

You believe that fewer people are getting married because of the trivialization of sex, and that more married people are getting divorced. You believe that divorce is a terrible thing, and that the prospect of it is preventing people from getting married. The simple solution seems to be to eliminate the institution of marriage itself, and the problem of divorce immediately disappears.

carnage_complex, tell me if I understand what you're saying.

You believe that a degenerate capitalistic system results in a commodification of sexuality. This enables the creation of a cultural notion that premarital sexuality is acceptable. This results in sexuality becoming widespread. This has three primary consequences:

The first is that there are some males who believe that the existence of this attitude of sexuality is a justification of date rape, which causes instances of it to increase.

The second is that the existence of this attitude destroys the significance of marriages. Fewer people get married, and of the people who do get married, more divorce.

The third is that the prevalence of sexuality results in more abortions, and more unwanted children, than would otherwise result.

You believe that it would be desirable to outlaw premarital sex to cause a gradual cultural shift away from all of this.

And I would like you to briefly elaborate on something so that I can better understand your position. What is it about marriage that appeals to you, and why do you oppose the prevalence of divorces?

You claim that marriage is a wonderfully positive thing, and it would be undesirable to eliminate marriage. If marriage permits people to share such wonderful love, then why limit it to only one person (or in the case of polygamists, a select few)? Why not allow someone to marry everyone else in the entire world? It sounds like a completely nonsensical idea because of what marriage actually is. Marriage does not permit the blossoming of love: it eradicates the potential to love. It is the restriction of that allegedly wonderful relationship to only one person, to the detriment of everyone else. Saying that marriage is a positive institution is saying that restricted and culturally-defined love is preferable to boundless love. Marriage is not love: marriage is hatred.

Marriage is not the only institution of its kind: the rest of romantic love is the same way. Your culture tells you that you must feel and act a certain way toward someone with whom you're in a "romantic relationship", and that it is unacceptable to feel the same way toward someone else. The same applies to what culture calls "familial love". Solely on the basis of ancestry, you are supposed to feel and act a certain way toward someone who happens to be particularly more genetically-similar to you than someone else.

There are all sorts of bizarre cultural labels for love and relationships which people are indoctrinated into having, and they all amount to the same thing. The effect of them is the compartmentalization of love for those who are in the group your culture tells you you're a part of, and the absence of the love for those who are outside of it. Love is not innately labelled: it is your culture which indoctrinates you into believing that there are such metaphysical things as "romantic love" as distinct from love. Why should the definitions of relationships be forced onto people? What makes a relative different from a stranger? What makes an American different than a Soviet? Why should you treat someone you're in a romantic relationship differently than someone you're in a friendship with? I cannot find anything positive in the cultural context which marriages, families, courtships, nationalities, ethnicities, religions, and whatever other bizarre categorizations there are. I won't profess to know a single thing about what associations are supposed to entail for people, because that should be entirely up to the individuals involved, completely beyond any arbitrary cultural context.

You are opposed to prevalent sex partially because it trivializes the meaning of sex. Why can't people's interactions be defined by those involved? Why support compelling people to believe that having sex with each other is any different from tying each other's shoes? If they want to associate particular meanings to it, then they can do so.

"Compelling" is an understatement for what you advocate. Your solution is to use the government to fine and castrate people who engage in premarital sex, which you claim is prevalent because of the capitalistic commoditization of sex. If that is the case, then why not instead reject the government itself, which enables the existence of the capitalistic system? You say that it is worth doing this to spare even a single person from the trauma of date rape, but what of the immense trauma which violators of your law would endure? Not even having harmed anyone themselves, they are fined, kidnapped, imprisoned, and castrated by their government. I do not see how it would be a desirable solution to torture people who do not conform to your beliefs of how they could best live their lives.

You know of instances where females have been raped because of the cultural notion that premarital sex is acceptable. To prevent that, you want to compel people to have the cultural notion that it is acceptable for people to be castrated for engaging in premarital sex. Instead of arguing about this or that being the right or wrong perspective and attitude, and subsequently seeking to violently impose your will onto other people, why not seek to entirely eliminate the notion of cultural attitudes themselves?

"Now, let's take a look at another common situation. A childhood friend of mine in a relationship with someone recently was gotten pregnant by him. She was panicked beyond all understanding, because she wanted to abort the child, but couldn't bring herself to do it, and has now decided to carry it to term. Both this young woman and her boyfriend were attending a prestigious university; both had futures ahead of them. Both have since dropped out of school. He is working two minimum wage jobs to support her, and she expects that she is now going to lose at least a couple of years before she can get back on the

career track again. Had this same couple waited until they were done school, and until they were married and he was in a decent job, then this never would have happened. Two lives have been put on hold because of one impulsive act. I wonder what that child's formative years are going to be like, given the fact that he or she has two parents who resent him or her on some level."

"Had this same couple waited until they were done school, and until they were married and he was in a decent job, then this never would have happened."

You're critical of capitalism, yet make an appeal to a "prestigious university", "futures", and "career tracks". These exist because of a capitalistic system and help to further propagate its existence, so I would have expected you to be opposed to that. I don't know anything about your political ideology, so I'll just leave it at this:

You want to support a government which enables you to inflict your violent will onto people "for their own good" to prevent them from possibly suffering adverse consequences which exist owing to an external system. That system is enabled by the existence of governments. Wouldn't it be more sensible to oppose governments, which subject people into a capitalistic system? It is not as though those minimum wage jobs disappear once your friends graduate from a prestigious university and get on their career track for the future- it merely enables your friends to shirk laboring and instead force other people to labor for them.

Instead of seeking a societal restructuring which is brought about by supporting a government to enable you to inflict your violent will onto people to prevent them from possibly suffering adverse consequences because of their actions owing to a system which exists because of governments, you should instead be opposed to the institution.

These same people you would castrate.

I said allegedly wonderful because it is difficult for me to believe that marriage is remotely positive, even beyond what I said earlier. I can only see marriage as being innately mutually abusive.

I'm an ultra-virgin like Mayhem, and the last contact beyond handshakes I've had with anyone was when my grandmother hugged me four years ago.

You are treating the actions of the the government as being metaphysically different than Eric and Dylan, when it seems clear to me that a travesty is not any less bad because a government decreed that it was okay.

What you condone is not even in the slightest any different from Eric and Dylan. I don't know if you're one of their groupies, but I assume you join the finger-wagging against them. Yet, you condone the slaughter of anyone who does not conform to your notion of behavior.

I am writing this more for my own comfort than for anything- I do not want to feel the loneliness I do. Though it is ironic that I feel this loneliness when surrounded by people. People may not be an accurate description of these creatures, however. (Describe why). It is creatures such as these that have driven me from my former life as a vagabond and into this abandoned shack which is now my sanctuary. They cannot enter, it appears, though I have not ascertained the reason. They indubitably know that I am inside, though. If I survive the night, I should be safe for the next day, This infernal noise they emanate will have subsided and they will have fled- They work in the darkness when we are most susceptible. Curse this mindless noise. It is all around this shack. If they enter, I am not sure what I would do. I immediately closed the latch on the door and fled upstairs and could not look around below, mostly owing to my lack of any source of light. It is a miracle I stumbled across this sanctuary. Upon stumbling up the stairs, I entered this room at the top of the steps. I fumbled around and found this functioning lantern which gives me this hope and simultaneously perhaps will be my downfall because the creatures know exactly where I am. Perhaps I could use this lamp against them if they manage to enter, but I do not believe they fear light in the way some may assume. I pray that I live to tomorrow- I may then have a chance. I am not sure what I will do first if I survive until tomorrow- I am not sure of anything. I am only writing this to comfort myself in this situation, not as a record of my activities but as a record of my emotions. Although I should think of the possible future. For now, I pray that they do not enter.

I managed to survive last night and now am writing on the following night. Last night, as dawn approached, the crawling gradually receded and I decided it would be appropriate (That is not the word I wanted-) to sleep and regain my energy. What was I thinking? I am now here awake at night when I could have utilized that time while the sun was shining to strengthen my defenses. Upon awakening, I decided that I would survey the damage that the babies caused. I nervously stepped outside and immediately noticed how normal everything seemed. The babies made no attempt at entering- What were they doing crawling outside if not attempting to enter? They clearly knew I was inside.

He hears crawling outside of house, explains situation.

Goes to town to enlist personnel against the babies.

Orders Saiga-12 online.

Goes to daycare to check on status of babies, teacher reports him (One of the babies is missing)

Returns from jail.

Finds the missing baby in his basement, cold and hungry. He offers to help him out of pity.

The baby comes around and tells him about how he defected from the daycare. He promises to help.

The baby helps him to infiltrate a small cache of poorly-guarded baby stuff in the woods.

Goes down to firearms shop and picks up Saiga-12, the baby is furious. ~"Babies must be hoplophobes in general. It makes sense, doesn't it?"

The baby does not say much. Firearms practice.

The baby is missing in the morning! Possible taken prisoner. He is nervous.

The crawling gets louder outside. He shoots outside of the window a few times in an attempt to frighten them away.

He is barricaded in the basement. ~"That goddamn mothersucking (Enter baby name)!" He comes to the conclusion that the baby had betrayed him. The crawling was completely surrounding the house during the morning, and by afternoon, the babies had broken in the door and were crawling all over the place. He engaged in a shoot-out with the babies and eventually had fled to the basement where he is now writing. He laments about not buying more magazines. He says that the journal will be safe ~"Cause babies can't read.", and says that he hopes that, since -he- couldn't effectively warn the general populace, someone will figure out what has been going on before it is too late.

Playtime

Storytime

Snack Time

Coloring Time

Arts and Crafts

Learning Time

Nap Time

Clean up time

Parent Pickup

Hamilton time?

Recess

Transcript of Adam Lanza's Call to *AnarchyRadio*

On 20 December 2011, Adam Lanza called in to a talk radio program, *AnarchyRadio*, broadcasted on KWVA 88.1 FM out of the University of Oregon. The show is hosted by John Zerzan, a writer described by *The Atlantic* as “an intellectual leader of the anarcho-primitivist movement, an ideology that regards technology as a destroyer of human communities.” The reason for Lanza’s interest in Zerzan’s writings is plainly evident in the call itself; Lanza calls to share a story about “Travis the Chimp,” a domesticated chimpanzee that in 2009 “snapped,” and viciously attacked 55-year-old Charla Nash, a friend of the chimp’s owner. The attack was seemingly random, nearly cost the victim her life, and ended when the chimp was shot by police. Lanza outlines how the chimp’s violent episode can be explained by his upbringing “as if he were a [human] child,” and argues that Travis’s “civilized” upbringing was what led to his attack.

JOHN ZERZAN: Here we go ... hello. We got the collapsible headphones here but, uh, we’re back.

CO-HOST: [*Unintelligible*] ... we’ve got Greg on the phone.

ZERZAN: Oh, Greg, okay, how’s it going?

ADAM LANZA: Hi, good. Um. I’m a fan of your writing. Um.

ZERZAN: Thank you.

LANZA: I’m sorry to [bring up?] such an old news story but I couldn’t find anything that you said about the topic, and it seems relevant to your interests, so I thought I would bring up Travis the Chimp, do you remember him?

ZERZAN: I don’t!

LANZA: Well, he was the highly domesticated chimpanzee who lived in a suburban home in Stamford, Connecticut.

CO-HOST: Oh, yeah.

ZERZAN: Oh.

LANZA: And he was raised just like a human child, starting from the week he was born. By the time that he was fourteen years old, which would be somewhere around age twenty in human years —

ZERZAN: Uh-huh.

LANZA: — um, he slept in a bed, he took his own baths, he dressed himself, he brushed his teeth with an electric toothbrush.

ZERZAN: [*laughs*] Really? When was this?

LANZA: Um. Well, this happened in early 2009.

ZERZAN: Oh.

Transcribed by Ilana Masad. Introductory text copyright © 2014 by Reed Coleman.

Originally published by Reed Coleman on the *Sandy Hook Lighthouse* blog. To hear a recording of the segment, and for an explanation of how we know that the caller is Adam Lanza, see sandyhooklighthouse.wordpress.com.

CO-HOST: Oh.

LANZA: Um.

ZERZAN: Uh-huh?

LANZA: He ate his meals at a table and enjoyed human foods like ice cream and he used a remote control to watch television and liked baseball games. And he even used a computer to look at pictures on the internet.

ZERZAN: Huh!

LANZA: And, [*chuckles*] it goes without saying that Travis was very overweight. He was two hundred pounds when he should have been around the low hundreds.

ZERZAN: Mmhm.

LANZA: And he was actually taking Xanax.

CO-HOST: [*laughs*]

ZERZAN: Amazing.

LANZA: I couldn't find any information about why he was taking it, but it just seems to say a lot that he was given it at all. And, basically, I think Travis wasn't really any different than a mentally handicapped human child.

ZERZAN: Hmm.

LANZA: But anyway, one day in February 2009, he was acting very agitated, and at some point grabbed the car – his owner's car keys, went outside and started beeping from car to car, apparently wanting to go for a car ride, and he was acting very aggressively, so his owner called her friend over to get her to help him to calm down and go back inside, and once she arrived he immediately attacked her and his owner tried to stop him but couldn't and she even resorted to stabbing him with a knife, but nothing worked. And she said that after she stabbed him he looked at her as if to say, "Why'd you do that to me, Mom?" Because apparently that was what the relationship was like, no different than between a human mother and a human child.

ZERZAN: Hmm.

LANZA: So after the stabbing, she called the police, who arrived twelve minutes after the attack, at which point her friend was pretty close to dead. And once the cruiser came up, Travis went over to it, tried to open the locked passenger door. He smashed off the side-view mirror, went over to the driver's door, opened it, and the cop shot him. He fled back into the house, where he went to his playroom and bled to death.

ZERZAN: Hmm ...

LANZA: And um, [*chuckles*] this might not seem very relevant, but I'm bringing it up because afterward, everyone was condemning his owner for saying how irresponsible she was for raising a chimp like it was a child. And that she should have known something like this would happen, because chimps aren't supposed to be living in civilization, they're supposed to be living in the wild, among each other.

ZERZAN: Mhmm.

LANZA: But, their criticism stops there and the implication is that there's no way anything could have gone wrong in his life if he had been living in this civilization as a human rather than a chimp.

ZERZAN: Ah, indeed.

LANZA: [And?] I'm so interested in Travis, um, because he brings up questions about this whole process of child-raising. Um.

ZERZAN: Yeah.

LANZA: Civilization isn't something which just happens to gently exist without us having to do anything, because every newborn child – human child – is born in a chimp-like state, and civilization is only sustained by conditioning them for years on end so that they'll accept it for what it is. And since we've gone through this conditioning, we can observe a human family raising a human child, and I'm sure that even you have trouble intuitively seeing it as something unnatural, but when we see a chimp in that position, we [visually?] know that there's something profoundly wrong with the situation. And it's easy to say there's something wrong with it simply because it's a chimp, but what's the real difference between us and our closest relatives? Travis wasn't an untamed monster at all. Um, he wasn't just feigning domestication, he *was* civilized. Um, he was able to integrate into society, he was a chimp actor when he was younger, and his owner drove him around the city frequently in association with her towing business, where he met many different people, and got along with everyone. If Travis had been some nasty monster all his life, it would have been widely reported, but to the contrary, it seems like everyone who knew him said how shocked they were that Travis had been so savage, because they knew him as a sweet child. And – there were two isolated incidents early in his life when he acted aggressively, but summarizing them would take too long, so basically I'll just say that he didn't act really any differently than a human child would, and the people who would use that as an indictment against having chimps live as humans do wouldn't apply the same thing to humans, so it's just kind of irrelevant.

ZERZAN: Mhmm.

LANZA: But anyway, look what civilization did to him: it had the same exact effect on him as it has on humans. He was profoundly sick, in every sense of the term, and he had to resort to these surrogate activities like watching baseball, and looking at pictures on a computer screen, and taking Xanax. He was a complete mess.

ZERZAN: Mhm.

LANZA: And his attack wasn't simply because he was a senselessly violent, impulsive chimp. Um, which was how his behavior was universally portrayed. Um, immediately before his attack, he had desperately been wanting his owner to drive him somewhere, and the best reason I can think of for why he would want that, looking at his entire life, would be that some little thing he experienced was the last straw, and he was overwhelmed by the life that he had, and he wanted to get out of it by changing his environment, and the best way that he knew how to deal with that was by getting his owner to drive him somewhere else.

ZERZAN: Yeah.

LANZA: And when his owner's – owner's friend arrived, he knew that she was trying to coax him back into his life of domestication, and he couldn't handle that, so – he attacked her, and anyone else who approached them. And dismissing his attack as simply being the senseless violence and impulsiveness of a chimp, instead of a human, is wishful thinking at best.

ZERZAN: Mmm-hmm.

LANZA: His attack can be seen entirely parallel to the attacks and random acts of violence that you bring up on your show every week –

ZERZAN: Mmm ...

LANZA: – committed by humans, which the mainstream also has no explanation for, and –

ZERZAN: No.

LANZA: – and actual humans – I just don't think it would be such a stretch to say that he very well could have been a teenage mall shooter or something like that.

ZERZAN: Yeah, yeah.

LANZA: And –

ZERZAN: Wow. Thank you, Greg.

LANZA: Yeah, I –

ZERZAN: That's quite a story. Yeah, that's, uh, really apropos, isn't it.

LANZA: Yeah.

ZERZAN: Travis the Chimp.

LANZA: It's just that I'm a little surprised that I never heard you bring it up at all because [*chuckles*] maybe I'm just seeing connections where there aren't any, but –

ZERZAN: Not – I think not, no, I just, I didn't catch that one, I didn't, uh – maybe I was out of the country or something, I don't know but I missed it. Thanks very much, man.

LANZA: Thank you. Bye.

ZERZAN: Take care. Wow. Very well articulated, I think. Okay, well, uh, uh, I guess we better move on ...

After some careful consideration, I've decided that I can't comfortably abide by the 500 maximum word limit. I can't bring myself to believe that anything valuable about a person can be demonstrated in such little space- I would have to write some gimmick. You are certainly welcome to fling this over your shoulder at any time if this is an instant disqualifier (or if informality gets on your nerves), but I would appreciate it if you read up until the end of the first paragraph, pretending that the entire essay is 500 words in length. I suspect that you'll be sufficiently interested in the unorthodox topic to want to finish reading the entire essay.

Tyler Clementi's suicide seemed to be something new to everyone, and I was the only one who remembered a similar death. Clementi's roommate had placed a hidden camera in his room and recorded eighteen-year-old Clementi having sex with another man, and broadcasted the events over the internet. The ridicule which Clementi received as a result of this was presumably what caused him to jump off of the George Washington Bridge on September 22, 2010. I do not mean to say that I was reminded of the several other young homosexuals who had committed suicide earlier in the month: the comparison was more tangible than that. It was the death of 56-year-old Louis Conratt on November 5, 2006. He had fallen prey to a sting operation which was broadcasted on NBC's former television series, *To Catch A Predator*.

The show originally emerged from the activity of *Perverved Justice*, a civilian watchdog group. Members of the group posed as boys and girls ranging from 10 to 15 years old and searched online chat rooms for adults who were willing to engage in sexual activity with them. Once they found one, they posted his personal information on their website. They additionally contacted as many people involved in the adult's life as they could, such as employers, to inform them about what he had typed to their decoy. When NBC became involved with *Perverved Justice*, the adults began to get invited over to a house which was covered with over a dozen hidden cameras. When an adult arrived, the cameras recorded him being confronted by the host of the show, who carried a transcript of the sexually-explicit online conversation with the *Perverved Justice* decoy. The host read the most embarrassing sentences to the adult and asked several questions about what he was intending to do. When the nervous adult stepped out of the house, he was dramatically arrested by the police. He was subsequently charged with numerous crimes, usually including at least one felony. NBC nationally broadcasted the events for the amusement of its viewers. Louis Conratt was one of the pedophiles who had agreed to meet what he thought was going to be a 13-year-old boy for sexual activity. When Conratt didn't show up at the house which was leased to NBC, police pursued a warrant for his arrest. The *To Catch A Predator* crew drove to Conratt's house to wait outside along with the police. When all of the legal technicalities were completed the next morning, they broke into his house and encountered Conratt. He reportedly said, "I'm not going to hurt anyone", raised a pistol to his head, and shot himself.

Perhaps this is making you uncomfortable, and some awkward questions might be surfacing in your mind: "Is this doctrinaire madman expressing sympathy for a pedophile?"; "Is this supposed to be a sick kind of bigoted satire against homosexuals?"; "Is someone in the office pulling my leg?". Independent of whatever opinion anyone might have of Louis Conratt, the similarities between his death and Tyler Clementi's seem obvious. Both men felt as if they had been forced into killing themselves owing to the way in which their society treated them in the course of pursuing its voyeuristic entertainment through surveilling their romantic lives. In Clementi's case, there was national sympathy expressed for weeks and the students who were responsible for broadcasting his sexual activity were universally condemned; in Conratt's case, the only criticism which was ever directed toward *Perverved Justice*, NBC, and the police, only applied to the technical methodology of his arrest. Xavier Von Erck, the founder of *Perverved Justice*, responded to Conratt's death by effectively saying that he would have preferred if he hadn't died, but the only thing which bothered him about the situation was that they would not be able to press any charges against a dead man.

Why is it that one of these deaths is considered to be tragic, yet the other is dismissed as being nothing other than an inconvenience and has been completely forgotten? If hypothetically only one of these cases can be considered tragic, why is it Tyler's death by default? Momentarily forget about all of the details pertaining to the lives of both of them for a moment, and only focus on the way in which their society responded to their sexuality. While the treatment which Tyler received was unjustified, it

effectively amounted to nothing other than simple ridicule. In comparison, the treatment which pedophiles receive cannot be described by words.

They are perhaps the most universally condemned, vilified, and isolated group of people on the planet. Pedophiles, virulently rejected by their fellow LGBT activists, have literally no one for them other than several effete associations which haven't been active in decades. In contrast, homosexuals have innumerable support groups to help them with anything they might need. While the discrimination which homosexuals receive is primarily directed toward them from other private citizens, the absolute contempt which pedophiles are subjected to is institutionalized by their government. If someone has been identified as an active pedophile, he is automatically imprisoned for prolonged sentences. If the other prisoners discover that someone is a pedophile, he is brutalized beyond belief, with the rest of society nodding in approval. The prospect of this happening is a significant incentive for pedophiles to commit suicide before being imprisoned. One pedophile who was being charged with child molestation expressed possibly the same sentiment which Louis Conradt was feeling by saying, "If it comes down to that, I'll swallow a bottle of pills. I'd rather go on my own than die in prison".

Everyone who is convicted of engaging in pedophilic activity is given a life sentence independent of the actual verdict: if a pedophile is lucky enough to leave prison within their lifetime, after being subjected to mandatory castration in some cases, they must live the rest of their life branded as a violent rapist. They are constantly under the supervision of their government, in some cases through the use of GPS bracelets. Their personal information is widely divulged to their neighbors, as if public castigation against them is encouraged. They can be evicted or denied service by landlords and can be denied employment without any opportunity for legal recourse while any other group could successfully win a civil rights lawsuit. Left itinerant and without meaningful employment, they are additionally subjected to the universal seething rage of everyone around them, and no one has any sympathy for any harassment, vandalism, death threats, or overt violence which is directed toward them.

Why is this the case? Is it right that pedophiles are the one social group which everyone can agree deserve to be tortured, if not outright killed? Are they truly the demons which everyone sees them as, which lead one judge in sentencing a pederast to saying among shouts of "Shame!":

". . . the crime of which you have been convicted is so bad that one has to put stern restraint upon one's self to prevent one's self from describing, in language which I would rather not use, the sentiments which must rise in the breast of every man of honor who has heard the details of these two horrible trials. That the jury has arrived at a correct verdict in this case I cannot persuade myself to entertain a shadow of a doubt . . .

It is no use for me to address you. People who can do these things must be dead to all sense of shame, and one cannot hope to produce any effect upon them. It is the worst case I have ever tried . . . I shall, under the circumstances, be expected to pass the severest sentence that the law allows. In my judgment it is totally inadequate for a case such as this."

Although the judge was speaking of pederasty, he presumably would have been even more appalled by pedophilia. Both terms are among a vague series of categorizations for adults who are sexually attracted to youths:

Pedophilia is the sexual attraction to prepubescent children.

Hebephilia is the sexual attraction to children in the early stages of puberty; Louis Conradt was technically a hebephile, not a pedophile.

Ephebophilia is the sexual attraction to pubescent adolescents. Pederasty is generally an instance of an ephebophilic relationship between males.

Pedophilia is commonly used as a blanket-term to encompass all of these, and I will be using it to refer to all of these for the sake of simplicity. Recognize that, however devious, perverted, or illegitimate it might be seen as, and despite the derogatory "phile" appended to it, pedophilia is merely a sexual orientation. It's a part of the rainbow, along with homosexuality and heterosexuality. A pedophile could live their entire life without ever coming into contact with a child because the only requirement for being one is having a sexual attraction to children. However, allowing myself even in the slightest to define pedophilia here as including adults who merely have a dormant sexual attraction to children, would be rapidly conciliatory, and would not address the larger issue. For that reason, the definition of a pedophile

which I will be using is an adult who both desires and engages in sexual activity with any person who is considered to be under the legal age of consent; id est, a child.

Before addressing whether or not the treatment of this group of people is right, the nature of persecution itself must be addressed. Regarding the subject of apathy of persecution, there is a quotation by the pastor Martin Niemöller which goes by several forms and is quite popular. An example of it is:

First they came for the communists, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a communist.
Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a trade unionist.
Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a Jew.
Then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak out for me.

Everyone feels good about saying such things, but the use of this quote is actually quite counter-productive because it insufficiently addresses the problem of historical perspectives. If you were to look at many of the groups which have been persecuted throughout history, you would find that many people have never actually been explicitly apathetic to the persecution: it's that they were incapable of seeing that the persecutory treatment of some group was wrong. Afterall, Martin Niemöller himself was an anti-communist who was not merely apathetic to the way in which communists were treated by the Nazi Party, but actively supported it, incapable of seeing that it was actually unjustified.

For example, many Christians during the Middle Ages did not somehow know in the backs of their minds that persecuting "blasphemers" was wrong, yet did not care enough to do anything about the issue: they genuinely believed that blasphemy warranted floggings, imprisonments, and murders. The highly-influential theologian Thomas Aquinas illustrated this belief by saying that heretics "by right . . . can be put to death and despoiled of their possessions by the secular [authorities], even if they do not corrupt others, for they are blasphemers against God, because they observe a false faith. Thus they can be justly punished [even] more than those accused of high treason". The harm which the Christian persecutors inflicted was not caused by apathy, but by a barbaric perspective.

Simultaneously, every generation of people believes that they are lucky enough to be living in a society which is the most enlightened of all history. They believe that they have the best perception of the world out of anyone, and that they are not fundamentally fallible. As much as everyone thinks that this is somehow nonapplicable today, this absolutely includes the current generation just as much as prior ones. This is how bigotry actually prevails: when people have genuine certainty, without any willful ignorance nor deliberate malice, that their actions are justified by their somehow optimal perspective. People must understand that they do not think any fundamentally differently from anyone who lived hundreds of years ago; we do not have some sort of metaphysical comprehension of everything which transcends anything prior people were capable of understanding.

Because of this notion of certainty that we have in our perspective, and being aware that people in the past have always had this identical perspective for themselves while still being fundamentally wrong (as best as we can discern), we can assume that we have beliefs which are fundamentally wrong; the only problem is that it's not exactly a simple matter to identify which ones they are. People who use that Martin Niemöller quote should not be asking themselves "What can we do to stop the persecution of X group?", which is highly dependent on their preexisting prejudices, but rather, "Who is X group?". You can ask yourself if the treatment of pedophiles is genuinely nothing other than the correct way to deal with them, or if this is yet another unseen incarnation of communists, trade unionists, and Jews.

Just like all marginalized groups, pedophiles are stereotyped in undesirable ways. In their case, a typical pedophile is portrayed as being a creepy old man in a dirty rain coat who hides in the bushes of a park with a bag of candy. This, however, is no more legitimate of a representation than any other generic stereotype for its associated group. What then, is a typical pedophile like? To Catch A Predator was actually quite successful in demonstrating that there is no such thing as a typical pedophile. The pedophiles who appeared on the show represented every age group, from 19-year-olds to a 68-year-old. They were of every race, major religion, and type of personality. They were employed in a wide variety of fields, which included education, engineering, marketing, medicine, law enforcement, fire control, and law; Louis Conradt was a district attorney for over twenty years. The one similarity between the pedophiles who appeared on the series was that every one of them was male.

This is not because every pedophile is male; female pedophiles rarely look to the internet to meet children because they generally have greater access to them without causing suspicion. It is not too

unusual for females to be in situations where they can undress or bathe children, and it is considered to be culturally acceptable for females to cuddle, kiss, and fondle them. Females comprise 6% of reported child molestation cases, although this number is lower than the real value owing to the aforementioned reasons in combination with a lower likelihood of being reported.

The age range of the decoys was also fairly representative of what the most pedophiles are attracted to, although skewed toward the ephebophilia range. Pedophiles who are attracted to prepubescent girls have an age preference of 8-10, and pedophiles who are attracted to prepubescent boys have an age preference of 10-13.

Socrates, along with innumerable other greek men, practiced pederasty. The trial from which the earlier judge's excerpt came was for the highly lauded poet and playwright Oscar Wilde.

"He's just like a flower in bloom. He's at that perfect stage in which he is hermaphroditic. That is to say, he is neither all male nor all female not that anybody is of course, everyone is some mixture of those two characteristics but he is at the moment in that wonderful limbo between being a child and being an adolescent that is he is certainly an adolescent at this point, but he still has this soft feminine grace about him.

A 12 or 13 year old boy."

"I would try by saying that it's the freshness of their mind, the nimbleness of their bodies, the way in which they move, they act- They're graceful."

"I just want to be able to walk down 5th avenue and see adults and children mingled together."

Forcing children into relationships with their parents by stripping away their right to employment and property is no different than forcing women to have husbands by stripping away their right to employment and property.

"A child is uninterested in it, and thus is abused by the adult who manipulates the child for sex."

This is what every adult does for the child. Every adult manipulates it. Yet, you only object when it comes to sex. Why?

If a child is not interested, then they have the option to refuse.

"I don't believe it is possible for a child and an adult to have a healthy symbiotic sexual relationship, mostly due to the fact that most children simply aren't interested in sexual contact."
You can say the same about women.

"And there's the rub. If it is not between equals, how do you prevent coercion?
Irrelevant. If that's reason to prevent sex between unequals, it's reason to prevent any interaction between unequals.... unless you can demonstrate that sex is different for some important reason."

People assert that prepubescent children are incapable of having children of their own, so they are not to be allowed to have sex.

Their restriction of children's behavior shouts, "Once you are physically capable of having children, you may have slaves of your own."

People who assert that someone can engage in sexual contact only once they are mature.

"Maturity" is someone's ability to conform to others' expectations.

"Children aren't physically capable!"

Define sexual contact. Perhaps I should define and use "sensuous contact" for them, instead, to encompass more activity.

voting- Men were supposed to represent their family.
Women are too capricious!

What does a person need to "get" about sex? What makes it any more spectacularly involved than tying your shoe, eating some ice cream, or watching a really good film? People don't do themselves any favors by placing sex in its own category of importance and significance. People can connect with each other intimately in many different ways, spiritually and intellectually, as well as physically.

Let me hazard a guess what people mean when they say "children don't understand". They mean they don't have the cynical, ugly jaded view of human beings as manipulating quasi-psychotics. The people who say this tend to see a poisoned well everywhere they look, they see ulterior motives beneath the surface of every expression.

Does a child understand that her step-mom buys her candy and takes her to the park in order to curry her favor? Does she understand that she has to go to Sunday school because her parents want her to grow up with the same inculcation they received? Does she comprehend the subtle molding and shaping and

channeling her guardians impose upon her, in order to try to steer her closer to matching their ideals?

No, most children would not. But you don't say "you shouldn't buy sweets for your kids because they don't understand your motives".

No, instead people telescope on sexual expression. By all means, manipulate children as you see fit. Pour your religion into them, fill them up with your phobias and your cowardice and weaknesses. But dammit, if a sexuality enters the picture at any point, buster, you've crossed the line! Most people don't give two squats about manipulating each other, manipulating children especially. Don't try to fool me that they do.

They care about sex because they've had it blemished by their own parents' shame and guilt and feelings of dirtiness. Religions, but not just religions, have told them to turn their nose in disgust at their animal selves, as if they should castrate an entire aspect of their nature. But you can't. The human animal has its desires and always will. That does not mean, however, that it does not come packaged along with human ego, human consciousness, and conscience.

People will manipulate. People will engage in sex. But these two do not necessarily occur at the same time. They do not entail one another.

If someone detests manipulation, then by all means fight it. I feel the same way, and I hate seeing children lied to and cheated.

But I won't for a second let someone make me feel ashamed because they have issues with human sexuality and place it on a black pedestal.

Sex can express beauty, rapture, spiritual awe. It can represent almost nothing but biological imperative. It can mean domination. It can mean insecurity, or acceptance. But I won't presume to know the particulars of any given case, projecting my problems onto another.

I'll summarize with one of my favorite Nietzsche quotes: "The ... resolve to find the world ugly and bad has made the world ugly and bad."

For instance, I hated having my grandmother kiss me.

People who deny the legitimacy of sexual orientation being based on age rather than gender believe that gender is a sort of immutable pseudo-metaphysical categorization of humans yet age is not, so it does not constitute a sexuality.

Yet people treat children

People saying, "You can't handle a relationship with an adult?" is no different than saying to a gay male, "You can't handle a relationship with a woman?"

Children cannot legally consent. That is incontestable.

A part of sexual orientation.

(Address the assertion that since some children are harmed, it's best to outlaw it to protect them.)

I would say that in the meantime, if one straddles the fence, and even if one does not, education seems of the most importance. Granted, we live in a time where I can't frankly engage in discussion with a child about sex without fear of repercussion. I can't even form a close friendship with a young friend without raising suspicions. That makes education difficult. Sometime, somewhere, someone has to fight this if it should ever change. That will inescapably cause hurt to someone else, and a rift in the established order and mean. I lament that, and while I don't know if I could bring myself to serve as such a thorny catalyst, I understand the necessity.

(Address the assertion that sex with children doesn't benefit anyone.)

Add Kinsey.

If a Muslim were to say that a female would be harmed if she let anyone see her skin, and he said that I needed evidence to prove otherwise, I would dismiss his claim. She would only be harmed if everyone told her that she was supposed to be harmed by it.

"When we "protect" children, we prevent them from having access to information and experiences. We may justify doing so in order to promote a particular notion of the good life ("have long term relationships, fall in love, have a family, been more successful, have better mental health" in your words). We lie to them and lock them up for their own good. But really, it's for our own good – our conception of the good. All your examples are euphemisms for pursuing a particular kind of life that may, in fact, be very immoral by some standards. Mutual sexuality output contracts, reproduction, achieving high social status, and behaving in a predictable manner do not seem to me to be goals so universally honorable that they justify denying 13-18-year-olds control of their own bodies."

Statutory-rape laws encode the outdated and sexist idea that a woman's virginity must be protected for her father's sake and that she herself can never desire on her own, Levine argues.

On a more general level we can look at the undoubted fact that in this society children are the property of their parents; they are placed in the hierarchical family structure which demands that they be non-sexual and denies them the liberty to choose with whom they want to associate. However much a child may suffer persecution from peers and be unloved

by parents, because of this property relationship, a friendship with an adult is frowned upon. Together with the wrath which results from their breaching of property rights, paedophiles also incur wrath because many people consider sex to be basically brutal and exploitative by its very nature and not mutually enjoyable. Some people therefore assume that any paedophile relationship must necessarily consist of an adult sexually exploiting a child. Consequently the law operates on the assumption that the superior power position of the adult has been used to force the sexual relation-ship. The criminal justice system then, according to this argument, is not primarily concerned with the safety of the child at all but with the safety of the family structure and the maintenance of private property.

Another example of children being controlled by parents- Custody cases. If they are asked what they want, the question they're asked is "By whom do you want to be dominated for a significant portion of your life?"

This contradiction between the free-spirit of children and being owned by their parents...

---Murderers don't have to register on a list, but sex offenders do?

The notion of 'protection' by means of taking all decisions out of the hands of the party to be protected, and giving all responsibility to 'authorities' who are presumed to know best, is clearly evident in the SPCC procedure. In this case it is the social worker who is presumed to know best. And the social worker is clearly charged with the task of convincing the child and family 'of the necessity for prosecuting the offender to protect the community'. What if they are not convinced? What if the child was very fond of the adult and knew a damn sight better than any social worker that he was not a danger to the community? What if the parents knew it too? - for parents often do oppose prosecution.

It appears that this 'we know best' attitude is even allowed to influence the judicial proceedings when they are under way, in the SPCC scheme of things: evidently they do not feel they are overreaching themselves by moral blackmail of the accused, in persuading him to plead guilty so as to protect the child. Yet this kind of pressure is just as unfair, in terms of being contrary to the ordinary rules of natural justice, as the Israeli system described above. Incidentally, it should be realized that the person most sensitive to the harm done by police and court proceedings is often none other than the accused. I have known several people who have pleaded guilty when they might have escaped conviction, simply to save

the child from the anguish of it all. One of them got a life sentence for his pains! Can it really be satisfactory to rely on a system which exploits the courage, the moral strength, the sheer goodness of the accused, in order to condemn him?

'What children really need is the option to refuse. The freedom not to engage in sexual activity is as important as any other aspect of sexual freedom. But children are raised in such a way that they cannot refuse adults. Parents have insisted that children accept all forms of affection from relatives and friends - being picked up, fondled, hugged, kissed, pinched, tickled, squeezed - leaving children with little experience in saying no. They also have little experience in trusting their own reactions to people and in resisting the promise of rewards. They are not informed about sexual matters, do not understand their own sexuality or that of others, and thus cannot cope effectively in this area. We keep children ignorant and then worry that they are vulnerable to sexual advances.' [note 18]

Afterall, different jurisdictions across the world seem to bungle all sorts of things, particularly when it comes to the sexuality of children. Each one seems to come to the conclusion that the children in one place are fundamentally different than the children in another, considering that the ages of consent range from 9 to 21; either that, or their decision is arbitrary and meaningless. There have also been such absurdities as instances of boys below the age of consent, claimed to be incapable of comprehending sexuality, simultaneously being held responsible for child payment. (Laws generally have no idea what they're doing, so perhaps the law is just confused.)

Yet, I cannot imagine that the same person who would claim that the ruling is too imprecise to apply to children, would have any opposition to a single law which deals with the legal treatment of pedophiles, as outlined in the fifth and sixth paragraphs, despite how draconian and absolute all of it is. *^{*} making such a claim would not object to the current enforcement of anti-pedophile and anti-child legislation, despite how draconian it is. However, I will grant that and address further objections to the consent of children even though it seems quite clear that children can consent.

My short response is that children are incapable of consenting merely because the adults around them say that they aren't capable of consenting. However, this understandably would not allay anyone's anxiety by itself, so I will have to go in-depth into this.

Professing that a child is incapable of understanding the concept of consent because of the belief that adults are universally "more rational" than they are, and thus children do not deserve to control their bodies, is equivalent to claiming that females do not deserve to control their bodies because males are "more judicious in personal affairs" in relation to them, or some other such inane fatuity. It's a senseless and morally reproachful position to hold.

. . . Before addressing this, I must admit that it sounds like a bizarre ad hoc justification for their pre-conceived position that children should not have sex. It seems scarcely different than saying that Africans are incapable of living as anything other than slaves because their brains are in some way not as sophisticated as Europeans', but I will grant the assertion that adults have more developed frontal lobes than children have.

Why does a relationship need to be perpetual? And if that's the case, then why do you not object to adults not intending on perpetually being in a relationship with each other?

^^\If it's "making love", then why does it matter if sexuality is involved? (Basically, just elaborate on that "making lov" argument.)

Can a child understand the consequences of different diets, and the serious health risks involved?
Can a child understand the consequences of traveling in a car? It is impossible for them to understand the possibility of them getting into a car wreck. Do they have enough of a conception of the way that cars operate to have informed consent to take the risk?
Can a child understand what it means to have a religion? How is it possible for their feeble minds to comprehend its doctrines? Can they comprehend that if they fail to follow particular rules, they will eternally burn in hell?

There is the notion that children are bumbling creatures who are incapable of knowing what is good and what is bad for them, and so other people must act on behalf of them to protect them.

You don't have a right to make decisions on my behalf even if you really do have better judgement than I do and even if doing so might actually be in my best, long-term interests. Anti-consensual, pedo-sex anarchists are using the basic argument for the very existence of states,

Presumably, it would be better to inform children of accurate technical knowledge of sex rather than have them basing their information off of pornography they happened to stumble upon.

These factors may prompt some approving nods as criteria for consent, if only because they appear to rule out most, if not all, children. Giving it a moment's more thought, however, a problem arises: even adults, in embarking on a sexual encounter or relationship, cannot be sure 'where it will all end'; nor do most people enter adulthood with a fixed idea as to the activities, and people, that might turn them on -- the scope for experiment and discovery is a lifelong one. Only the third factor, that of control over the situation, appears to maintain its crucial importance when viewed in an adult context.

The usual mistake is to believe that sexual activity, especially for children, is so alarming and dangerous that participants need to have an absolute, total awareness of every conceivable ramification of taking part before they can be said to give valid consent. What there most definitely needs to be, is the child's willingness [*1] to take part in the activity in question; whatever social or legal rules are operated, they must not be such as to allow unwilling children to be subjected to sexual acts. But there is no need whatever for a child to know 'the consequences' of engaging in harmless sex play, simply because it is exactly that: harmless.

Those who see only a negative potential in power discrepancies should bear in mind that there is a comparable discrepancy in the parent-child relationship - in which women, as mothers, may sometimes with justice be dubbed the oppressor. Every time a mother makes an 'ageist' assumption that her child isn't old enough to do something she wants to do (regardless of her actual development), that she needs 'protecting' from a new experience, when in reality she needs freeing, needs to spread her wings, she is being oppressive.

Similarly, the psychological need of many women to keep their children as children, rather than letting them develop, is often an oppressive fact during those children's later childhood and early adolescence, and it can in extreme forms go on well into adulthood. This type of oppression is common enough, but the sexual constriction of children in early childhood by their mothers is much more than common - it is all but universal in western cultures. In the Freudian formulation, little boys fear that their fathers will castrate them, but in fact it is generally mothers who take upon themselves the role of imposing sexual taboos. It is the mothers who tell their little boys (and girls) the places where they must not touch themselves, the parts they must not play with. And if the barriers

against masturbation in infancy are gradually being broken down, mothers still reinforce prohibitions against guilt-free sex play with age-mates, to say nothing of the incest taboo and the prohibition of sex with adults. It is the mothers who must answer for the 'complexes' which are the result, and which give our culture its characteristically guilt-ridden flavour. Father may appear superficially to be the stern law-giver in the family, but mother is the law-giver-in-chief to both girls and boys in the formative early stages and her threatened capacity to withhold love is a far more potent weapon in fashioning what Freud called the 'super ego', or castrating conscience, than any sanction wielded by the father.

The disparity in size and power between parent and child creates a potential for abuse: a mother could not batter a baby as big as herself. But, on the basis that parent-child relationships are generally positive (and, in addition, given that safeguards can be built in, such as according rights to children) we accept that inequality is simply in the nature of the thing. In itself, it is not an aspect on which we would focus our attention in determining whether a particular mother-child relationship was good or bad.

I would like to see paedophilic relationships looked at in a similar light, because I believe that the comparison with the parent-child relationship is in most cases more appropriate than that with adult sexual relationships. Another model, made much of in J.Z. Eglinton's *Greek Love*, is that of teacher-pupil - the mentor relationship. Why should these models, traditionally asexual as they are (in our culture), be appropriate? Essentially because, notwithstanding the sexual element of paedophilia, the affectual structure of a paedophilic relationship, so far as the child is concerned, is more like that between parent and child, or between teacher and pupil, than between lovers. Sometimes the child feels 'love' for the adult, in a romantic sense; more often, in the case of pre-adolescent children, the affection for the adult is not different in kind to that which it would feel for a parent. On the adult's side there may of course be romantic, essentially non-parental feelings, but in any discussion of the impact of the relationship on the child, it makes sense to take as one's model that which best fits the child's perceptions.

"Preventing adults from exploiting children by making children slaves is . . . counterintuitive."

"Let's face it: the modern crusade to "protect" children is really about protecting traditional parental authority and control."

They conflate rape with sex. They can do the same with adult males and females.

At the moment children are trained not to refuse adults anything and to accept all forms of physical affection as being the right of an adult to impose on a child.

We keep children innocent and ignorant and then somewhat hypocritically worry that they will not be able to resist the sexual approaches of pedophiles.

Pedophiles constitute only half of the relevant parties in a pedophilic relationship: the other party is the child. What kind of a child would want to be in a pedophilic relationship? This question is characteristic of society's view of pedophiles: the view that pedophiles invariably molest children instead of having consensual relationships. "They are seen as preying on children rather than relating to them, and corrupting them instead of showing them affection.". Society tries to reduce pedophilic relationships to an adult's sexual attraction to a child. Imagine trying to describe a heterosexual relationship to someone, who, no matter what you say, inevitably responds with, "I will not be tricked by you. The relationship is fundamentally based on the decadent sexual attraction of a male and female, despite whatever justifications you might contrive". What can be said to someone like that; to someone who has an immutably fixed judgement, such as all heterosexual relationships being illegitimate, and who will not listen to reason?

Perhaps a personal anecdotal experience will help you to see this. A while ago, I knew a thirteen-year-old boy online. He was the youngest person in an online group of people ranging from mid-teens to late thirties. He didn't speak very often, but a couple months after first meeting him, I asked him about his opinion on something and we got to talking about various things each night. At one point, he degraded something he had said because he was "just a kid", and I replied that age meant nothing to me. Another time, he asked me what I thought about homosexuals and I said that someone's sexuality was irrelevant to me. He thought it was amusing that I appeared to not judge anything about anyone.

Soon after, he confided in me that he was bisexual and that I was the only person he had told. He began talking to me about sexuality and all sorts of personal things, like his anxiety over being in a family of Jehovah's Witnesses, of being in an abnormally-homophobic school, and of his attraction toward his male best friend. I had never tried talking about his sexuality to him: he brought up the subject himself because, for the first time in his life, someone was actually willing to listen to him as a person instead of the label of a child. He appreciated that very much, and even joked about wanting me to be his father for the next five years.

All of it made me wonder how many lonely children there are who are dismissed as being unimportant because of their age. While there was nothing pedophilic about any of this, it illustrates how a pedophilic relationship could begin. One pedophile in his journal described that, "Boys just want to know about sex and no one really wants to tell them about it — they want to play with themselves and with other people and they want to do it more times than teachers or parents would think possible. All I do is give the boys what they want and to let them talk about things that no one else would let them talk about". After the pedophile was discovered by the police and, in standard pedophile-style, subsequently committed suicide, one of his young lovers said of him:

"I could really talk to him about this girl whom I wanted to fuck. We had petted but I guess I was a bit scared about what to do then and she, I think was like me. We spent a bit of time together (him and I) working out what I should do and it seemed to work. When I went back to his place a week or so later I was very proud and couldn't wait to tell him what I'd done and how it had gone. He seemed very pleased with me and asked me all the details and I told him and we were both happy. It was really a big kick to have (him) do things to me. I mean I really liked him touching me there and all over the body in fact. I might have felt a bit guilty to start with but as the years have gone by I just see it for what it was; just a bit of fun and a way for me to get a new experience."

Pedophiles have the capacity to relate to children better than the rest of their society's adults, precisely because they do not see them as "children". Pedophiles are seen as reducing children to sex-objects, but it's instructive to see how the rest of society actually views children. This perspective might explain why pedophilia is so abhorred by society. A clue is provided in a quote from Xavier Von Erck's personal website. A couple of months prior to Louis Conradt's death, he said that, "I'm not in this to protect children, it's a nice side benefit sure, but my motivation is to make life a living hell for predators and pedophiles online."

That sounds a bit strange. According to everyone, their opposition to pedophilia is based off of a desire to protect children. Yet, the mother of a girl who had consensual sexual activity with an adult said of the pedophile that "My little girl was abused and abused. She probably knows more about sex than I do. It

sickens me to have to say it, but I think she came to like it. She must have, she was always excited when he came around to the house . . . when police told me what he had done to my little girl I thought she would be better off dead". For the pedophile, she said that she "just wanted to tie him on an ants' nest and pour boiling water over him".

This is a view which is expressed invariably by adults: that children are better off dying than having consensual sex. From what does this (dogma) come? Hidden beyond the overt treatment of pedophiles in this society, it is instructive to see the treatment of children. What is the life of a child like?

Battery of children, euphemized under the cute-sounding "spanking", is fully legal in the United States; bizarrely, the penalty for loving a child is significantly worse than the penalty for hating one. Children's free wills are suppressed and annihilated in every conceivable manner within families. Their associations, location, and every action is subject to the arbitrary caprice of their parents. They are denied their own thoughts, opinions, values, and religious beliefs, instead being manipulated into adopting their parents'. Within the rest of society, children are denied property; their parents can instantly siphon it from them, regardless of how the child obtained it. Furthermore, they are forced into all of this through being denied employment, and they are denied the right to have even the remotest impact on their government which institutes all of this.

If an adult discovers that a child has chosen to engage in a pedophilic relationship with another adult who is able to sympathize with (the child's pain), the relationship which the child considered to be valuable is instantly destroyed. Children are indoctrinated into believing that they have been unimaginably abused by the pedophile- even while their own parents continue to control every facet of their life-, they are labeled as horribly damaged victims, and are subject to the (abusive) will of psychiatrists who "treat" them into believing that they can overcome their "abuse". Doesn't it say everything about society's view of children when pedophilia is compared to necrophilia and bestiality? Society views children as being no different than inanimate, unfeeling matter at worst, or mindless animals at best. Consent is something which is important to me. On the contrary, people who oppose pedophilic relationships are the ones who do not care about consent. They completely dismiss children's wills and desires as being nonexistent.

Imagine that the world takes away the only person who loves you, and tortures him for the rest of his life, and the world tells you that you have done something very wrong for not submitting to its will, which demands that you abstain from such a meaningful relationship. The world shouts that your feelings are nonexistent at worst and completely illegitimate at best, and that you must be taught to see everything in the same way everyone else does. People think of children as being fundamentally different than adults, as if their emotions are meaningless, and that they must be conditioned into having the values the rest of society has.

I can only come to the conclusion that adults do not fear pedophiles at all: adults fear the freedom of children. The assertion that children are incapable of consenting is an indication of the abusive mentality which is inflicted upon them daily in this society, dehumanizing them and oppressively relegating them to the status of slaves. The opposition to the sexuality of children cannot be conceived as a concern for them- the adults who oppose it are self-serving. The world shouts to children that they are not people: children are property.

"You do not see children asking to be free!" "Children are asexual. Why would they want to have sex? They must have been coerced."

This is blatantly false and no evidence exists to justify this. Even infants are sexual.

This is the exact type of claim which would be used to relegate females to the status of property: the notion that females are asexual, and thus there is nothing wrong with denying them their own decisions because they must be controlled for their own good; violent coercion is justified against a female because no female would ever desire anything sexual owing to some arbitrary cultural criterion.

Someone might say that it would be difficult to find a child who wants to have sex with an adult, or that children are happy to be in their current situation and do not want "freedom forced onto them". Although I do not believe that to be the case, if that were true, then it would be no different than slaves in the pre-Civil War United States believing that their slaveowners have bestowed a positive economic benefit upon them, and they're happy to live the way they are. After all, they receive food and housing in exchange for their obedience.

But whatever they desire is quite irrelevant (especially considering that it is the result of the current state of things); I am not saying that they cannot be enslaved if they so desire. What I want to offer them is the choice to be free, with them deciding if they want to be. I wouldn't need to demonstrate a slave's desire to be free: all that I would need to do is allow them to have the option of attaining freedom. The same applies to children: I do not need to demonstrate their desire to be free: all that I would need to do is allow them to have the option of attaining freedom. I'm not going to act of behalf of children, coercing them to behave in the way I want them to. If a child wants to engage in sexual behavior, then that is all there is to it.

A number of factors dispose Bender and Blau and others to think of the sexuality of children as pathological. Chief among them is the cultural factor that children in our society are not expected to have sexual relationships, certainly not with adults, and that any expression of such 'symptoms' is a sufficient indicator that they need 'treatment'.

Pedophilia is subject to numerous explicitly fallacious arguments, which are often accepted as obvious truths. If they were to be applied against homosexuality, many people would see them for what they are, but the inclusion of children clouds people's vision. An example would be to say that pedophilia is unnatural, and therefore should not be tolerated. People who make that assertion presumably believe that anyone who exhibits unnatural behavior deserves to be tortured, but beyond that, whether or not some behavior is "natural" is entirely irrelevant to whether or not it warrants any mistreatment. Another example is the assertion that pedophiles need to be treated in such a way because the DSM-IV recognizes pedophilia as a mental illness. Beyond the relevance of this assertion, it is difficult to take any of the DSMs seriously when it comes to the classifications of sexuality; prior editions arbitrarily listed homosexuality as a mental illness, which was equally arbitrarily removed in a revision. Despite all that could be said about the status of pedophilia under the DSM-IV, it is not relevant to the legitimacy of pedophilic relationships. I will not address the dozens of such arguments for the sake of brevity, and will go directly toward the most common and most understandable argument: the idea that a child is fundamentally incapable of consenting.

Someone who argues against pedophilic relationships in this way might concede that there are

individual children who are capable of consenting, but that the majority are unable to, so there must be, at the very least, an age of consent law to protect them. In either case, the belief is that at least a considerable portion of children are incapable of consenting to sexual activity, and that therefore, any instance of sexuality among children should be outlawed because it might constitute rape. To include both groups, all references to "a child" and "children" will refer to a completely average child rather than an exceptional one.

Personally, I do not understand why sexual activity is considered to be incomprehensible to a child. Perhaps I missed a memo which I was supposed to receive at some point, because I have the same conception of sexuality as I did when I first was exposed to any information pertaining to it at age 11. While my value-judgements of sex have changed, I haven't had a divine transcendence which I was presumably supposed to have pertaining to the conception of it. Additionally, when I was prepubescent, it was my observation that none of my peers would have had any incapacity to consent. I have never understood the mysticism with which this topic is treated. However, I will try to treat this assertion seriously.

Some who argue that children cannot consent to sexual activity claim that they are literally cognitively incapable of the necessary comprehension. This argument is based on the assertion that children's frontal lobes are inadequately developed to conceive of something as allegedly confounding as sex. The state of their frontal lobes is said to be relevant because their capacity to reason is perceived as being considerably affected by it; capacity to reason is a requisite for understanding what sexual activity entails, which is necessary for the establishment of consent to it. From this view, children would be similar to a mentally-impaired adult. An argument against such an adult's ability to consent does not directly pertain to the developmental state of their brain, but instead relies on a doubt as to their capacity to reason. Similarly, a child's ability to consent would also be purely dependent on their capacity to reason rather than the irrelevant developmental stage of their brain.

At the beginning of 2011, the High Court of England and Wales had to determine the criteria applying to a mentally-impaired adult in establishing the legitimacy of consent to sex. It ruled that:

"For capacity to consent to sex to be present the following factors must be understood:

- (a) the mechanics of the act
- (b) that only adults over the age of 16 should do it (and therefore participants need to be able to distinguish accurately between adults and children)
- (c) that both (or all) parties to the act need to consent to it
- (d) that there are health risks involved, particularly the acquisition of sexually transmitted and sexually transmissible infections
- (e) that sex between a man and a woman may result in the woman becoming pregnant, and
- (f) that sex is part of having relationships with people and may have emotional consequences."

of cognitive development. The court did not need to isolate mentally-handicapped adults into some quasi-metaphysical category separate from typical adults: the ruling applied to both. Momentarily ignoring (b), these appear to be reasonable criteria for the establishment of consent to sexual activity, and I cannot imagine other jurisdictions coming to vastly different conclusions. The ruling states that any mentally-impaired adult who could understand all of this would be eligible for sexual activity. Likewise, it would intuitively apply to children, who are to be seen as being mentally-impaired owing to their undeveloped frontal lobes. Therefore, if a child understood all of this, then they would be free to engage in sexual activity if they so desired. However, the judge threw in (b), a requirement that only adults could legally engage in sexual activity. It is a qualification which I would similarly expect from every jurisdiction.

If a severely mentally-impaired adult may engage in sexual activity simply because they are capable of understanding sex, then why may a child not enjoy the same right? While it might be conceded that children are cognitively capable of understanding sex, it is further argued that for some number of external reasons, they should not be allowed to engage in it. Because the court did not attempt to justify its position, I will have to assume that it was a general reflection of the attitude of the rest of its society, and I will attempt to address those widespread contentions.

While some people may concede that children are cognitively capable of consenting to sex, they claim that children do not have the practical knowledge to do so. If that is the case, then that is an indication that children should be exposed to all of the relevant information pertaining to sexuality rather

The only re

than continue the standard practice of distorting their image of the world. It is as if someone has lived their entire life while forcefully being help captive in a cage; upon my telling the guard to release the prisoner, they proclaim, "What do you expect me to do? He has not lived in the cage long enough to have a conception of how to live outside of it". If a particular child is ignorant of sexuality, it is not owing to some inadequacy they have: it is because their society has deliberately withheld the relevant information from them.

Perhaps someone would argue that children might be able to understand information which is given to them about sexuality, but they are incapable of making informed decisions with that information. It is said that, because sexual relationships are multifaceted, they are subsequently incomprehensible to a child. This view can only mean that children have not been conditioned into having the same arbitrary cultural values about sexuality as the rest of their society has. Basically, in the case of childhood sexuality, they argue that children have not been indoctrinated into understanding that child sexuality is supposed to be morally outrageous.

If homosexuality were to be considered indecent by a society, would you tell a new member of that society that they cannot engage in it because they do not have an accurate conception of what homosexuality means to their society; or would you dismiss their society's perspective and recognize that the only relevant parties are the ones engaging in the homosexual relationship? Why would those external societal meanings matter?

Furthermore, who gets to decide what the values are which pertain to sexual relationships? Personally, it is my opinion that the overwhelming majority of adults have no conception of how to participate in a meaningful romantic relationship, and that they would be better off if they were single. Should that mean that I would be justified in treating everyone in the same way which this society treats pedophiles and children? My personal opinions seem to be entirely irrelevant, along with every other person's opinions. Any contexts which pertains to any particular relationship is up to the individuals involved to perceive on their own. The most prudent position would be to allow everyone to live in the way they desire instead of forcing them to behave according to some irrelevant external notions of vague prerequisites, and of what sexual relationships are "supposed to" entail.

In the case of children, why can't each child determine by themselves what sex means to them? While I don't recognize the validity of their assertion, perhaps there genuinely are perceptions of sexuality which are important for people to have to live their lives. If that is the case, then if children were allowed to engage in sex, they would no longer be alien to any of those meanings and could share those values with the rest of their society.

Some might argue that children should not be free to determine their own values when it comes to sexuality, or perhaps they should not even have any information pertaining to it, because sex destroys their childhood innocence. "What does innocence mean, other than enforced ignorance?" It is a societally-sanctioned notion which is thrust upon children independent of their will. When people are appalled about the idea of exposing children to information about sexuality, using such trite slogans as "Let kids be kids", all I can hear is, "Let us force our societal notions onto these people, who may not live in any way other than in the way we've decided for them".

The notion of a society "protecting" the innocence of children by preventing them from engaging in sexuality, is no different than the notion of "protecting" females from engaging in premarital sex: "We can't allow our dear women, with their dainty and purely untarnished minds, to be exposed to such base and immoral matters as sex: it would fluster their poor hearts and corrupt their very soul. We must outlaw their premarital sex for their own good". Instead of acting on behalf of females, it makes the most sense to allow each one to come to her own conclusions and act in the way she desires. Similarly, instead of outlawing pre-age-of-consent sex for children, they should be able to come to their own conclusions about sexuality and act in the way they desire.

If protecting children is something which is genuinely important to you, then you should be eager to inform children about sexuality in an honest manner. This notion of "innocence" is very harmful to children. Imagine a case in which a little girl is sitting on her uncle's lap. The uncle fondles her genitalia against her will. Information about her genitalia, which she only knows as her naughty off-limits zone, was viewed by her parents as being so dirty for a child, that they never mentioned anything about it. In a house where sexuality is a topic which everyone acts nervous about whenever it is remotely referenced to, it's to be expected that the little girl would never mention her uncle to anyone. She would be too worried about getting into trouble over the matter because she would imagine that her molestation was her fault, and that she was being naughty. Meanwhile, she continues to get molested everytime her uncle

sees her because her parents were afraid of destroying her "childhood innocence".

She would have been better off in preventing her uncle from molesting her if she had even the slightest information about sexuality, instead of being kept ignorant about it and having parents who were terrified of the topic. The best way you can prevent children from being molested is informing them about sexuality so that they can identify what's happening to them.

(Imagine another case in which someone has had their "innocence" taken.)

"Adults have more power than children, so their relationships are illegitimate!"

The proposed solution to eliminating instances of a discrepancy of authority in relationships, is to use the authority of adults to control children as property rather than allow them to live in the way they desire. It seems counterintuitive.

The issue present here is the notion of societal authority.

Children should not be taught that they are to be submissive to the will of adults. It is appalling that such a practice is accepted.

You advocate a system under which children are to be treated as sub-human, and then are appalled when an adult has sex with one?

How can anyone criticize a pedophilic relationship owing to a power discrepancy, while supporting the power discrepancy in every single non-romantic relationship the child is forced into having with adults? Why is it that the presence of sexuality makes one abusive, yet not any of the others?

It is because the opposition to pedophilia from a power-disparity perspective has nothing to do with pedophilia in itself. The same thing applies to x (like psychiatrists and employers). The reason why it is opposed, like the others, is because of an atavistic opposition to sexuality.

What about the power disparity between a politician and a subject? A politician has the ability to write an arbitrary law which allows police to kill the subject on sight, yet no one objects to this for the reason of a "power discrepancy".

What if the instance of power changed?

Or what if there is one person who is significantly better at doing something which the other person is completely unable to do? Would it be right to persecute the ones with more power in their field for "abusing" the one with less?

What if a child desired the wisdom or X or X of an adult?

There is innately a "power disparity" in every relationship.

Saying that children should be prevented from behaving the way they desire because adults have more authority, is no different than saying that slaves should be prevented from behaving the way they desire because free people have more authority. The issue would have absolutely nothing to do with the slaves: all of the fault lies in the institution which oppresses them and continually contrives justifications for its existence.

Instead of eliminating sexual relationships which have power discrepancies, it seems as if the most prudent solution is to eliminate the notion of power: the idea that it is right for one person to be subject to the caprice of another, and instead allow people to live in the way they desire. If a child wants to have sex with an adult, why can they not?

No one believes that a pretentious "power disparity" argument applies to the legitimacy of sexual relationships between adults, yet it arbitrarily applies to children?

This argument against pedophilic relationships can be applied to females to oppose their premarital sexual relationships. Because males in such a society have more "power", that makes their relationship illegitimate? What is wrong with that? Someone could say to a male that, "The institution of an adult male having sex with an adult female is rife with innumerable centuries of domination and oppression. Females cannot countenance the power dynamics involved in such a relationship, and thus must be prevented from engaging in any until they attain our societal milestone of marriage". All that you can say to such a person is, "This has nothing to do with specious notions of institutions, power dynamics, and society. This is what we want to do and it only involves us. Nothing else matters."

The real reason you bring this up is because of a patronizing perspective of children as being sub-human.

There is the argument that the "power disparity" in the relationship between an adult and a child renders any sexuality between them to be inherently abusive.

In any event, the pedophile doesn't have any "power" in the relationship. Numerous people will want to kill the pedophile as soon as he is discovered. How can it be said that there is any power involved in pedophilic relationships? In fact, there is a subversion of power- a subversion of the power of society. (Elaborate, I guess.)

"Children who engage in pedophilic relationships are harmed!"

What the younger one in the relationship from earlier said:

"I can't really think how this could have possibly affected me adversely, but I sometimes think about what would have happened if we had been caught. Certainly, he would have been devastated by the law and the police. I think I would have been made to feel as though I was some sort of freak and might well have sort of begun to think of myself as being a queer or whatever. But that's all that might have happened. What really happened was enjoyable and didn't affect me in a major way at all."

Presumably, this is because sexual relationships have unimaginably grave consequences of some sort, and thus must be approached exceedingly carefully.

When children are taught that engaging in sexual activity is immoral, of course they will feel guilty.

Is the abuse which can be observed in pedophilic relationships endemic because of the age difference, or because it is legitimately abusive?

"I was abused as a 13-year old, but it wasn't abusive just because of my age. No, it was abusive because this guy was lying to me and keeping me from my family. Sex is OK if it is consensual and safe, no matter what the person's age is. There isn't some metaphysical category of "children" who are all nonsexual, naive, innocent beings."

One of the reasons children do not report sex abuse is that their parents have usually made it abundantly clear (by their behavior) that they don't like talking about sex, or interpersonal problems the child is having, and children are able to guess what kind of news might make their parents go off on them. Kids hate it when their parents flip out (for good reason). Also, people learn very early in life to manage information. Little Johnny doesn't tell his folks what he did that got him in trouble, if it can at all be avoided. And children are likely to assume that an unpleasant experience is their fault in some way--another reason to not fess up.

Why is it considered that the sexuality is what harms them rather than actual abuse as distinct from sexuality, and associating with someone who has psychopathic behavior?

The data is distorted because instances of rape and molestation are conflated with instances of consensual pedophilic sexuality. Nonconsensual instances are more likely to be revealed to authorities.

If you demand that children need to obey your command that they cannot know about sex, cannot engage in sex, then you cannot expect them to decline when another adult says that they must have sex. You do not help anyone by treating sexuality in the worst light. "Sexuality is not a matter of violence".

Adult panic or disgust about young people's seeking pleasure for themselves is responsible for much of the trauma that minors experience when they are caught behaving "inappropriately" for their ages, even in a consensual context.

So, quite the contrary, I don't think I am encouraging the kind of behavior that some priests, a few priests, in the Catholic church have been practicing. Rather, I think I am arguing for an atmosphere and an attitude opposite to what began in the Catholic church, which would be more protective of children.

Where the literature suggests that negative consequences of a short or long term nature occur as a result of child-adult sexual contacts, it is found that the consequences are generally associated with three common factors. The first relates to a situation where physical force, coercion or psychological pressure is used. The most adverse reactions occur when physical violence is involved, especially when the child attempts to resist but is unsuccessful. The second negative consequence occurs when poor communications exist in the child's family. Sexual matters cannot be discussed openly and the child receives, or anticipates receiving strongly negative reactions to disclosure of sexual activities. The third relates to a situation where there is little sexual knowledge on the part of the child or alternatively where the child has absorbed parental values suggesting that sex is dirty, painful or frightening. But even when the last two conditions exist the effects, the research would suggest, are nowhere near as traumatic as popular folklore would have it. [*10]

The response of the criminal justice system both to the 'victim' and 'offender' in adult-child cases is counter-productive. We have already seen that the older male is treated with contempt by both the police and the courts and little sympathy is shown towards the way he will be treated in prison. Similarly, the young male's treatment bears a remarkable similarity to that received by incest victims. In both paedophilia and incest considerable distress to the boy or girl occurs when parents, relatives or the police themselves discover the relationship. Constant and often insensitive questioning adds to this distress and it is not unusual to find that many researchers have noted that far more damage is caused by the confrontations the child has with his parents or the legal authorities than by the act itself.

In the case of paedophiles as opposed to, for example, parents, it is assumed that any disparities and inequities in power between the adult and the child will be exercised by the adult malevolently. In reality, however, many paedophiles are patently well disposed towards their partners and take the role of loving teachers, house parents, or simply close friends. Clarence Osborne often epitomised the benevolence that exists in paedophile relationships because, in many respects, he displaced the interest shown by their parents. In short, it is a myth to assume that paedophiles necessarily use their greater experience and power in a destructive way.

An associated myth concerns the very common view that the child is traumatised and socially and sexually seriously damaged. We have dealt with this point in length in past chapters, but it is worth reiterating that the

evidence simply does not support these assumptions. In the short run the studies suggest that problems with the partners of paedophiles often flow from the reactions of parents and officials, who respond to news of their son's relationships with such horror that it elevates the significance of the event in the child's life. Even in the study showing the worst possible result—Gagnon's sample of 333 victims — only 5 per cent of the 'victims' had what Gagnon called 'damaged adult lives'. [*1] Even here though 'damaged adult lives' is a vague term and diverse causes of the damage besides the paedophile relationship could be possible.

As Plummer perceptively points out, one obvious problem with the stereotyping of paedophiles and the consequent myths that arise as a result of these stereotypes is that the myths and stereotypes usually direct us to look only at the behaviour of men. Similar activities when performed by women such as cuddling, caressing, touching and stroking children are socially acceptable. [*5] But for a man to engage in such contacts is inviting the label of paedophile and possibly risking imprisonment. The stereotypes surrounding paedophiles erect a sexist myth — and that myth is that only men have intimate physical relations with children. The myth conveniently ignores the fact that women often engage in similar sexual behaviour and therefore perpetuates two common views. The first is that 'men should not do this but women can' and the second that 'any man who does this is deeply disturbed'. But by perpetuating these myths, we conveniently forget that children have sexual needs and emotional components that are well documented by contemporary psychology. The very barriers that we put between ourselves and paedophiles are in a sense the same barriers that we put between ourselves as parents and our own children. With both groups we prefer to stereotype them ('paedophiles are monsters', 'children are innocent') and in this way avoid realities that we would otherwise be forced to face.

when the study in question has an inbuilt methodological bias towards producing figures which make the proportion of molestations look artificially high.

(It should always be borne in mind, as stated earlier, that these findings, like so many research data, are based on offences which have resulted in a conviction, and are thereby heavily biased towards relationships which gave rise to complaint by the child.)

Not all those involved in the prosecution process are that dogmatic, thank goodness. In a letter to *The Times*, [note 30] a police surgeon of twenty-

five years' standing echoed Ingram's feelings by pronouncing that legal proceedings in most paedophilic cases do the children more harm than good – and he was honest and courageous enough to admit that the examinations of children he had been obliged to conduct over the years contributed much towards this harm.

Think of it intuitively. Imagine the position of a child whose family just found out about sexual activity he had with an adult. The father is pacing around yelling that he's going to kill the adult. The mother is crying hysterically. The siblings are afraid to treat the child normally. Subsequently, all sorts of strangers begin interrogating the child over and over. Other children treat him like a freak. Doctors examine them against their will. If they hadn't been raped by the adult, they most certainly are raped by the doctor. Everyone is constantly treating the child differently. He's under constant supervision. If the adult is out on bail while the legal process begins, the child is forced to move to a far location. Even if the child liked the adult, he is incessantly compelled to testify against him and is forbidden from associating with him again. The court process takes an unimaginable amount of time, during which the child keeps getting interrogated by many different strangers. Psychiatrists and the rest of society tell the child that he has sustained something unimaginably horrible. The child is under the impression that sexuality is something absolutely evil, and that they are terrible for having participated. Can it really be said that it is the sexual activity which is harmful rather than the obscene response of the child's society? All of this is done under the pretense of protecting the child, who really needs protection from the people who profess to be acting in his interest.

There is nothing metaphysical about sexuality. The only reason why everyone perceives sexuality as being dangerous of children is because everyone feels that childhood sexuality is in some sense "wrong", and despite any contrary evidence, they continue to profess this.

"There's an assumption that sexuality is something very grave for children, and that they will be harmed if they engage in it. Because of the way that their society treats sexuality, children end up developing issues regarding it."

Children would not be "scarred" by their voluntary sexual experiences any more than adults in typical sexual relationships would be "scarred" unless their society shamed them into believing that they should feel guilty. The reason why a child would be mentally damaged after having consented to sexual activity is because they are socially conditioned into believing that what they did is in some ill-defined way deleterious. This is no different than submitting to oppressive religious beliefs that premarital sexual activity should be viewed negatively, and that anyone who engages in it should feel shame and remorse for having committed their sins. I assume everyone here understands that there is nothing innately pernicious about the nature of sexual relationships between adults, and that there is nothing innately immoral about sexuality in general, yet somehow sexual activity inexplicably becomes a pestilence once children engage in it. This argument is the equivalent of saying that the sexual activity of unmarried couples is harmful, yet the sexual activity of married couples is neutral, or even virtuous. It's completely nonsensical. The morality of the sexuality of children should not be evaluated any differently than the morality of the sexuality of adults.

'What seems to have happened was that the boy was rather deprived of affection from his parents who were cold and undemonstrative. He had often allowed the man to cuddle him, and this sometimes led to the man feeling him inside his trousers. If one can make a strong attempt to master the disgust this might evoke, and consider the possible damage done to the

boy by being starved of love at home, by enduring the anger, fearful interrogation, and most of all by submitting to the formal repetition by the doctor of the acts which were causing all the trouble, one can see that the offender was the last one from whom the boy needed protection.

"Children cannot have sex because of STDs or physical damage."

This seems like another ad hoc justification. If STDs did not exist, pedophilia would not be any less opposed.

STDs are so stigmatized because they pertain to sexuality, not because they're diseases.

If STDs are to be perceived as a serious threat, then there is a great incentive to expose children to full information about sexuality as early as possible, not instead defer any relevant information until they're practically adolescents.

Pregnancy and STDs are very simple concepts that can be thoroughly explained in fewer than five minutes.

They should also have access to contraception and protection rather than the current situation where they have nothing.

Paul Gebhard statistics

Regarding physical damage to children, 95% of consensual pedophilic relationships do not involve penetration.

Pedophiles as a group are not psychopathic: they love children and would not want to harm one.

The Pedophile's Guide to Love and Pleasure, which everyone was freaking out over at the end of 2010, represented the general opinion of pedophiles when it explicitly stated that there should be no penetration with prepubescent children.

People need to realize that children are exposed to risks significantly more harmful than STDs.

If people genuinely were concerned about the health of children, they would exhibit it in other ways. They don't seem to care what unhygienic actions they take. They also do not care about nutrition.

"Children can be brainwashed" . . . Yes, that is absolutely true. People of all ages can be brainwashed, but this in particular applies to children. However, I don't think you are applying this observation to its

natural conclusion. You allow other types of brainwashing: ---

A glance at the way in which we think about religion, and the religious education of children, may help to put our own culture's attitudinal response into a useful perspective. At an official level, it is agreed that a child's introduction to religion is extremely important. In Britain it is enshrined in the 1944 Education Act that all children in all schools shall begin the day with an act of worship -- the only element in the curriculum which is insisted upon by statute. This being the case -- religion being considered to be of vital importance -- one might have expected that there would be an equal concern in Government, at least as great as that in relation to sex, that children should not be subjected to 'manipulation' by ruthless adult salesmen offering every kind of creed; that these people should not be free to exploit the vulnerable minds of children. For if it is true that children are incapable of making judgements about sexual relationships, how much more adept are they likely to be at judging the rival claims of Protestant and Catholic, or Jehovah's Witnesses and the Exclusive Brethren? How can a child, who is so easily persuaded to believe in Father Christmas, be expected to make sense of it? Won't she or he accept, far too uncritically, the highly contestible notion that there is a god? Why not leave the child's mind in a state of unmolested innocence until an age is reached at which intellectually valid judgements can be made?

But no. Even though this is an important issue, adults are free to fill a child's mind with any prejudice or bigotry they like, without any danger of facing a sentence for corrupting a minor, assault on a child's mind, or anything else. Children are seen as fair game for the imposition of any religious belief or value system that the adult, particularly the parents, cares to impose. As Bertrand Russell has remarked, 'One of the few rights remaining to parents in the wage-earning class is that of having their children taught any brand of superstition that may be shared by a large number of parents in the same neighbourhood.'

Why does society tolerate this? Partly, there is a vague feeling that it is better for a child to have some religion than none at all -- not least because most religions emphasize a restrictive sexual 'morality'! But it is instructive to note that very little is made of the dangers of manipulating a child's mind. The dangers are demonstrably far greater than any consequence of manipulating a child towards consensual sexual activity (one need only mention Northern Ireland to remind oneself of how religious bigotry reinforces antagonism between peoples) but, quite irrationally, society cares less about it. Religious manipulation is assumed to be good and is positively encouraged; sexual manipulation (or 'guidance', 'showing how',

etc.) is assumed to be bad and is stamped upon with maximal force. I shall try to show that the latter assumption is misplaced.

Young children above the age of infancy become susceptible to manipulation of a less direct kind, characterized by deception. When children acquire language, they can be told untruths, from the relatively (though not entirely) benign Father Christmas myth, to the pernicious threat of the 'bogeyman', who comes to take away naughty children. Sexual myths usually fall into the pernicious category, alas, so that the whole area of sexuality becomes poisonously invested with mystery and darkness -- and the perpetrators, far from being paedophiles, are usually ordinary parents who, because of their own sexual anxieties and conflicts, are inclined to fob off children with such classics of deception as the idea that babies are brought by the stork.

If the use of deception is a possibility for parents, it is of course a possibility for paedophiles too. A paedophile who concocts a non-sexual 'reason' for him and a small child to strip naked together, say, may succeed in arousing the child's sexual curiosity and excitement. This would quite clearly be manipulation, based on exploiting the ignorance of the child as to the adult's motives. Supposing, by contrast, the paedophile had been scrupulously non-manipulative. Supposing, instead of playing tricks, he had simply, and openly, invited the child to 'play' sexually. Both approaches would require for their success the child's willing involvement and participation at all stages. The fact that in the more manipulative case the participation is induced by sleight of hand is really less important than the fact that the child is relaxed and enjoying the situation. Indeed, the sleight of hand may be an effective means of enabling the situation to occur 'naturally', so far as the child is concerned, without any embarrassment or uncertainty on the adult's part.

If the child is being led, or manipulated, it is at least a benevolent manipulation, in the sense that it leads -- so long as the child is willing -- towards a pleasurable and harmless outcome. Parents constantly engage in benevolent manipulation of this sort, without fear of social condemnation: usually it is called not 'manipulation', but 'encouragement'. Very often, parents will presume to anticipate a child's long-term wishes by ignoring, or manipulating their way around, her or his immediate wishes. For instance, in teaching a child to swim. The child may at first be tearful and apprehensive of going into the water, or beyond a certain depth. By encouraging 'pull' forces, and cajoling 'push' forces, the parent persuades the child to have a go, to not be afraid, to do that which is not at first desired. The parent does this in the full knowledge that eventually the child

will relax, learn to swim, and enjoy the water.

What the sensible parent does not do is to drag his protesting six-year-old screaming towards the edge of the pool and throw him into the deep end. Interestingly enough, were he to do so, and providing the child were not allowed to drown, this would probably not qualify as a criminal offence, although for the child it could be as nasty an experience as rape. It is not an activity in which the intervention of law is thought to be necessary. There is no elaborate questioning of whether in any particular case the child actually consented to be introduced to the water, or was manipulated into consenting. It is presumed that the adult will be benevolently intentioned, and that all will work out well.

I am not suggesting that in sexual activity a child's wishes should be ignored, in the same way that a parent gets round his child's fear of the water. Given that many children in our culture grow up with a deep suspicion and fear of all things sexual, and given that there are deeply held views as to the 'sinfulness' of many sex acts, adults are morally obliged to accept the child's attitude towards sex. A parent does not accept his child's inalienable right to be afraid of water and of swimming. That would be silly. But the paedophile does have to respect the child's fear of sex. It is the child's right to take a negative attitude, whether because she/he is genuinely afraid of sex, or because she/he simply doesn't fancy, or like, the paedophile in question, or for some other reason.

As a boy-lover, I am aware that chatting to a twelve-year-old is a vastly different matter, on average, to doing the same thing with a boy half that age. The potential for manipulation, benevolent or otherwise, by a male adult at any rate, is enormously curtailed. By this age, practically every boy has learnt a great deal. He will be well aware of the prevailing sexual mores. No adult could con him into sexual activity by disguising his own motives. He would know too well what the grown-up was after. He would know that such people are usually looked down upon. He would know that they are described as 'queers' and 'benders', and that to go with them could result in social disgrace.

There are others who use the opportunity afforded by such social integration to consciously and deliberately seek sexual encounters. Over a period, they may succeed in creating an atmosphere in the group in which sexuality generally is seen to be acceptable, in which the prevailing barriers of sexual inhibition and guilt are lowered. In such a context, the 'seduction' of an individual youngster is likely to be facilitated. It is possible to view the whole, long-term process as cunningly calculating, and therefore manipulative in a mischievous way, but only if one believes it proper that

youngsters should feel sexual inhibition and guilt, and that they are being cheated out of these feelings.

As a final exercise in perspective on the theme of manipulation, we may consider the advice given in a recent medical textbook [*5] to those doctors called upon to examine children following a discovered sexual relationship with an adult: 'If the child refuses to be examined, a process of negotiation and bargaining sometimes results in acquiescence.' (By offering a bag of sweeties, perhaps?) 'Sedation or deferral of the examination to another visit are other alternatives, depending on the circumstances. Occasionally, none of these alternatives can be utilised successfully, these cases will require admission of the child to the hospital for examination under anaesthesia. [*6]

So much for the consent of the child to an examination! In the same textbook, a contributor describes the paedophile's efforts 'to persuade his victim to co-operate and to acquiesce or consent to the sexual relationship, oftentimes by bribing or rewarding the child with attention, affection, approval, money, gifts, treats, and good times. But he may be dissuaded if the child actively refuses and resists because he does not resort to physical force. His aim is to gain sexual control of the child by developing a willing or consenting sexual relationship.' The desire for a consensual relationship is thus represented as merely a cynical combination of manipulation and bribery by the adult, although it is conceded that 'At some level, he cares for the child and is emotionally involved with him or her.' The point is that when the consent condition is fulfilled, the rules of the game are suddenly changed and consent is no longer of any account: the paedophile simply cannot win.

Society forces children to be dependent on the caprice of their parents. How can you be surprised if another adult offers them independence?

"Despite all of this, what can we do to prevent children from having sex?"

If you want to teach a child to understand that violence is bad, you must expose the child to accurate information about genuine violence instead of distorting children's minds with cartoons of anvils being bounced off of animals' heads. If someone is appalled by the idea of doing something like exposing a child to an autopsy report of someone who was bludgeoned to death, or exposing them to their mourning associates, or X, it is because that person has an artificial cultural notion of "childhood", which harms the child infinitely more than any degree of truth ever could. Demonstrating the effects of violence is infinitely more persuasive than saying "Violence is bad because I said so" because it has a basis in reason beyond "I'm bigger than you, so what I say is true". Similarly, information about sexuality should be given to children. If you do not want children to have sexual contact, then provide children with the most accurate and most extensive information about sexuality as you can. Instead of withholding information and saying "You'll do what I say because I said so", you can explain why you believe that they should not engage in sex.

However, once they have the proper information, you will necessarily find that your position is not legitimate in the same way that it would be pertaining to an advisal against violence. Sexuality cannot be reasonably argued against because it is not harmful. You should reevaluate why you don't want the child to engage in sexuality. It's probably because of the indoctrination which you received when you were a child, which dogmatically states that sexuality is wrong.

Inevitably, every parent will shout "But what of my parental rights?": their right to "raise" their children in the way they see fit. However, the existence of "parental rights", by definition, can only entail the license to curtail other people's rights: children's. This is no different than a slaveholder being aghast over someone else telling him that he cannot enslave someone: "But what of my rights as a slaveholder?" he asks. It's a weird cultural perversion that enables the belief that parents have a right to control children. A parent cannot logically object to someone else preventing them from controlling their child under a notion of human rights, unless they view their child as being sub-human and thus beyond human rights. The only justification I can imagine for "parental rights" is that someone would say because the child is alive owing to the parent, or because the child is financially dependent on the parent, then the parent gets to control the child until some arbitrary future point. By that logic, if someone were to rescue someone else from death, the rescuer would be able to rightly enslave the survivor because they would not be alive without them. Similarly, if someone were to help someone else escape from a labor camp, then that person gets to enslave the laborer because they would not be in the current economic situation they're in without them. The correct solution is to stop forcing children to be dependent on their parents, the same way in which slaves should not be forced to be dependent on their owners. Parents do not have a right to parenting, just as slaveholders do not have a right to slaveholding.

In all of this, there is one resounding question: What are we to do? How can children be anything other than property?

Children have continually been the conceptual fall-guy of civil rights groups.

Slaves, "We are not children. We are not any different from X."

Women, "We are not children. We are not any different from men."

It is time that children stop being seen as (children).

Children are the x (stone or something?) of civil rights.

This is a multifaceted revolutionary notion which cannot be realized immediately, so I will only prescribe the actions which are quite simple and can be immediately taken under the current political situation. I will not include prescriptions to changing social attitudes.

First, children, being subject to laws, should not be disenfranchised from voting. Children currently have absolutely no representation.

The notion itself of children being property of their parents should be eliminated. They should not be viewed any differently from a tenant living with their landlord. They should not be subject to their parents' coercion to opinions, religion, perspective, (x), (x) . . . Most of all, this includes the right to be free from corporal punishment. "Spanking" should not be viewed with more toleration than wife-battery.

Eliminate the cultural notion of "age-appropriate" material and information.

Children should have the opportunity to separate from their parents as early as is possible, in better circumstances than the current situation under which they have to become destitute. This means that children should have a right to employment and a right to contract for land.

Lastly, children should be sexually liberated, with all of their consensual relations decriminalized. They are to be viewed no differently than adults.

[C]hildren should have the right to conduct their sexual lives with no more restrictions than adults . . . [and] must be provided with all information about sex and related matters so that they are in a position to make reasonable choices. . . . A punitive and draconian justice system that directly punishes a paedophile, indirectly scapegoats a boy who has been involved in a sexual relationship with an older man, . . . and does so with an impact that severely damages both. . . . For the reality is that boys have come to men and will continue, for time immemorial, to come to them in order to have their sexual and emotional needs met.

For [Clarence Osborne] has shown us that . . . young people in western countries feel sexually repressed, alienated from adult company, and emotionally bankrupt. . . . Young boys are sexually active from a very early age and will pursue their sexuality whenever they can find an opportunity to do so; young males wish to give and receive affection in ways that we as a community have not clearly understood before; men who have relationships with boys often do so for benevolent reasons. . . . But if we don't heed the lesson that Osborne taught us, then we will continuously reinforce bigotry and prejudice and we do so at the cost of further damaging our children's welfare.

"I could go into an in-depth discussion refuting the notion that child-adult sex is inherently harmful but whether or not it is or isn't is actually irrelevant. A consistent anarchist would realize that they are not morally entitled to make decisions on behalf of other humans. You can strongly disagree with a child having consensual sex with an adult but it remains their decision to make. You don't have a right to make decisions on my behalf even if you really do have better judgement than I do and even if doing so might actually be in my best, long-term interests. Anti-consensual, pedo-sex anarchists are using the basic argument for the very existence of states, 'their

Eliminate the notion that someone can act on behalf of a child without the child's consent.

Yet the current bizarre situation exists that in every state, you can beat a child as much as you want to under the euphemism of "spanking" and few people will mind, yet as soon as you tell a child that you love him, you're instantly shunned by everyone.

What, then, is my solution?

It is more complicated than this, but the simple answer is that there is no artificial construction of an age of consent. All romantic relationships are decriminalized between consenting people. Current laws which protect against genuine abuse, such as battery, already exist: there is no reason to outlaw a relationship owing to an arbitrary label which this society wants to append to people.

Children should be more autonomous in every way and should be informed about sexuality. They should be free to engage in it with anyone who agrees. The right of children to have sexual relationships is a small step toward liberating them from the oppression of adults which they currently endure.

Pedophilia undermines an atavistic societal opposition toward sexuality, and it combines it with a subversion of adult authority. If pedophilic relationships were condoned, then it would be a recognition of the rights of children, which demonstrably do not exist in this society. Children, being people with their own legitimate thoughts, feelings, and desires, deserve the same rights that adults receive. Instead, they're currently nothing other than the sub-human property of adults who have free-reign to do whatever they please with them. It's quite ironic that everyone views pedophiles as manipulating children, with everyone being completely unable to observe what they themselves do to children.

A man is walking down a street at night. He comes upon a few houses and, being a bit of a voyeur, looks inside each window he passes to see what his neighbors are up to. In the first house, he sees a child being ordered around. He thinks to himself, "What a great work-ethic those parents are instilling in their child". In the next house, he sees a child being told what thoughts are appropriate, and he says, "What great values those parents are instilling in their child". In the third house, he sees a child being spanked and proclaims, "What great discipline those parents are instilling in their child". He approaches a garden and sees a child who is sitting on the lap of an adult. He arrives just in time to hear the child say, "It's a good thing my parents haven't found out about us", as the two lovers passionately kiss.

Our voyeuristic friend screams in horror at the scene which would be considered romantic if only the younger lover were a few years older. A policeman runs over to (beat) and apprehend the pedophile, and thus begins the process of (persecution) as outlined above in the fifth and sixth paragraphs. The lonely child, previously happy about having his adult friend, will be "treated" by his society to "overcome his abuse". He will grow up cold, isolated, and terrified of sexuality. I cannot comprehend how someone can look at this situation and say that the first three children are abuse-free, living in "loving homes" with "parents who care", yet the fourth child is considered to have sustained horrible abuse.

The only abuse which I can conceivably see the fourth children receiving comes not from the pedophile, but from his society, who shoves the child into the dirt and leers, "Who are you to have sexual feelings? You don't have feelings at all. You're a child. It's not your place to have emotions". Society then shoves the pedophile into the dirt, and shouts, "I expected better of you! I thought you were one of us: an adult who respected our right to control each of our slaves in the way we see fit. How dare you love a child?", while kicking the pedophile until he eventually dies a miserable and inevitable death.

Am I the only one who sees the partially-buried corpses of blasphemers, communists, trade unionists, Jews, and all of the others who have been (persecuted in history), decomposing in the dirt alongside him? The pedophile turns over and sees the rotting corpse of a Middle Ages blasphemer of Christianity. He sees all of the scars, the worst of which being the B which had been branded onto his forehead, and the pedophile knows what fate his own sex offender status will bring.

The child turns over and sees the corpses of slaves (rotting) all around him. Society snarls at the child and shouts, "Stop crying! You won't end up like them. You'll grow up and become one of us eventually. The lives of slaves was terrible because they were never freed, but your slavery is only temporary". Yet the fact that every person is at one point an oppressed child does not mitigate their treatment in any way. If it alters the nature of it at all, it makes it become even more pernicious that everyone is subjected to this without anyone escaping its clutches.

How can I look at the treatment of both pedophiles and of children, and see anything other than a

tragedy? (The depths of my soul scream) that this is wrong, this is evil, and no excuse exists which can justify this. Meanwhile, this goes completely unseen. All sorts of civil rights groups march up and down the street nearby this cemetery and protest everything imaginable except for this. The pedophile fashions a NAMBLA sign and manages to crawl to the street and begs the LGBT group to let him join. They shove him back into the dirt and shout, "No! You're not one of us. You're scum and you're making us look bad by associating with us!" as they go back to proselytizing about Tyler Clementi. Louis Conradt's corpse is (rotting) in the cemetery along with Clementi's, yet not a single person cares to mention him. Is his death really to be forever ignored because a young boy agreed to meet him for sexual activity? I am unable to see how Oscar Wilde's "love that dare not speak its name", which earned him a sentence of hard labor, could be thought of as so horrible when he declared to the court and the world that it was

". . . such a great affection of an elder for a younger man as there was between David and Jonathan, such as Plato made the very basis of his philosophy, and such as you find in the sonnets of Michelangelo and Shakespeare. It is that deep spiritual affection that is as pure as it is perfect. It dictates and pervades great works of art, like those of Shakespeare and Michelangelo, and those two letters of mine, such as they are. It is in this century misunderstood, so much misunderstood that it may be described as "the love that dare not speak its name," and on that account of it I am placed where I am now. It is beautiful, it is fine, it is the noblest form of affection. There is nothing unnatural about it. It is intellectual, and it repeatedly exists between an older and a younger man, when the older man has intellect, and the younger man has all the joy, hope and glamour of life before him. That it should be so, the world does not understand. The world mocks at it, and sometimes puts one in the pillory for it."

I am not expecting to change anyone's thoughts on pedophilia. That is not the actual purpose of this essay. It is also not meant to be a thorough analysis of pedophilia, although I would have loved to have the opportunity. I deliberately tried to limit this essay to as many a priori assertions as possible for the sake of brevity.

Perhaps contrary to what you might have expected, I have absolutely nothing at all to do with pedophilia. I am not myself one, I have never been touched by one (at least not from what I'm aware of!), and I have never knowingly had any contact with one. Then why would I write about pedophilia out of all subject for a college application essay? I can almost hear you shouting, "Does he have no idea of what's appropriate?" as you crumple this page. Pedophilia is certainly not my idea of a conversation-starter, but as strange as it may sound, this is the most appropriate topic I could select. It is my belief that the best way to understand someone is to understand the way in which they think.

For all of these reasons, I have to conclude that the most noble form of activism would involve the advocacy of pedophile's rights and the liberation of children. This is why I'm currently considering becoming a member of the North American Man/Boy Love Association.

Structured, stoic, methodological, thoughtful, calm, and dispassionate.

And I am aware of its obscene length. Being inappropriately thorough is actually a component of my personality.

The most amusing description of me which I've heard is, "You usually sound absurdly calm, as if the world could be ending and you'd just rub your chin and say, 'Interesting'".

I could have written about a more mundane topic, but it would not have illustrated my thought-process as well.

Somewhat amusingly, this also allows me to evaluate the school. If I would have been rejected independent of my essay, then I could have written anything and still get rejected. If, however, I was otherwise eligible, I could use my topic to evaluate the college. Presumably, while each admissions officer varies, they presumably would not have fundamentally different criterion for selection. If one were to be aghast about my topic and could not comprehend why I would write such things, then it would be safe to assume that all of them would also have some level of dismay. If, however, one were to find this to be an intriguing topic, all of them might have had some level of interest. Presumably, the admissions officers would also reflect the overall college considering that the applicants have to go through them to even be there. If they would have been interested by this topic and not aghast, then it's possible that there would be many people at the college which also were x. The most important criterion for me is the type of people which are there, so that I can engage in discussions which pertain to topics such as this. If I could not do that at such a college, then I wouldn't want to be there in the first place.

And in the course of writing this, I realized that it illustrates something else about me quite well. While rhetorical questions asked to the own writer are to be expected, they are highly reflective of my life. All I have ever been able to do is talk to myself (rhetorically, of course). I have been isolated my entire life. At such a college in which x, I would be able to have discussions with others rather than always thinking about things while alone.

Inflation Of Conflict: the 9-21 Age of Consent argument.
Rhetorical question arguments, look over when you're finished.

- * Okami, Paul (1991). "Self-reports of 'positive' childhood and adolescent sexual contacts with older persons: an exploratory study," *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 20, 437-457.
- * Leahy, Terry. (1992). "Positively experienced man/boy sex: the discourse of seduction and the social construction of masculinity," *Journal of Sociology*, 28(1), 71-88.
- * Leahy, Terry (1994). "Taking up a position: discourses of femininity and adolescence in the context of man/girl relationships," *Gender & Society*, 8(1), 48-72.

None of these are freely available online, and I only recommend the first. Paul Okami is a deeply honest researcher, and all of his work is well-worth reading. "Sociopolitical Biases in the Contemporary Scientific Literature on Adult Human Sexual Behavior with Children and Adolescents" is a fantastic primer on the problems with most "child sexual abuse" research.

Adam Lanza: Two Personal Messages

On 18 June 2015, Reed Coleman published a blog post about two messages Adam Lanza sent to people he knew through his online activities. These individuals forwarded the messages to Coleman, who published them on his blog, *Sandy Hook Lighthouse*, along with commentary (“Exclusive: Private Messages sent by the Sandy Hook shooter”). The first message is significant for containing a description of what apparently was Lanza’s first psychotic episode. In the second message, Lanza explains his arguments in defense of pedophilia, though he concludes by stating that he is not a pedophile. Some minor typos have been corrected below.

“Smiggles” was one of Lanza’s nicknames online. For explanations of how we know that Smiggles was actually Lanza, see Reed Coleman’s post “Brief review of the evidence against ‘Smiggles.’”

[From: Smiggles]

[Posted: Sunday, 23 October 2010, 3:56 AM]

I don’t have the persistent sense of fear that you described, but around once every couple months when I’ve gotten arbitrarily fatigued and it’s around 12:00–5:00 in the morning, I have images of distorted faces flashing through my mind. They’re sort of similar to the ones toward the end of the movie *Terror House*, at about 75:00. When I first saw the scene, I mentally flinched for a moment because of its similarity to what I have imagined in the past.

<http://www.zshare.net/video/7072064402072186/> [dead link]

On a tangent, this is probably among my favorite movies (although its ending was disappointing). I searched for it after reading an IMDB review, and I eventually found this link. The review said that it was similar to *Children Shouldn’t Play With Dead Things* and *Don’t Look In The Basement*, both of which have aspects which I enjoyed. I first knew from about 5:00 to 5:30 that I was going to love the movie for its style of atmosphere. I wouldn’t expect most people to enjoy this movie nearly as much as I do, but I’m surprised that it has received so little attention. *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* (which I haven’t seen; I’m not interested in that sort of movie) has a similar plot scenario, but this one preceded it by a few years.

About the images – they’re not exactly like the ones in that movie, but that’s the best I can do to display an example of them. It’s not the normal screamer type of pop-up for me; the faces are fairly mundane, and they sporadically rapidly appear without any context and then disappear.

When it happens and I get slightly paranoid over them, I usually go straight to my bedroom and try to sleep; I don’t even bother to brush my teeth first because the bathroom’s window only has partial drapes and I don’t like being around exposed windows during it. It sounds pathetic, but when I get into my bedroom after it happens, I search it to determine that there’s no one in there with me, and then feel better knowing that the only route someone could take is through the closed door. I’ve occasionally felt uncomfortable about looking at the gap between the windows and their synthetic drapes.

On another tangent, what do you think about sunlight? Those drapes haven’t been opened in the last five years, and the drapes in the room I’m in right now have actually been taped shut (to block the gaps from allowing sunlight through) for the same amount of time. I

absolutely hate sunlight, along with any artificial light which resembles it.

The few times I see an extremely bleak, dark, and dreary day outside during the morning or afternoon with thick gray clouds covering the entire sky, I get into a good mood and think about how wonderfully beautiful it is outside. Bright, sunny, “cheerful” days are depressing. Nearly every afternoon is miserable for me. Beyond just the normal animosity I have for sunlight, I get exhausted between noon and and sunset when I’m in a room which allows the slightest amount of afternoon light in.

I hate having my skin exposed to sunlight, so I always wear a hooded sweatshirt and full-length pants, even in the hottest weather. The sunglasses I wear are gigantic and almost completely prevent me from seeing any direct sunlight when I’m looking in any direction. I would also wear a full balaclava if it wouldn’t get me profiled as a criminal. They need to make a fashion come-back ...

I check this website often:

<http://www.epa.gov/sunwise/uvindex.html>

I intend on eventually living in northwest Washington (probably Seattle.) It’s among the most consistently overcast regions in the mainland US

(<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/online/ccd/cldy.html>).

I always get disappointed when I check the UV index for the day and see how low it is compared to my state’s level.

Getting back to the subject of paranoia – those images were the worst “hallucinations” I had experienced until a couple of weeks ago late one night when I was getting very tired. The incident was so surreal that I only remember a small amount of the details. Basically, I began to “see” many different things. Although I knew that none of it was actually real, it came as close to being real as it could for me without it being physically tangible. I heard screaming around me, and I had an overwhelming sense that there was someone dead behind me. I kept seeing silhouettes of flickering people everywhere. I felt like I had to cry. The entire ordeal persisted for about fifteen minutes and sort of faded away. Prior to it happening, I had never had that sort of delusional hysteria before. It was possibly the strangest thing I’ve ever experienced.

♦ ♦ ♦

[From: Smiggles]

[Posted: Friday, 12 November 2010, 8:25 PM]

Basically, I take the belief that everyone should have equal rights and apply it consistently. I’ve had these thoughts for years and haven’t spoken to anyone about them. I’d like to be able to discuss this in a topic, but it will probably be too offensive. I’m going to keep it to myself for now.

And now that I think about it, this might sound a bit satirical, but it’s not. Anyway, this is what I would have posted:

Ever since I was 14, the entire subject of gay rights which is so pervasive in this society has frustrated me. It’s not owing to any malice I have toward homosexuals, but instead is caused by the absurdity of the overwhelming fervor against the discrimination of homosexuals while there is another class of people who genuinely suffer from persecution for their lifestyle.

While many people celebrate homosexual relationships, sexual relationships between adults and children are universally condemned and vilified. Every adult who is known to have been involved in one is automatically branded for life as a violent and dangerous rapist. Anyone who is unfortunate enough to be subjected to this societal corruption endures the effects of it for the rest of their lives: their personal information is widely divulged to their neighbors as if public castigation is encouraged; they are denied employment; their location must be reported to their oppressive government; whether or not an adult engages in a sexual relationship with a child, they must forever hide their mere sexuality or else be stigmatized infinitely beyond anything homosexuals endure. If any of this applied to homosexuals, the public would be appalled, yet no one cares when it applies to pedophiles.

It seemed as if the entire country was outraged when Tyler Clementi killed himself a couple months ago. From what I know, the catalyst for his suicide was the way that he had been mocked after being recorded by a hidden camera while he was engaging in sexual activity with another male. Yet *To Catch A Predator*, a television program which was based on the manipulation of hundreds of adults into being recorded by hidden cameras after desiring sexual activity with children, has never received anywhere near this level of outrage. The audience is supposed to find entertainment value in the humiliation of ephebophiles were afterward violently subdued by police and impounded, having the rest of their lives impacted significantly greater than anything Tyler Clementi had experienced. There was scarcely any criticism when one of the ephebophiles was forced into shooting himself in the head as police were surrounding him.

Watch this video objectively and imagine that they are speaking about homosexuals like Tyler Clementi:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ISzUkjTqvTQ&fmt=18> [dead link]

There is an inordinate amount of innately fallacious arguments against pedophilia, most of which are also directed toward homosexuality. I'm not going to address any of them to begin with because I assume everyone here already understands that arguments such as "The DSM recognizes pedophilia as a mental illness" or "pedophilia is unnatural" are ludicrously invalid. For this first post, I'm only going to address arguments which are remotely coherent. If anyone invokes more ignorant ones, I will address them later in this topic. I'm not sure how well I'll be able to do this preemptively, though, because I don't entirely understand the mindset of people who disparage pedophilia as a sexuality. From my perspective, it's like trying to argue against someone who believes that females are inferior to males. It's a patently absurd notion, and I find it to be sort of comical that I even have to make this argument.

To begin with, you must understand that pedophiles are not the only victims of this virulent persecution. The children who choose to engage in sexual relationships with adults are invariably severed from their loving relationships and are indoctrinated into believing that they have been abused, being labeled as "victims" and being subjected to the genuinely abusive will of psychiatrists (the most immoral profession I can imagine) who "treat" (coerce) them into believing that they can overcome their "abuse". I don't understand how this can be perceived as being fundamentally any different from the nature of the mental abuse which is used to indoctrinate political dissidents.

Children would not be "scarred" by their voluntary sexual experiences any more than adults in typical sexual relationships would be "scarred" unless their society shamed them into believing that they should feel guilty. The reason why a child would be mentally damaged after having consented to sexual activity is because they are socially conditioned into believing that what they did is in some ill-defined way deleterious. This is no different than submitting to oppressive religious beliefs that premarital sexual activity should be viewed negatively, and

that anyone who engages in it should feel shame and remorse for having committed their sins. I assume everyone here understands that there is nothing innately pernicious about the nature of sexual relationships between adults, and that there is nothing innately immoral about sexuality in general, yet somehow sexual activity inexplicably becomes a pestilence once children engage in it. This argument is the equivalent of saying that the sexual activity of unmarried couples is harmful, yet the sexual activity of married couples is neutral, or even virtuous. It's completely nonsensical. The morality of the sexuality of children should not be evaluated any differently than the morality of the sexuality of adults.

The specious propaganda which is primarily disseminated against the legitimacy of sexual relationships between adults and children is that a child is incapable of consenting to sexual activity, so any occurrence of it is inherently rape. This is an arbitrary assumption which oppresses children and is an indication of the abusive mentality which is inflicted upon them daily in this society, dehumanizing them and relegating them to the status of slaves.

Why is sexual activity considered to be incomprehensible to a child? What is so fundamentally challenging about the concept that there is not a single child who could possibly fathom it?

It's absurd for to claim that sexuality is something which requires significant mental capabilities and thus must be violently controlled by governments, because there is no restriction against imbeciles being sexual. Children are innately incapable of comprehending it, yet once someone attains a certain age (which varies extremely depending on the time period and location, thus demonstrating that it's absolutely meaningless), everyone is suddenly capable of it? If the nature of sexuality is fundamentally a concept to understand for all children, then it is not reasonable to assume that even a small minority of people are capable of comprehending its perplexity at 18. If an adult may engage in sexual activity because they are demonstratively capable of employing prudent rationality, then why may a child not enjoy the same right? Professing that a child is incapable of understanding the concept of consent because of the belief that adults are universally "more rational" than they are, and thus children do not deserve to control their bodies, is equivalent to claiming that females do not deserve to control their bodies because males are "more judicious in personal affairs" in relation to them, or some other such inane fatuity. It's a senseless and morally reproachful position to hold.

There is the argument that the "power disparity" in the relationship between an adult and a child renders any sexuality between them to be inherently abusive. This notion can be applied against females, arguing that they cannot be in a sexual relationship because many of them explicitly desire one with a male who is in a higher position of societal "power", thus none of them are capable of giving consent. No one believes that a pretentious "power disparity" argument applies to the legitimacy of sexual relationships between adults, yet it arbitrarily applies to children? It is also outright fallacious because the child has all of the control over the relationship. The adult would have to be extremely careful around the child because virtually everyone would accuse the adult of raping the child without consideration as to whether or not s/he gave consent.

Some of you may say that children would never consent to sexual activity, and that if they engage in it, an adult must have forced them into it. Apply this argument to females once again and it immediately evinces why this is a meaningless assertion. It is equivalent to asserting that violent persecution is justified toward any female and her associate who engages in premarital sexual activity because no females would ever desire it owing to some arbitrary criterion. It's a presumptuous way to justify discriminatory coercion and is not based on any logical argument. Personally, I don't understand why children in general would want to be sexual, but I also don't understand why adults in this society are so sexual. If I was ever going to engage in any sexual activity, I would be certain that it would be meaningful, but

adults everywhere engage in it as if it doesn't matter. Adults seem to invariably claim that it is "making love" or some other haphazard justification of their licentious behavior. In that case, how can you define what is and is not a legitimate expression of love? If you believe that adults "making love" can be described as positively as I constantly hear it is, then the sexual activity of children is equally positive.

Why is this society so adamantly opposed to pedophilia? Children deserve all of the rights and respects that an adult should receive, yet this is not the case to any extent. The inexorable battery of children ("spanking") is fully legal in the United States. Children's free will is suppressed and annihilated in every conceivable manner within families. Beyond having their associations, location, and every action subject to their parents' wills, they are denied their own thoughts, opinions, values, and religion, and instead are coerced into adopting their parents'. Within the rest of society, children are denied property (their parents instantly legally siphon it from their children's domain regardless of how the child obtained it), employment, and are denied the right to have even an token impact on the government which innately subjugates them through its very existence (although I'll spare you from my anarchistic rhetoric in this post). Children are not even allowed to control their own bodies: if an adult wants to force any medical procedures or treatments onto a child, the child does not have any choice in the matter.

This is why children are forced into being ashamed of their sexuality and why adults are violently persecuted for loving children. If pedophilic relationships were condoned, then it would be a recognition that children have human rights, which this egregious society is not capable of accepting. Children deserve all of the rights and respects that adults should receive, yet they do not because this morally reprehensible society implicitly enjoys the abusive subjugation of them as sub-human property instead of as people who have their own legitimate thoughts and desires. If you support civil rights, such as through being a feminist or a LGBTQIA activist, you should oppose the violent persecution of pedophilic relationships and the subjugation of children. The right of children to have sexual relationships is a small step toward liberating them from the oppression of adults which they currently endure.

I wasn't intending on posting anything about this topic because I don't think that anyone would consider an alternative perspective (about which I still have very little faith), but the recent removal of that book from Amazon has irritated me. I've barely read any information about the book or its removal, so I don't know anything about its contents, but it was probably completely benign. It doesn't matter either way, though, because it would have been removed under any circumstance merely because of the nature of its subject.

While it seems like nearly everyone wants the and anything like it to not be available through Amazon's website, the motive of the very few people who oppose its removal is nothing other harrowing. According to them, it's inappropriate for Amazon to not support the free speech of authors. These people use the same mentality and reasoning for the justification of the availability of material pertaining to nuisances such as racial supremacy, as if pedophilia is something that is equivalently morally repugnant; as if the existence of information pertaining to it should merely be grudgingly tolerated rather than supported as something which can be positive. I don't have an moral opposition to a book which directs adults on how they can safely have a relationship with children: I condone its availability. Information like that needs to be available because any beauty which could potentially be present in such relationships is currently violently suppressed. I support anyone, child or adult, who believe that their love is important enough to be in a relationship together and risk the current consequences, because I believe that nothing is more important than love. Those who seek the application of violence to suppress these relationships are the depraved profligates, not the individuals who seek to express their love regardless of age.

I know that I will be accused of desiring sexual contact with children, and there might possibly be accusations that I have already had it, but neither case is true. I also have not seen any degree of child pornography (nor intentionally seen any adult pornography). All of the sexuality which is rampant in this society in general is as disgusting to me as pedophilia is, but that isn't sufficient reason for me to desire the violent persecution of anyone over it because of personal perspective. I'm pretty confused when it comes to my sexuality, but I'm certain that I'm not a pedophile.

After having spent much time analyzing this, I've determined which factors enabled me to love you.

I projected a personality, which I consider to be virtuous, delusionally onto you. For the same reason, I ignored the many things which I fundamentally hate about you. I was deluding myself.

I am heavily emotionally susceptible to environments. Most of my social contact was through those players. All of them are typical detestable humans, and it bred an aura of innumerable negative emotions for me. You were a respite from that.

You could actually type coherently. Relationships cannot exist if communication is not present, which would immediately preclude me from being able to have a relationship with 99% of the humans there. I don't believe it's a coincidence that the only other person I liked at all was Soresu, who usually types coherently. If I had spoken to him more often, I might have loved him. Once every month or so in that game, I would meet someone who would type properly, and I would always try to play with them. I remember one person in particular whom I followed around only because he typed properly, which allowed me to communicate with him without feeling as if I was dealing with a severely mentally handicapped duck. He spoke disrespectfully of his girlfriend the first day I spoke to him, which would normally serve as the catalyst for my detestment of such a person, yet I completely overlooked it because I was so relieved to be able to speak with someone who was in any way capable of communicating.

Relationships have absolutely no physical aspect to me: all that matters is communication. The nature of the internet fosters this.

I incessantly have nothing other than scorn for humanity. I have been desperate to feel anything positive for someone for my entire life.

Early on, you referenced serial killing multiple times in ways people normally don't. That immediately appealed to me.

I have an affinity for people whom I perceive as being abused, and consummate scorn for the abusers. It was probably the primary enabling factor. The way you are relentlessly treated by these humans is obscenely offensive to me, so everytime they would do it, it would simultaneously increase my sympathy for you and increase my resentment for all of them. My wrath for them fostered more of a negative atmosphere, which would cause you to be even more of a respite from their depravity. It was self-perpetuating.

I'm capable of boundless affection. I had never been in a situation to feel that way before, so I thought that it was special.

I took my focus away from myself and directed it toward you.

Because I used to be hate-filled and couldn't just dismiss people I didn't like. It tore me apart, and I needed someone who didn't.

Coercion is endemic to parenting in general. Children are slaves to their parents' will in virtually every family.

You're a Christian. Religion, being cultural, inherently subjugates.

That whole "dishonor" fatuity. Something is "dishonorable" not because it lacks virtue, but because it goes against their "authority". All they're doing is imposing their will on you.

You submit to the notion of culture, which your parents forced onto you.

-You often made reference to the ways genders should behave.
-You celebrate holidays.
-You derogatively said that C_Redfield was "whitewashed" because his Vietnamese pronunciation was poor as if that was an issue. Vietnamese culture is equally as pathetic as American culture is. The entire notion of culture is pathetic. You believing that he should be able to speak Vietnamese merely because that's what his father did is absurd.

You saying that I shouldn't disassociate myself from my parents- that I need to change the way I think about them. I had never spoken about my parents prior to that, so you had no knowledge about them. Saying what you did would necessitate all parents inherently being virtuous, which is not true. The reason you believe that is because the culture your family forced onto you virtually defies familial elders.

When your sister was angry at your mother, allegedly over a haircut. It had nothing to do with the haircut; she was angry about other issues.

I'm certain that I would be a phenomenal father because I would foster a free environment for my child. S/he would never do anything "because I said so". Instead of treating her/him like a pet that can talk, I would treat her/him like a little person who doesn't know very much. I would not subject my child to my opinions: I would encourage them to think for her/himself

If you believe that you understand me, then I should be able to verify that through asking you some questions and seeing your answers.

Why did I love you?

Why do I feel nothing other than negativity toward you?

What comes to mind when I make the statement "Vietnamese culture is deplorable."?

What gender am I?

Why did I not ____ on July 18th?

What political ideology do I find most plausible?

Why am I an atheist?

Why will I never drink anything alcoholic?

What would my parenting style be?

Why is it that the only time you've spoken to me while I've been angry (enough so that my heart rate was approximately 150 even though I had been doing nothing other than sitting) was when they were making sexual derisions about you?

What is wrong with being mentally deficient and such? People say that discrimination based on skin color is wrong because they are not actually inferior, but what is wrong with inferiority? Why should they be discriminated against just because they are inferior?

You're a Christian?

Why are you a Christian?

How did you come across the information you know about Christianity?

How do you know that the information you received is true?

How is that distinct from the basis other religions use to claim their legitimacy?

How do you know that you are correct in your religious beliefs and that people of other religions are wrong?

If you had been born into an Islamic family in Iran, would you still be a Christian if you came across the information about Christianity?

Is it possible that you're wrong?

It's like you're beginning with the proposition "There are magical little people."

One group says "The magical little people are gnomes."

Another group says "The magical little people are leprechauns."

What basis is there for believing that there are magical little people at all?

Is it really love if you're not willing to romantically love a male the same way you would a female?

Why do I take my scorn for certain individuals and apply it to humanity in general?

Figure out why "rape is about power" in relation to the institutions of families and states.

~HMM... If people were not conditioned into believing that rape is traumatic, rapists wouldn't have "power"!

She needs to be contemplative, introverted, introspective, insubordinate, non-confrontational, able to

communicate with me, and engage in banter. And I think I want her to be at least vegetarian.

Sometime, check your honesty while speaking to someone.

Hair in the front was awkwardly wavy while the sides were relatively straight.
Some acne was prominent
My head was turned slightly to the right. That's most visible with my nose and larynx.
I was awkwardly smirking because I was told to smile. I shouldn't have done anything.
I was paying too much attention to my hair and didn't notice my eyebrows, which would have taken a second to fix.

4/16 Italian
3/16 Irish
3/16 English
2/16 French-Canadian

4/16 ? "Wilkinson", Scandinavian.

What is wrong with culture?

It restricts free thought.
It inflicts arbitrary prejudiced perspectives onto people.
It dismisses the differences between individuals to contrive an artificial group, to which people are coerced into submission.
It enables baseless bigotry between other arbitrary cultural groups and cohesion among people in the group for which there is no reason to associate.
It causes people to suffer through the arbitrary perspectives.

Why do I oppose religion, as distinct from culture?

It is cultural.
It requires actions and encourages types of behavior which are based on delusions which don't have any basis in reality. Happiness is increased by rationally evaluating the world and modifying your behavior.
The more delusional you are, the less you're able to be happy.
It conflates morality with the religion.

How to be pale:

Always be covered as well as possible and avoid the sun
Always use sunscreen
Wash your skin thoroughly and exfoliate
Reduce blood pressure
Donate blood every two months

Why not vote for the lesser of two evils?:

Voting is a false sense of control.
Authoritarian governments, operating under the presumption of being free, force compulsory voting.
What if no one voted? The lower the voter turnout, the more of a message it sends.
My single vote doesn't make a difference. I would have to organize an incredibly large group of people who also are not voting for this reason, with all of us agreeing to vote.
Getting involved with politics is meaningless.
It can easily be sabotaged, anyway.

What kind of people go to X college?

Engage your imagination to dream vividly.

I step into Socrates's forum and speak to him about happiness. Other philosophers gradually step in.
Plato speaks on behalf of Socrates.
How is happiness attained?
Through moderation.
Moderation of what?
Other philosophers gradually step in.
I refute all of them.
The philosophers bicker.
Toward the end, I say that for all of their philosophizing and such, they can't answer the simplest answer relevant to my life, such as what is good and what is evil. They contradict each other and they contradict themselves.
The philosophers argue angrily, and I watch them. I sit toward an edge and watch, saying that I might eventually be able to make sense out of the loudening clamor.
Einstein shouts from some other building behind the forum, and tells me the definition of insanity.
I ask him how his unified theory is coming along.
Touché.

-PRape

Honestly, doctors touching my penis when I was a child was worse than it would be if I consented to an adult in a loving relationship with them. I don't see how I and every child was not raped by doctors: We did not consent to it. We only did it because our parents made us. Which is another point: If we as a society taught children that they are independent of their parents and that they should not blindly follow them, they would not be abused by their parents in the way they often are. (Tie this into the "Adults enjoy subjugating children" argument?)

Why does "medicinal practice" change the nature of it? An adult touched my genitals when I didn't want them to. Because it "had" to be done and because my parents allowed it fundamentally changes the nature of it?

1.) Why would I be upset over this? Perhaps it because I personally think that the entire notion of "power" and "authority" is pathetic, so I don't feel as if I was "manipulated" (even though by definition, I was; it's just that I don't apply the societal meaning to it).

2.) Why is it okay for a parent to "allow" an adult to touch a child, if they are demonstrably capable of applying reason, just because they're the child's parent? A child should belong to themselves.

I was coerced by an adult into having my penis stroked. This is by definition rape. This happens to virtually every child. Yet everyone thinks there is nothing wrong with this? It should be up to the child to decide if it is right or wrong.

I was molested at least a dozen times by a few different adults when I was a child. It wasn't my decision at all: I was coerced into it. They felt me all over my body, and it usually culminated in the fondling of my penis. What do each of the adults have in common? They were doctors, and each of them were sanctioned by my parents to do it. This happens to virtually every child without their input into the matter: Their parents sanction it.

And yet, virtually none of these children grow up feeling traumatized by the experience. How can we reconcile this extreme dissonance? Virtually every child's genitals are fondled without their decision in the matter, but when a child deliberately wants to engage in sexual activity with an adult, it becomes traumatic (whether or not they are even cognizant of the "trauma")?

I'm not saying that this is wrong. A child should decide for themselves whether they want to allow a doctor to fondle their penis instead of being coerced by their parents into having it done.

It must be because the victims of rape are coerced by their society into believing that what they experienced is an irrevocable evil and a lifelong trauma. And maybe it is to some individuals!

How can we reconcile the fact that virtually every child has been raped and everyone's indifference to it, with the notion that rape is something traumatizing?

I am:

Anticultural

quasi-pacifist

quasi-moral nihilist, although I do not like the term because it gives people the impression that I am not opposed to what is considered immoral.

mutualist anarchist

Morality seems no different than religion to me. The reason why no one can agree on ideal systems of morality and ideal political systems is because all of it is contrived sophistry. It is always an instance of people with power contriving arbitrary ideals to justify actions, or adjusting their actions according to their arbitrary ideals.

Such bizarre instances as "moral agents". It's okay to kill an animal, but it's not okay to kill a human. Killing one person to save many people is wrong, killing one person to save many people is right.

The common factor is that "immoral" behavior is permitted to be treated with force. That's all morality is- the application of force.

These are all completely meaningless bizarre supernatural claims. The truth of the matter is that "morality" is always an instance of a group with power contriving arbitrary ideals to justify their actions, adjusting their actions according to their arbitrary ideals, or whatever.

There are so many ways in which they could be compared. Such as their treatment of suicide.

In conventional Christianity, killing yourself would intuitively be desirable because you would be able to go to heaven. In Buddhism, taking five seconds to kill yourself would free you from a lifetime of suffering. And yet in both, suicide is arbitrarily forbidden for contrived reasons.

The same with morality: Killing yourself would intuitively be moral because you would not have the capacity to commit immoral deeds, which you innately do through being alive; and yet many would somehow forbid suicide as being immoral.

Wars are inevitable

incarceration of nonviolent criminals

economic misuse

miseducation of the young

vote buying

taxes

arms around the world

subsidies

economic inefficiencies

permanent underclasses through ilegal immigrants and welfare

organized crime increase

Third paragraph, three: (Other than Jenzzzy)

After reading that a female who was shot by George Sodini repeatedly exclaimed "Get me out of here, he's going to kill me." after having been shot. I thought that it was absurd that she did not realize it was an attack against a group in the aggregate rather than someone having a personal vendetta against each person (Although she was specifically only thinking of herself and not of others at the time). It made me recall how I read in a testimony against Kip Kinkel that another female sought a natural life sentence for him because she had to "[deal] with my own fear that you will one day try to hurt me again" even though he confessed literally hours after the incident that he did not target any specific people and had no idea who any of them were (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JyaMiL7XeiY> 7:11 - 7:26). I could not understand why females thought this way. I now believe I understand it, though. When people are exposed to stressful situations, they shed articial civility and reveal their subconscious mindset to a considerable degree. While males would say, "There is someone shooting people" demonstrating their selflessness, females would say, "Someone is shooting -me-.", demonstrating their selfishness. I speculate that it is because females have a predilection for self-ish thoughts. I use a hyphen so that no one assumes I imply the negative connotations "selfish" has developed; what I mean is that females think in a manner which pertains to themselves. I mean this every time that I use the words selfish and selfishness. The selfishness of females can explain literally every major difference between the conscious thoughts and behavior of them and males.

It also explains why females are, as I have observed, more likely to be offended by a general statement or by any criticism: Such as, if I were to debunk a political ideology to which a female subscribed, they would interpret it as a personal attack against them because they had accepted that philosophy as being true. Because they also accept the legitimacy of theirself, they anthropomorphize their thoughts as actually being theirself in a convoluted sense. Another example of females stereotypically not accepting criticism is how people advise "Your wife is always right", because a female will be more likely to think that the unwitting husband was trying to "hurt" when he criticized her idea even if he legitimately pointed out how she was wrong in something. A female in this situation would be unlikely to admit her error because she subconsciously would think of it as denying the legitimacy of herself. In the same vein, I understand why females are more likely to be offended by humor which, independent of how simple or complex, involves some degree of violence. An example is the ubiquitous Dead Baby Joke "Stop crawling in circles or I'll nail your other foot to the floor". A male would be more likely to enjoy this because they are amused by the absurdity of the situation, but a female would often literally exclaim "Ew" because they subconsciously actually visualize a scene of a hungry infant with a bloody impaled foot helplessly trying to free itself. They subsequently personalize the circumstance, thinking, "What if that was me? He is amused by this. He must want to do that to me.", which explains why a female would not only not find it amusing to any degree but would also be angry at the person who said it.

It also explains why there are, excluding very few exceptions such as Brenda Spencer & Laurie Dann, virtually never female spree killers compared to the amount of males that there have been. Spree shooters often are motivated by a hatred of humans in the aggregate (For various reasons, but that is entirely irrelevant) and sometimes also act in an attempt to ameliorate some lackluster philosophy which they have established in their minds, such as the two ubiquitous morons Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold. A female would not be likely to have a legitimate and consummate hatred of humans in general because they would not be capable of detaching themselves from that collection while a male would likely have no compunction with it. A female would also not be willing to sacrifice something, especially their life, for what they believe to be righteous because they view nothing else mattering above themselves and especially the comfort they would be losing; they would see themselves as being dead, and if they are dead, they believe their ideology would not matter. Females' aversion to sacrifice in the pursuit of what they believe to be righteousness (And it is possible females are inherently less likely to form hardline philosophies because they would ultimately not be willing to make sacrifices in the pursuit of it) can be illustrated by this perfunctory example which used to happen to me when I was younger: I would get into an argument with a female who would in some way be disseminating false information about me. I would then prove them wrong in some way which would to a great extent damage the situation, whether trivial or

not, and they would always say "You showed me." sarcastically, implying that I was wrong in valuing the truth above the status quo. Another (More coherent) example is the lack of females aspiring to be involved in politics. Females are less likely to desire doing something stressful which does not in any way have a direct effect on themselves, their family, their friends, et alia, even if it does ideologically. Its pertinence to themselves is actually all that matters, though, because to them, their family and friends are an extension of themselves.

Females are more likely to be charitable than males are because of their selfishness. They are unable to detach themselves from a situation: They subconsciously think "What if -I- was hungry? I might die. I do not want to die". A person starving to death would likely be willing to do anything to acquire food so that they survive, and a female is perpetually in this mindset while helping other people because of their subconscious affinity for selfishness.

People say that females are oriented towards emotion and males toward objectivity. I do not accept this aphorism at face value. A female appears more emotional than a male because of their desire to express themselves, owing to their selfishness. They want other people to know how they feel so that they can have their feelings accepted, thus legitimizing their feelings and subsequently thinking that that they themselves have been legitimized. Males experience this too, but rather than having more objectivity (Greater selflessness) as though it is a trait in itself, I believe they merely have a smaller degree of affinity for selfishness, and thus display less emotion because they gain nothing from doing so.

This is also why females are very unlikely to say that a male having a girlfriend is pointless. I was discursively searching Google for the fatuity in having a girlfriend when I found a response by a female against someone who asserted that girlfriends are a waste of money (Monetary cost is not why I will never desire to have a girlfriend; do not castigate me over it). Summarized, she said that girlfriends in general are not a waste of money because -she- personally pays for everything herself. Also, that they are "great companions" because she said that -she- herself never "disrespects" her boyfriend. She then said that perhaps females in general might be expensive (While earlier saying that they are not), but she personally is not. She did what I observe happening incessantly: She conflated herself with a group of people when clearly it was inappropriate to. It would have been correct for her to say from the beginning that most females are expensive to have as girlfriends, but she personally was not. She was unlikely to do so, however, because she subconsciously had to see herself as other females, unable to detach herself from them. This partially explains why females in general are collectivists and are fundamentally opposed to rational political ideologies such as libertarianism and anarcho-capitalism without reason, but I am not going to get into that because this will already be too eclectic of a post. I fortuitously observed the same phenomenon in my mother just yesterday, which serves as a definitive example. She asked me what I would think about moving back to New Hampshire, where I originally lived until I was six years old. I asked her why she was asking this and if she was considering it, because it had no relevance to what we were just talking about, so it could not be that she just wanted to know my implication over whether or not I liked New Hampshire as a state in itself as opposed to other states. She said that she was not considering it, and after I kept insinuating that she had to have been, she said that she was thinking about it. I asked why she did not originally merely say that, and she said because she was not seriously -intending- on doing it, as though it was already decided. That is not what I asked, though. While I thought of "consider" as its reasonable unspoken definition, her selfishness led her to visualize the concept of my question as being literal- of her actually moving- the idea of which she did not presently intend on doing, so she said that she was not considering it. I observe this incessantly in females, although not usually as explicit. My point is that female selfishness is so fundamental that it guides their speech and behavior to the point of logical fallacies.

Females also feel the desire to have attention more than males because of their selfishness. Females' fundamental desire to express their feelings is a truism on which does not need to be expounded. It exists in anything ranging from their propensity to verbally say things such as "Aww" and "Eew" in comparison to the frequency males use them, to creating art (The acceptance of which and cultural subordination being another topic. I will not deal with that here.) They are more likely to act emotionally than males are because they want their feelings to be legitimized by other people, which they subconsciously believe would subsequently legitimize themselves because they are conflating the two owing to their selfishness.

This is also why females stereotypically have many friends with whom they horde around.

Here is an example of females being offended by a general statement: Whenever I am criticizing a group of people -in the aggregate- on a forum who have a monolithic opinion and say "You people" in addressing them, if anyone ever addresses those two words specifically, it is always a female who acts offended and says something to the degree of "What do you mean 'You people'?". This is because they cannot view themselves separately from a group of which they are a part because of their selfishness. Even if they are a part of "the people", they still will act offended because I criticized them- whether I am correct in my criticism or not is irrelevant to them-, and subconsciously invoke their selfishness in their response saying that abhorrent adage while thinking they have disproved whatever I said.

What I mean is this: Female behavior and speech is guided by their predilection for self-ishness to a degree which males do not have. Even though males may express their emotions owing to selfishness just as much as females (Although often less so), their emotions do not have the pervasive effect on their behavior that they have on females.

I know literally nothing about psychology and have no intention of ever having anything to do with it nor psychiatry, so I don't know if any information relevant to this exists.

you guys have shitty girlfriends. i always pay for myself and ive been doing so with my bf for the last five years. he only pays if he wants to, i never ask him to.

its not pointless to have a gf, if they are good ones. we can be great companions, i never flake out on him or treat him disrespectfully.

...although not many gfs, especially at the high school level, are cheap to have. i think that girls like me are deffinatley worth it. if she is making you pay all the time then obviously she isnt great to have around. i think im a worthy lifelong investment though! id make a great wife.