, however, a fundamental tenet of responsible boylove that any physical expression of sexuality is only acceptable with the age appropriate understanding, encouragement, and consent of the boy in-

volved. However, both parties must also carefully take into consideration that any such physical expressions, no matter how completely consensual, are considered a criminal act under the present legal systems in most of the world.

Common misconceptions: Responsible boylove does not include, support, nor in any way condone non-consensual sexual activity. It does not try to excuse or justify such things as attempts to seduce an obviously unwilling boy, molestation, or predation in any form. Those who subscribe to the responsible model of boylove are as appalled by such crimes as anyone else; indeed, perhaps more so, because of their love for all boys, and the pain they feel when one of them is molested, raped, or murdered. The public and the media seem to know only one word when there is sexual contact between a boy and an older male, the ugly and pejorative label of "pedophile." But the current use of that term is a total corruption of the original meaning, it is a malicious creation of misguided academics, radical religionists, malignant feminists, and prejudiced politicians, and as such is considered unacceptable by a large percentage of boylovers.

With the dearth of any valid research data that support the victimological “harm” hypothesis, and with the evidence and citations against the existence of intrinsic harm in consensual sexually expressed boyhood relationships that have been presented in this book, it is difficult to understand why this unsupported harm hypothesis has persisted. The only excuses for its continued existence are the ignorance, fear, hatred, self-serving political agendas, religions, and other such superstitions of its advocates and adherents. However, if we define ignorance as a lack of knowledge in a specific area, then, as Richard Dawkins noted, “Ignorance is no crime. To call someone ignorant is no insult. All of us are ignorant of

most of what there is to know. … If I tell someone that he is ignorant [in a certain area], I am paying him the compliment of assuming that he is not stupid….” (2007, p. 89) The good news is that ignorance can be remedied, and it only degenerates into stupidity when enlightenment in the specific area of ignorance under discussion is willfully rejected.

Prepubescent and adolescent boys need to feel wanted, accepted and loved (Wilson, 1981), not only by family, from whom these qualities are normally expected, but from others, including unrelated peers and adults. The attentions of older unrelated males who are not “obligated” (as are teachers, for instance) to invest themselves in the boy, but who do so out of a genuine liking for and interest in him, are important to boys. Such a relationship, in which the boy also feels he is not obligated and has the right to consent or decline, frequently goes beyond a cognitive form of consent and tends toward a bonding that is in a very real sense a form of love, and can be one of the most positive and beneficial psychological experiences in the boy's life, important to a healthy psyche (Prescott, 1975). It should not come as a surprise that such an intimate relationship can become sexually expressed, since it would seem that a meeting of the minds exists which implies consent in its most basic form when people express their love for each other sexually. In cultures where children are not forbidden to be sexual (Ford & Beach, 1951), it is clear that they need, desire, and understand sex as an expression of love. It is a sociobiologically inherited, intrinsic, and instinctive desire, and therefore implicitly consensual on the part of the child.

The present malicious practice of depriving boys of the right to their own sexuality can do nothing but create intense and traumatic harm to a boy’s psychosexual development, as well as contribute to the violent nature of today’s adolescents (Prescott, 1975). To quote Calderone (1979) again, “What

kind of silently tormenting existential hell is this to which we consign our children from their earliest memories? Do any ever manage to live through it with their ... sexuality undistorted?"(p. 6). Additionally, Judith Levine (2002) tells us:

> Sex is not harmful to children. It is a vehicle to self-knowledge, love, healing, creativity, adventure, and intense feelings of aliveness. There are many ways even the smallest children can partake of it. Our moral obligation to the next generation is to make a world in which every child can partake safely, a world in which the needs and desires of every child – for accomplishment, connection, meaning, and pleasure – can be marvelously fulfilled. (p. 225)

If it is agreed that the present taboos about childhood sexuality in general, and about consensual sexually expressed boy/older male relationships in particular, are erroneous and harmful, the obvious next question is what can be done to rectify the situation. Harris Mirkin (1999) addresses the current status of that issue:

> [T]here is a two-phase pattern of sexual politics. The first [phase] is a battle to prevent the battle, to keep the issue from being seen as political and negotiable. ... The second phase more closely resembles traditional politics as different groups argue over rights and privileges. ... [Responsible boylove] is in the first [phase]. (p. 1, abstract)
>
> This article will develop a model of sexual politics ... and then use the model to clarify the current political situation of [boylove]. ... Sexual issues ... have been [one of] the major ones that have caused a suspension or diminution of constitutional rules and of normal political and Bill of Rights protections. ... Sexual power positions

are fiercely held and outcast groups ... have little political protection. (pp. 2, 3)

Essentialists, fundamentalists, and Natural Law advocates claim that their categories reflect an underlying physical or moral reality... . Social Constructionists and multi-culturalists argue that that the categories are social creations, and that realist conceptions simply protect the sexually privileged. ... [and that] the concept of child molestation is a culture and class specific modern creation. (p. 4)

During Phase I struggles there is initially an overwhelming emotional and intellectual consensus around sex and gender issues. Sexual dissidents (deviants) are not heard by the dominant society, and are not conscious of themselves as a group that has a right to make political claims. ... [M]embers of the subordinate group begin to identify with each other and to think of themselves as oppressed rather than as evil or inferior. ... The groups talk as though they can force the dominant society to change, [but] the weak cannot simply take power from the strong... . (pp. 5,6)

At this point there is a pre-debate. Dominant groups deny that there is anything to discuss... . Dissenters are dismissed as “radical,” “crazy,” “evil,” or “cult” figures. ... The subordinate group is viewed as nihilistic, and sharp limits are placed on their speech and art on the grounds that they are disgusting, pornographic, dangerous to the social order and seductive of the innocent. ... Forbidden sexual worlds are portrayed as areas inhabited by psychopaths and criminals... . Attempts to counter negative propaganda with more realistic information ... meet with censorship, and there are continuous ideological struggles... . (p. 7)

> Psychology has been the primary site for disputes about normalcy... [and] has almost always functioned as a supporter of the dominant ideology. ... [I]ssues are framed in terms of nature, and of absolute good and evil. Real discussions of [responsible boylove], as opposed to ritualistic condemnations, are almost non-existent. (pp. 10, 12)

It is obvious that those who would advocate for the sexual emancipation of boys from this "last taboo" face almost overwhelming opposition from sexual victimologists, the highly profitable and well entrenched child sex abuse industry, various superstitions including most organized religion, self-serving politicians, and the equally self-serving and profit motivated media. Against this formidable array, the only weapon available to proactivists to combat the self imposed ignorance of the aforementioned individuals and groups is objective truth supported by empirical facts. A lopsided battle, no doubt, but no more lopsided than the battles against other sexual taboos such as masturbation, premarital and extramarital sex, and homosexuality that were waged and won in the past when entrenched ignorance was overcome by enlightenment, and fear and hatred withered when the underlying ignorance in these areas was rehabilitated and transformed by exposure to truth. Given that the present repression of the right of boys to their own sexuality is just as unsupported and onerous as the abovementioned taboos that have been successfully extinguished, it would seem that the question is not "if" this last taboo will be likewise be extirpated, but how soon.

Imagine.

Imagine a world where human sexuality would be free from the pernicious myths of intrinsic harm so prevalent today.
A world in which any two people of any age and either gender were able to consensually explore and enjoy their sexuality without fear of persecution.
A world in which neither superstition, religion, nor politics had control or even influence on the basic human right to one's own sexuality.

Imagine a world where boys who so desired would be encouraged to explore and enjoy their sexuality with other boys and older males.
A world where factual information about the pleasures and dangers of sex would be readily available, but where malicious myths would disintegrate under the pure light of truth.
A world where the normal transition from boyhood male mutual exploration and enjoyment to adult heterosexuality could wait until the turmoil of adolescence had begun to subside.

Imagine such a world.
Compare that world to the present state of ignorance, fear, hate, and hysteria concerning boyhood sexuality.
Then ask yourself why this better world has not yet been achieved, and what must be done to make it a reality.

References:

American Psychological Association. (1989). Amicus curiae brief to the United States Supreme Court, Nos. 88-805, 88-1125, and 88-1309.

Asch, S. (1955). Opinions and Social Pressure. *Scientific American*, 193, 31-35.

Baron, R., Vandello, J., & Brunsman, B. (1996) The forgotten variable in conformity research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 71*, 915-927

Bender, L. & Blau, A. (1937). The Reaction of Children to Sexual relations with Adults. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 7.

Bernard, F. (1985). *Paedophilia: a factual report*. Rotterdam: Enclave.

Briere, J., Runtz, M. (1989). University Males' Sexual Interest in Children. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 13.

Calderone, M. (1979). Parents and the Sexuality of their Children. *SIECUS Report* VIII (2).

Constantine, L. & Martinson, F. (1981). Child Sexuality: Here There Be Dragons. In *Children and Sex*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Cowan, J. (1996). *Gay Men and Women Who Enriched the World.* Los Angeles, Alyson.

Crompton, L. (2003). *Homosexuality & Civilization.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Davidson, M. (1988). *Some Boys*. Swaffham, UK, GMP.

Dawkins, R. (2007). Should Science Speak to Faith? *Scientific American* 297 (1) July 2007, 88-91.

Dineen, T. (2000). *Manufacturing Victims*. Montreal, Robert Davies.

Duffy, M. (2002). Methodological Issues in Web-based Research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 34 (1) 83-88.

Feierman, J. (1990). *Pedophilia: Bio-social Dimensions*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Finkelhor, D. (1979). *Sexually Victimized Children*. New York: Free Press.

Finkelhor, D. (1981). The Sexual Abuse of Boys. *Victimology* (6) 76-84.

Finkelhor, D. (1984). *Child Sexual Abuse*. New York: Free Press.

Ford, C. & Beach, F. (1951) *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*. Harper & Brothers.

Freund, K. (1970). The Structure of Erotic Preferences in the Nondeviant Male. *Behavior Research and Therapy* 8.

Hare, E. (1962). Masturbatory insanity: the history of an idea. *Journal of Mental Science*. 108, 1-25.

Hibberd, D. (1986). *Owen The Poet*. London. Macmillan.

Jenkins, P. (1998). *Moral Panic: Changing concepts of the child-molester in modem America.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Katz, J. (1976). *Gay American History*. New York, Crowell.

Levine, J. (2002). *Harmful to Minors.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Liddell, H. (1888). *Greek-English lexicon*. New York: American Book Company.

Lilienfeld, S (2002). When Worlds Collide. *American Psychologist*, 57 (3) 176-188

Martin, Y. (2003). Sex-case brothers asked to return. Press, Christchurch, New Zealand, July 23, 2003.

Mattick, J. (2004). Program of Complex Organisms. *Scientific American* 291 (4) October 2004, 61.

Menninger, K. (1942). *Love against Hate.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Mirkin, H. (1999). The Pattern of Sexual Politics. *Journal of Homosexuality* 37 (2).

Mirkin, H. (1999a). The Prohibited Image: Child pornography and the First Amendment. In *Porn 101: Eroticism, Pornography, and the First Amendment.* Elias., J., Elias, V., Bullough, V., Brewer, G., Douglas, J., and Jarvis, W. (Eds.). Amherst, NY: Prometheus.

Money, J. (1988). Commentary: current status of sex research. *Journal of psychology and human sexuality*. 1, 5-15.

Oellerich, T. (2000). Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman: Politically Incorrect, Scientifically Correct. *Sexuality & Culture*, 4 (2) 77-79.

Okami, P. (1991). Self-Reports of "Positive" Childhood and Adolescent Sexual Contacts with Older Persons: An Exploratory Study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 20 (5) 437-457.

Okami, P. (1997). Sexual Experiences in Early Childhood: 18-Year Longitudinal Data from the UCLA Family Lifestyles Project. *Journal of Sex Research* 34 (4) 339-347.

Percy, W. (1996). *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Prescott, J. (1975). Body Pleasure and the Origin of Violence. *The Futurist*, IX (2).

Quinsey, V. (1984). Men Who Have Sex with Children. In *Law and Mental Health* (Volume 2), Weisstub, D. (Ed.) New York: Pergamon.

Rhodes, S., Bowie, K., Hergenrather, K. (2003). Collecting behavioral data using the world wide web: considerations for researchers. *Journal of Epidemiological Community Health 57*, 68-73.

Riegel, D. (2004). Effects on Boy-Attracted Pedosexual Males of Viewing Boy Erotica. *Archives of Sexual Behavior 33*(4) 321-323.

Riegel, D. (2005). "Abused to Abuser": An examination of new non-clinical and non-prison data. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality 16*(4) 39-57.

Riegel, D. (2006) Propuesta de una tipología de hombres con atracción sexual hacia los muchachos. *Boletín de Información Sexológica 50,* 1-3.

Rind, B., Tromovitch, P., & Bauserman, R., (1998) A Meta-Analytic Examination of Assumed Properties of Child Sexual Abuse Using College Samples. *Psychological Bulletin 124* (1) 32-53.

Sandfort, T. (1987) *Boys on their Contacts with Men*. Elmhurst, NY: Global Academic Press.

Schlessinger, L. (1999). Evil Among Us. *Dr. Laura Perspective*, June 1999

Scouting (2006). Child Abuse: Let's Talk About It. *Scouting Magazine*. Downloaded from http://www.scouting.org/pubs/ypts/mags/scouting/01.html on 10 November 2006.

Spiegel, D. (2000). The Price of Abusing Children and Numbers. *Sexuality & Culture* 4 (2) 63-66.

Tetlock, P., McGraw, A., & Kristel, O. (2003). Proscribed forms of social cognition: Taboo trade-offs, blocked exchanges, forbidden base rates, and heretical counterfactuals. In N.Haslam (Ed.), *Relational models theory: A contemporary overview.* Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tindall, R. H. (1978). The male adolescent involved with a pederast becomes an adult. *Journal of Homosexuality, 3*(4), 373-382.

Vanggaard, T. (1969). *Phallos.* New York: International Universities Press.

Waber, D., DE Moor, C., Forbes, P., Almli, C., Botteron, K., Leonard, G., Milovan, D., Paus, T., & Rumsey, J., (2007) The NIH MRI study of normal brain development. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society* 13 1-18.

West, D. (1980). Treatment in Theory and Practice. In West, D. (Ed.) *Sex Offenders in the Criminal Justice System*. Cambridge: Institute of Criminology.

Wilson, P. (1981). *The Man they Called a Monster*. North Melbourne, Australia: Cassell.

Afterword by the author

My public involvement with the issues in this book began with the outrageous attack on science by the United States congress on the 1998 article in *Psychological Bulletin* by Bruce Rind, Philip Tromovitch, and Robert Bauserman entitled "A Meta-Analytic Examination of Assumed Properties of Child Sexual Abuse Using College Samples." In August of 1999 I was contacted by Bill Taverner, an editor of the McGraw-Hill textbook *Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in Human Sexuality*, asking for a summarizing essay on the Rind article. I submitted the essay as requested, and, in a convoluted story that is much too long to repeat here, it was accepted, rejected, accepted again, and finally rejected by upper management as too controversial. Interestingly, I was contacted again in 2005 by Mr. Tavener, who by then was senior editor of the textbook, with the result that a revised form of the essay became part of the ninth edition, published in 2006.

The 1999 rejection of my essay prompted me to look for another venue, and early in 2000 my first paperback book, *Understanding Loved Boys and Boylovers*, was published. Here are some excerpts from the introduction to that book, which is now out of print:

> This is a book about boys and men. It is also specifically about those boys and men, related or not, who share a very special love for one another. A love that may, along with providing companionship, protection, nurturing, and material needs, include an active consensual sexual component. A love that, since other equivalent terms have become hopelessly corrupted in modern usage, has come to be known as "boylove"…

This is a book about truth and facts, a rational examination of suppressed knowledge which boys and men have nevertheless grasped intuitively since the beginning of humanity. This knowledge has been disparaged and forcibly silenced for decades or longer, but is now reemerging into public awareness as a result of the unrestricted communication afforded by the Internet. Whereas men who were loved as boys, and men who have shared their lives and themselves with one or more boys, were before almost totally isolated from one another, the Internet has made possible extended discussions among all who choose to participate.

This book is neither a manifesto nor a set of demands, it is a plea for reasonableness and understanding. While those militants who rant and rave against boylove are able to capture the public's attention from time to time with emotional appeals to blind hate and intolerance, this book attempts to reach out to intelligent humanity with truth, facts, logic, and enlightenment. The only requirement to profitably read this book is an open and inquiring mind, a mind that is capable of grasping the fact that the generally perceived and accepted wisdom is not always correct. But those with closed minds, those who do not wish to hear facts, those whose bigotry and prejudices preclude any rational examination of an unpopular viewpoint, will not profit by what is said here.

Many of my friends have expressed concern that I would dare publish this book, citing the possibility of recriminations, harassment, or even physical danger. But I have said to them, and I say now to all, in the words of Andre Sakharov, "If not me, who?" To which I would add, "If not now, when?"

Except for a flurry now and then caused by attacks on the book by media radicals, *Understanding Loved Boys and Boylovers* sold very modestly, and when the supply was exhausted it was decided not to print more. Instead, this present volume is intended to replace that first book.

None of my books have been "solo" efforts; many people from various disciplines and backgrounds have assisted and advised me in all of my investigations and writings. It is unfortunate that in the present state of hysteria I am not able to identify and thank them personally and publicly, but their contributions have been invaluable and are greatly appreciated. I would note, however, that neither I nor any of those who have contributed to my research and writing are members of, or are in any way associated with, such organizations as NAMBLA, IPCE, or MHAMic.

Since my baptism of fire in 1999, I have continued my investigations into these issues. For over a year I worked with another researcher and conducted a "paper and pencil" survey, the results of which unfortunately have not yet been published. After this disappointment, I began looking into the Internet as a means of investigation, data collection, and research, and reports of some of these studies are listed below. Reports on other research projects over the years were rejected by journal editors who, I feel, were frightened by the subject matter and the obvious implications of the data.

I am not the first to raise my voice in opposition to the gross injustices that are perpetrated against sexually inquisitive boys and their older male friends. I would like to think that I am far from the last, and that others may be inspired by this slim volume to join in the battle against ignorance and hysteria. I only hope that I have added somewhat to the foundations provided by those who preceded me, and that those

who follow after me will be able to successfully build further upon those foundations.

Academic publications to date include:

Riegel, D. (2004) Effects on Boy-Attracted Pedosexual Males of Viewing Boy Erotica. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 33(4) pp. 321-323. (Editorially reviewed "Letter to the Editor.")

Riegel, D. (2005) Pedophilia, Pejoration, and Prejudice: Inquiry by Insinuation, Argument by Accusation. *Sexuality & Culture*, 9 (1) pp. 88-97. (Editorially reviewed "personal perspective" essay.)

Riegel, D. (2005) "Abused to Abuser": An examination of new non-clinical and non-prison data. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 16(4) pp. 39-57. (Peer reviewed research report)

Riegel, D. (2006) The Real Evil Among Us. In W. Taverner (Ed.) *Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in Human Sexuality* (Ninth Edition). Guilford CT: McGraw Hill/Dushkin, 205-210. (Textbook, Issue 13: "Is Pedophilia Always Harmful,").

Riegel, D. (2006) Propuesta de una tipología de hombres con atracción sexual hacia los muchachos. *Boletín de Información Sexológica*, 50 pp. 1-3. (Editorially reviewed essay, translation into Spanish by Dr. Agustín Malón Marco)

Other submissions are currently under review.

Paperback books, in addition to the now out-of-print *Understanding Loved Boys and Boylovers*:

Beyond Hysteria: Boy Erotica on the Internet. 2004, Philadelphia, SafeHaven Foundation Press.

Could they ALL have been WRONG? 2005, Philadelphia, SafeHaven Foundation Press.

As of this writing, these books are in print and available from Amazon.com.