



## The Role of Androphilia in the Psychosexual Development of Boys

David L. Riegel

To cite this article: David L. Riegel (2011) The Role of Androphilia in the Psychosexual Development of Boys, International Journal of Sexual Health, 23:1, 2-13, DOI: 10.1080/19317611.2010.509696

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2010.509696>



Published online: 18 Mar 2011.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 12792



View related articles [↗](#)

## THE ROLE OF ANDROPHILIA IN THE PSYCHOSEXUAL DEVELOPMENT OF BOYS

David L. Riegel

**ABSTRACT.** It is generally recognized that boys, and especially later prepubertal and young adolescent boys, are openly attracted to older boys and men. They identify with these more mature, most often unrelated males; they want to learn about the masculine world; they want to “be like” these people. This article examines previctimological and more recent literature to consider the extent to which boys’ generalized inclinations to explore, experience, and enjoy their emerging masculinity in the company of older males also may be manifested in their psychosexual developmental interests, desires, and activities. Insights from the literature concerning boys’ perspectives are taken into account, and various extraneous factors that may negatively affect boys’ psychosexual development are considered. The authenticity of this juvenile male androphilic sexuality is found to be supported, as is the repression thereof as a significant dynamic in young male social alienation and maladjustment.

**KEYWORDS.** Juvenile male androphilia, psychosexual development, boys, boy-attracted pedosexual male

Citing Hertoft, Frederiksen (1993) described *apprentice-love* as the “attraction a [boy] may experience toward an [older male] whom he . . . sees as a model or teacher.” He further identified *hero worship* as a form of that apprentice-love, which led in his day to the “super heroes” in “books, comics, and movies boys are interested in” (p. 39). In today’s electronic world, bookmarks on a boy’s computer may include Websites about these people, and his bedroom walls may be plastered with pictures and posters of his television heroes: noted male athletes, musicians, and other public figures. This admiration and attraction also can exist locally with a coach or teacher, a friendly neighbor, or even an older boy.

It is accepted by most that it is appropriate and advantageous for boys to emulate older males and learn from them experientially, either on an individual basis or through organizations such as Boy Scouts, Big Brothers, and so on. These arrangements are accepted, encouraged, and seen as good and positive in al-

most every area of activity and learning, with the notable exception of sexuality, which society has decreed must be scrupulously avoided. In the last few decades, even physical contact previously considered casual and innocuous has come to be viewed by some as having sexual implications. The almost paranoid necessity for these avoidances has, unfortunately, severely reduced the number of older males who are willing to interact with boys, especially on a one-to-one basis, for fear of exposing themselves to the possibility of suspicions—no matter how unfounded or unsubstantiated—of sexual interest. Furedi and Bristow (2008) documented how “cultural distancing of generations weakens the bonds of community life . . . through policies that encourage the erosion of the older generations in the joint enterprise of socializing youngsters” (p. xiii) and Hayes (2008) noted that “the lack of male role models is of concern” and that “effects on boys are detectable early in life, especially in areas of social development” (p. 502). Thus many boys are

unable to find and interact with the male role models and mentors they are seeking and are deprived of the bolstered sense of self-worth and other benefits that such relationships can provide.

Nevertheless, there is much truth in the observation that, in spite of efforts to repress them, “boys will be boys” and will tend to ignore or sidestep what they see as specious social taboos. Although it may not be universal, and the level of activity and pursuit no doubt varies among individuals, “Young boys are sexually active from a very early age and will pursue their sexuality whenever they can find an opportunity to do so” (P. Wilson, 1981, p. 134). To boys these explorations are simply a matter of curiosity and physical pleasure: “Priests, doctors, psychiatrists, and others have invested sex with magical powers . . . [but boys] . . . saw sex as being no more than just a game” (P. Wilson, pp. 129–130). The harm that some consider the inevitable result of any sexual activities with older persons (e.g., Finkelhor, 1981, 1984) is dismissed as minimal to nonexistent by the boys themselves, “They regarded the experience with a certain robustness, if not relish” (Ingram, 1981, p. 177; cf. Leahy, 1992; Riegel, 2006, 2009; Sandfort, 1987; Tindall, 1978). Further, the symbolism and other emotional baggage that culture tries to impose on their native views of sexuality tend to be of little importance to them (Hertoff, 1993, p.10; cf. Leahy, 1992; Okami, 1991; Sandfort, 1987), as most who have been boys, and who know and have known boys as equals and confidants, can confirm. It is only when associated with a serious emotional involvement—typically with a girl and usually late in adolescence or even into adulthood—that a boy on his own may begin to perceive sex as having emotional connotations and consequences. But until these become significant, and so long as they fend off the incessant drumbeat of the ideology that sex is something mysterious and unfathomable, a concept that P. Wilson, as quoted above, refers to as “magical powers,” it would seem that many boys—perhaps most—tend to operate primarily within what they see as the intuitively logical paradigm that sexuality—absent physical force or any other extrinsic coercion—has no original

intrinsic morality or immorality of its own, and that any abstract moral values that other persons may attempt to assign to sexuality are irrelevant to them (Riegel, 2006, 2009; Sandfort, 1987). Furthermore, a boy’s sense of immediacy is unlikely to allow for delaying the exploration of his sexual curiosity and urges until some socially mandated arbitrary time in what to him is the distant future. P. Wilson (1981, p. 133) and Holt (1974, p. 270) have made the point that children should have the right to control their own sex lives, and social and/or governmental interference with this right is not only likely to be futile, but to result in the alienation of these young people from their own society.

### INNOCENCE, MORALITY, AND RELATIONSHIPS

Much is said about boyhood “innocence,” but Calderone (1979) and Levine (2002), among others, have pointedly made the case that children are in no way unaware of their own sociobiologically inherited sexuality. This innocence—or more properly, “ignorance”—instead results from mythical qualities (i.e., Wilson’s previously cited “magical powers”) that are attached to sex by those who dictate “morals” to other human beings, such as Finkelhor (1981, 1984) and Ondersma et al. (2001, p. 711). This ignorance may indeed be blissful until it collides head-on with societal sexual taboos and restrictions.

Under this mantle of sex-negative morality, previous research evidencing boys’ willing participation in sexual exploration (e.g., Constantine & Martinson, 1981; Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy, & Christenson, 1965; Sandfort, 1987; Tindall, 1978; Trobriands, 1993; P. Wilson, 1981) is disparaged, and the expressed insights and introspections of boys in this body of research are ignored by authors such as Conte (1985), Finkelhor (1981, 1984), T. Johnson (1988), and Ondersma et al. (2001). These moralists unilaterally decree that boys have neither the capacity to understand and/or evaluate their own personal sexuality, nor the right to participate willingly in sexual exploration with other persons. Even the usually

accepted sex play of boys with their male peers is called into question by some (e.g., Cunningham & MacFarlane, 1998; T. Johnson, 1988; for criticism see Okami, 1992). Boys thus are forbidden any sexual contact with other persons—a proscription which is perhaps especially vigorous in respect to older males, but which boys may very well see as nothing more than an unwelcome and illegitimate intrusion into their private affairs.

Even though homosexuality has been largely depathologized, negative attitudes toward homosexual behaviors persist in the United States and some other countries. A particularly prevalent and insidious myth is that boyhood sexual explorations with males are indicative of incipient homosexuality, an accusation that can be especially onerous to adolescent boys. Another impediment to boys' development is the campaigning of some feminists who view boys' psychosexual masculinization as an undesirable sexist and antisocial quality (e.g., Gilligan, 1996; A. Johnson & Steinem, 1997). These and other similar factors may contribute to the feelings of estrangement described by P. Wilson (1981) "young people in western countries feel sexually repressed, alienated from adult company, and emotionally bankrupt" (p. 134; cf. Prescott, 1975).

As noted by Vanggaard (1969), the male sexual worlds of the boy, the older adolescent, and the man are neither exclusive nor incompatible, they have much in common and constitute a shared and unbroken continuum. A boy's sexual world no doubt is intrinsically and inalienably very real and important to him, no less so than is the sexual world of any other human being. Therefore, from the boy's point of view—a view to which science would do well to pay more attention—it must be an inexcusable offense against his masculinity, indeed, against his very humanity, to attempt to make him feel guilty about his sexuality, to deny the existence of his sexual world, and/or to forbid him to explore, experience, and enjoy that world and the continuum of which it is a part. Various authors have commented on this:

[L]earning about sex in our society is in large part learning about guilt, and learning how

to manage sexuality . . . involves learning how to manage guilt. (Simon & Gagnon, 1970, p. 34)

Sex robs children of their innocence, we are told, as though the introduction to the world of sexual gratification is an initiation into a world of guilt and burdensome knowledge which somehow spoils the perfection of childhood. (Klooger, 2009, p. 87)

Imagine, if you can, something you experience often and intensely as real and present being accorded no recognition of its existence whatsoever by the world around you. Or imagine this real and intense experiencing of yourself being subjected over and over to severe, totally bewildering disapproval and punishment. *What kind of silently tormenting existential hell is this to which we consign our children from their earliest memories?* Do any ever manage to live through it with their . . . sexuality undistorted? (Calderone, 1979, p. 6)

[C]hildren who are seeking a close relationship with an adult do not necessarily feel that there is such a big chasm between close mental and physical contact in the general sense and the kind of contact which we . . . label as sexual. (Hertoft, 1993, p. 9)

Although the sexual aspect of a boy's chosen relationship with an older male may only be a pleasurable and temporary adjunct, his emotional attachment to that male may be of much greater significance and duration (Sandfort, 1987), and depending on the depth and intensity of the relationship, unwanted interruption for any reason potentially could leave him "heartbroken" (Seligman, 1993, p. 232). In a retrospective Internet sample of 103 such relationships, 80 were reported as being at least somewhat important, 75 lasted over one year and 48 more than 2 years, whereas non-negative effects were reported by 90 and positive effects by 59 (Riegel, 2006, 2009).

## CREDIBILITY

In Western cultures where boys are explicitly prohibited from exploring their sexuality with older males, the severest of punishments

are inflicted on their partners, and, collaterally, on the boys themselves (P. Wilson, 1981, p.133), under “laws seemingly designed for the protection of the young [which] are really intended to control them” (Mirkin, 1999b, p. 503). But the extent to which this prohibition is routinely and massively ignored raises further questions as to its underlying premises and intrinsic legitimacy. Data examined by Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman (1998), indicate that, in spite of stringent social prohibitions, 17% of college males had sexual contacts with older persons when they were boys, some two thirds of whom reported their experiences as non-negative and thus presumably to some degree willing. Additionally:

Among all samples, the Landis [1956] reaction data were the most negative. In computing mean reactions across samples we employed *weighted* means, thereby giving the most weight to Landis’ negatively skewed data . . . . Using the weighted approach, mean positive and negative reactions were 37 and 33 percent, respectively. Using an *unweighted* approach would have yielded . . . 43 and 30 percent. Dropping the Landis data completely would have yielded . . . 50 and 24 percent. (Rind, Tromovitch, & Bauserman, 2000, p. 22)

Therefore, depending on the approach taken, from three eighths to one half of boyhood sexual experiences with older persons were perceived as positive, and as much as three fourths as non-negative. It should also be noted that because of the likely underreporting due to the stigma associated with such contacts, especially when the older partner is male, the 17% incidence figure is almost certainly an underestimate.

But applying even this minimal percentage to the 90 million males age 15 or older in the United States Census of 2000 (US Census, 2000) produces a figure of some 15 million of what some would label as “male victims of child sexual abuse,” but which others, apparently including many of the participants themselves, consider to be consensual, nonabusive, and personally satisfactory sexual experiences. Gebhard et al. (1965), in their classic

study of sex offenders done for the Kinsey Institute four decades ago, documented three levels of willingness among boys sexually involved with men, finding that in the majority of cases the boys encouraged the sex, especially early adolescent boys. For boys ages 12 to 15, according to the boys’ accounts in official court records, 70% of them were encouraging, 11% of them passively consented, and 17% were coerced or forced (2% were classified as mixed cases). Similar indications of willing participation have been reported by Bentham (~1785), Bender and Blau (1937), Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948), Tallman (1953), Tindall (1978), Sandfort (1987), and others. It would seem that in the real world the prohibition of boy/older male sexual contacts has little credibility with many of its intended young subjects.

## QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Given the academic antipathy (e.g., Conte, 1985; Finkelhor, 1981, 1984; Ondersma et al, 2001), social service inquisitions (Goodyear-Smith, 1993; Levine, 2002), and zealous law enforcement coupled with media hyperbole (Dineen, 2001; Jenkins, 1998; Salkin, 2006) with which society attempts to stifle childhood sexual explorations with older persons in general, and more specifically this apparent seeking out by boys of older males for sexual mentoring, puzzling questions emerge: Why, year after harassed year, decade after beleaguered decade, generation after denying generation, does this boyhood androphilic phenomenon continue to persist, apparently undiminished? (Schopenhauer, 1819/1958). Is there something inherent in the psyche of many—if not most—boys that is irresistibly drawn to older males for mentoring, including sexual instruction, experimentation, and enjoyment? Is there something inherent in the psyche of some—if not many—older males (Freund, 1970) that predisposes them to accept and participate in the nonsexual and sexual explorations and education of boys?

Nearly 40 years ago, Danish psychiatrist Thorkil Vanggaard (1969) investigated these issues and proposed the existence of a mental or psychic attribute that he called the

“homosexual radical” to describe the sexually expressed attraction that he saw as existing between boys and older males, carefully excluding what we know today as adult male homosexuality. He defined this radical as “[S]omething inherent in humans, something which, . . . exerts a powerful pressure, and which therefore has to be dealt with either by being given discharge in some form, or by being suppressed in one way or another” (p. 16). Supported by the above-mentioned wholesale flaunting of prohibitions by boys apparently driven by this radical, as well as by many recent, historical, and cross-cultural examples (e.g., Ford & Beach, 1951; Kinsey et al., 1948; Murray, 2002; Percy, 1996; Sandfort, 1987), Vanggaard’s proposition would seem to be quite reasonable and logical.

Additionally, it can be hypothesized that a tendency for boys to be sexually attracted to older males is an evolutionary development. Feierman’s (1990) *Pedophilia: Biosocial Dimensions* compilation took the concepts of E. O. Wilson’s *Sociobiology* (1975) and applied them to the issues of sexually expressed child/older person relationships, devoting four chapters by four different authors to the evolutionary aspects of these issues. In his introduction, Feierman noted that

Selected behavior that leads to an increased chance for the individual to survive and reproduce is called “adaptive behavior” [and that] aspects of the behavior result from an interaction of genetic and nongenetic determinants and . . . genetic determinants were subjected to positive selective pressures . . . in our evolutionary past. (p. 2)

Proceeding from Feierman’s (1990) thesis, it can be postulated that in prehistoric times it is likely that many children, due to violence, disease, poor nutrition, and life spans that were considerably shorter than what we have considered normal for the past couple of centuries, found themselves without either parents or other adults who would be willing to take on the burden of looking after and feeding a not yet productive child. However, a boy who was sexually androphilic (Vanggaard, 1969) would have the potential advantage of closely bond-

ing with an older male whose sexuality included a male-directed pedosexual component, and who would preferentially protect, provide for, and teach the boy the skills necessary to survive and prosper. Studies have identified such secondary boy-attracted pedosexual tendencies in 20% to 30% of self-identified heterosexual adult males (Freund, 1970; cf. Briere & Runtz, 1989, Quinsey, 1984, West, 1980), and these tendencies would not be selected against so long as the bearers were primarily heterosexual and only secondarily male-oriented pedosexual. There is no reason to believe that these percentages were not similar in prehistoric times; there is some evidence for familial transmission (Gaffney, Lurie, & Berlin, 1984). In the absence of our modern-day taboos, such adaptive and beneficial boy/older male relationships could proceed unimpeded, the boy’s juvenile androphilic sexuality would typically be supplanted by heterosexuality as he matured (Sandfort, 1987), he would then pass on his genes, and thus both of these traits would be maintained in the gene pool.

### CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISONS

Current ethnocentric “consensus morality” (Rind, 2002) holds that all other cultures and times are/were inferior to the present state of Western enlightenment, and that victimology and child sexual abuse anxiety are significant and superior features of the current culture. However, there is much evidence that the sexually expressed relationships between boys and older males that are reviled and prosecuted today were considered innocuous, acceptable, desirable, or even the norm in many other times and places—and in some cultures still are (Murray, 2002). Percy (1996), for example, cited writings from classical Greece stating that such relationships were one of the factors that distinguished Greek society from the “barbarians.” Various other authors, including—but certainly not beginning with or limited to—Ford and Beach (1951), Bliebtreu-Ehrenberg (1991), Bauserman (1997), and continuing on through Murray’s 507-page magnum opus (2002), have

catalogued and described an impressive number and large variety of accepted and/or institutionalized sexual contacts of boys with older males wherein the boys were not only willing partners, but desirous of the relationships. In Melanesia, oral and anal insemination “is initiated by the young adolescents themselves” for them, based on their beliefs, to mature into men and “appears for all practical intents and purposes to be grounded in personal affection rather than obligation” (Murray, 2002, p. 32).

Sexologist, physician, and legal scholar Richard Green (2002) presented his own list of such cultures, including the Siwa of northern Africa wherein males of all ages seek out and practice anal intercourse with other males (Ford & Beach, 1951, pp. 131–132), and the Etoro of New Guinea, where a boy who receives semen from an older male does so to “make him grow and strengthen,” and who “is demonstrating his desire to be masculine” (Murray, 2002, p. 33). Green (2002) observed: “These cross-cultural examples are not cited to argue for similar practices in Los Angeles or London,” then rhetorically asked: “But are we to conclude that all the adults engaged in these practices were mentally ill?” (pp. 467–468). Multiple additional examples could be provided from the authors cited above, but those cited are sufficient to frame the question: If willing boyhood androphilic sexual activities with older males are not psychopathogenic in North Africa or New Guinea, then on what rational basis can Western culture justify defining similar voluntary behaviors as supposedly psychologically and/or emotionally traumatic in Chicago or Cambridge?

Cross-cultural comparisons of sexualities tend to elicit the criticism that “Well, some cultures also engaged in infanticide, human sacrifice, and cannibalism,” and these and other repugnant practices have, in fact, appeared in history. But, unlike these relative rarities, boy/older male mutual sexual attractions and/or interactions do not normally cause bodily harm, are generally evident in every time and culture, and are of “universal nature and persistent ineradicability” (Schopenhauer, 1819/1958, p. 562). Stekel (1922/1952) also noted that “My daily contact with patients proves to me . . . the phe-

nominal ubiquity of pedophilic tendencies” (p. 284). One has only to consider the previously mentioned statistics (Rind et al., 1998) and their extrapolation to realize that this ineradicability and ubiquity of boyhood sexual androphilia is very much in evidence today in the United States and other Western countries, and perhaps even more so in other places in the world whose cultures are not yet so extensively affected by Western influence. Ethnographically, in cultures where such interactions are not pathologized, willing participation apparently is nearly 100%. The question then becomes: In this ongoing clash between, on one hand, the intrinsic, universal, ubiquitous, and apparently benign or even beneficial sexually androphilic nature of boys, and on the other hand, Western extrinsic, ethnocentric, inconsistent, restrictive, and potentially iatrogenic “moralities” (Malón, 2009b), which should take precedence?

## THE INTERNET

The Internet, especially in the United States, has opened up a new and virtually uncontrollable venue for children and adolescents to reach out for personal contacts. Various Websites oriented to young people provide for the posting of personal information, and the chat forums on these sites permit initial contacts that can lead to private conversations online or by other means. For a tech-savvy androphilic boy looking to establish contact with an older male, these sites provide an escape from outside interference and potentially anonymous opportunities to investigate potential sexual contacts, with the option of unilaterally terminating any unwanted conversations with the click of a mouse. The sheer number of these private conversations makes it logistically impractical to monitor or control what is discussed, so an unknown, because this obviously cannot be investigated or quantified, number of these may lead to in-person meetings which may include sex. Describing these liaisons, Wolak, Finkelhor, and Mitchell (2004) invoked the standard terminology of *victim* and *offender* while admitting that many are consensual and repetitive, but then

go on to say that young people need to be convinced that what they do freely and willingly is seen by society as inappropriate and detrimental.

A principal response developed thus far by law enforcement is the “sting” operation, directed not at the boy (who cannot be entrapped without first being illegally “seduced”) but at his hoped-for older friend, in which operatives pretend online to be androphilic boys who are receptive to sexual invitations, thus luring the older males who respond into real life meetings (i.e., de facto entrapment) where they are arrested and fed to the media as evidence of pedophilic depravity and police effectiveness (Salkin, 2006). One view of these unfortunates is as naive or imprudent—or even downright stupid—to fall for such a transparent ruse, but another very credible possibility is that there may be such ongoing substantial numbers of undiscovered successful boy/older male liaisons that those entrapped are only a fraction of those who succeed, thus the vast majority—and especially the more experienced and wary—are unlikely to stumble into these ambushes: “you simply can’t get caught . . . if you know what you’re doing “ (cited in Fournier, 2008). Law enforcement, the media, and some activists seem to be convinced that this is the case, at least judging from the hyperbole about the pervasiveness of these “evils” and the pleas for greater funding to combat them (e.g., Fournier, 2008).

Also, according to the media reports, many of these ensnared older males turn out not to be the playground-haunting “turned down fedora and trenchcoat with candy in the pockets” caricature of the sociopathic child molester. They instead tend to be personable, bright, well educated, and socially successful individuals: teachers, Scout leaders, clergy, policemen, attorneys, judges, and so on, that is, people who are eminently capable of contributing positively to boys’ overall development if the sexual involvement were not so unacceptable. It is heretical in today’s sociopolitical climate to suggest that such contacts may not be intrinsically injurious; nevertheless it is interesting to reflect on the possibility that these Internet-facilitated liaisons

in some cases might be serving the dual positive functions of harmlessly satisfying boyhood needs and desires for androphilic sexual exploration and other mentoring, while providing equally harmless connections for older males who are emotionally and sexually attracted to such boys. It even might be that by providing an “outlet,” these contacts reduce the likelihood that either the younger or older males out of frustration will commit antisocial or even violent sexual acts, as in the case of 15-year-old Sam Manzie, a victim of what appears to have been a dysfunctional family, inept social and legal services, and overzealous law enforcement. Sam apparently was pushed over the edge when his highly valued and voluntary relationship with an older male was destroyed by police interference, and he impulsively and senselessly raped and murdered 11-year-old *Eddie Werner* (Dribben, 1997).

### LESSONS NOT LEARNED

Beginning in the 1700s and continuing through the middle of the 20th century, it was claimed that childhood and adolescent masturbation were intrinsically harmful, even to the extent of causing insanity, although this activity is now known to be innocuous and even beneficial (Hare, 1962; Laqueur, 2003; Malón, 2009a). Money (1985), paraphrasing Santayana, noted that the many parallels between the now-defunct masturbation hypothesis and the victimological child sexual abuse hypothesis were “an example of those who have not learned from history being condemned to repeat it, replete with all its dreadful consequences” (p. 97). Another sacred cow was the concept of marriage as the only permissible venue for sexual intercourse, with virginity prior to the wedding being vital. Those who failed to conform were seen as “trash” and children born outside of marriage were considered “bastards,” but this nonsense now largely has been consigned to the rubbish heap of history. With homosexuality at least theoretically no longer available as a “hate” target, the “magical powers” fable (P. Wilson, 1981, p. 129) that society inflicts on the sexuality of children

and adolescents is perhaps the last remaining major bastion of Augustinian sexophobic morality. The only responses that self-realization-seeking androphilic boys and other young people would seem to receive are more stringent restrictions (raising the age of consent), more repression (“abstinence only” sex education), and increased persecution (through their older partners). But here again, the disregard for these prohibitions pointed out by Rind et al. (1998) and the apparent explosion of sexual interactions originating through the Internet are giving clear indications that young people are—as young people have done before—rejecting this taboo as meaningless, and are taking matters in their own hands. Perhaps it is time for the rest of society to face up to this reality.

### CONTROVERSY, CHILLS, AND CONCLUSIONS

There are, of course, many issues in this article that, though not new, admittedly are quite controversial and need to be brought back into the bright light of full and open academic and professional investigation and discussion, rather than—as has been the case for some two or more decades—being summarily dismissed as polemical nonsense or simply ignored or suppressed. What can only be described as a full-scale war (Mirkin, 1999a) on open and honest research and discussion of boyhood androphilic sexuality has been, and continues to be, waged by the pseudoscience of victimology (Money, 1988), the “Psychology Industry” (Dineen, 2001), and the media (Jenkins, 1998). The unfortunate victims of this war, besides the researchers holding positive views about boyhood sexuality, include truth, boys, and older males who may be very important to the well-being of these boys, and thereby society.

It is interesting to note that various researchers have, when they were younger, evidenced an understanding of, and professional respect for, boyhood androphilic sexual exploration with older males. Their papers and

books included phrases such as “positive contact” with older persons, and sexual contacts between boys and older males that were “positively experienced” (e.g., Leahy, 1992; Okami, 1991). Boys’ sexually expressed “contacts with men” were described as having “no negative effects,” that they “might also have a positive influence upon the youngsters,” that “relationships [were] based on personal factors of close friendship and trust,” and that children “may be better off for a [sexually expressed] relationship with a loving adult outside the family” (e.g., Bauserman, 1997; Constantine & Martinson, 1981; Ingram, 1981; Sandfort, 1987). In later life, however, almost all of these researchers for all intents and purposes have—at least publicly—abdicated their insights in favor of pragmatic self-preservation. I am aware from personal contact and private communication with some of them that their withdrawal has much to do with the danger of victimologically generated academic stigmatization and social hysteria. This chilling effect began to be evident in the late 1980s, became more pronounced in the 1990s, and, as a result, next to nothing new on the subject of positively experienced boy/older male sexual relationships has been published by academically based researchers since the end of the 20th century.

Also apparently as a result of these insidious pressures, some have left academic research and writing in favor of other fields, and at least one has left the homeland where he conducted his landmark research to teach other subjects in another country. Most of these formerly active researchers now completely avoid mention of their earlier investigations and publications, but private communications with some of them indicate that their views have not changed, only their public expression of those views. One in particular has been very helpful to this author, but when offered a coauthorship after making major contributions to another paper, he demurred, noting that he did not wish to “jeopardize my family and professional position.” And an e-mail inquiry to another one about further research into boy/older male sexual contacts elicited only an angry retort and an abrupt dismissal.

Dr. Paul Wilson (1981), who, as of this writing, holds the Chair of Criminology at Bond University in Robina, Queensland, Australia, published what is perhaps the most profound apologetic ever for juvenile male sexual anophilia, noting in the introduction how controversial the truths in the book would be “The conclusions I draw . . . are, it seems to me, inescapable, even if they are bound to be unpopular” (p. vii). He, like the other researchers referred to above, regretfully has written nothing more on these issues since, but nevertheless this article could conclude in no better manner than with the following quotes from this distinguished scholar who described, analyzed, and discussed Clarence Osborne’s self-recorded sexual contacts with some 2,500 boys (p. 1), of whom “not one . . . ever complained to the police” (p. 2):

[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.* (p. 133, emphasis added)

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. (pp. 134–135)

Although the academic and media uproar that followed the publication of P. Wilson’s (1981) book has faded, and the wounds that were inflicted over his failing to paint the “monster” and “victims” that were expected and demanded must have largely healed in the 30 years since that time, one may surmise that some of the pain and the scars still remain. But despite all this acrimony, P. Wilson’s (1981) perceptive and incisive analyses and conclusions, like those of Sandfort (1987) and others, have never been disproved, only disparaged and dismissed. For decades and centuries the vast majority of research about boyhood sexuality unquestionably was—and still is—severely compromised by the ideologies of what too many investigators presumed “should be,” instead of being an objective, unbiased and impartial quest for “what is.” It is therefore legitimate to ask, even with the occasional insights of Wilson, Sandfort, and a few others, just how much of the real intrinsic nature of boyhood sexuality is known and understood—and even more importantly, how much is recognized and accepted—by the academic and scientific communities.

Furthermore, the problems P. Wilson and others have identified of young male sexual repression, alienation, emotional bankruptcy, and the anger and antisocial behaviors these generate are still very much with us. Should not science at long last free itself from “magical powers,” ethnocentric superstitions, and narrow-minded taboos that cannot be shown to have any basis in fact, and which may well exacerbate (Malón, 2009b), rather than ameliorate, these afflictions that burden young males? Crittenden (1996) proposed that consensual sexual relationships between children and older persons be “considered more as a common variant of human behavior than abnormal behavior” (p. 166), and it would seem that the time has arrived to part company with the failed pseudo-scientific myths of victimology (Malón, 2009a) and the child sex abuse industry (Dineen, 2001), and to replace them with a model of

boyhood psychosexual developmental motivations and behaviors that is built upon honest and unbiased empirical observations, truth, and reality—a genuinely scientific paradigm that accurately reflects, and properly serves, the fundamental qualities and needs of boys.

## REFERENCES

- Bauserman, R. (1997). Man-boy sexual relationships in a cross-cultural perspective. In J. Geraci (Ed.), *Dares to speak: Historical and contemporary perspectives on boy-love* (pp. 120–137). Norfolk, UK: Gay Men's Press.
- Bender, L., & Blau, A. (1937). The reaction of children to sexual relations with adults. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 7, 500–518.
- Bentham, J. (~1785). *Offenses against one's self*. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/eresources/exhibitions/sw25/bentham/index.html>
- Blibtrey-Ehrenberg, G. (1991). Pederasty among primitives: Institutionalized initiation and cultic prostitution. In T. Sandfort, E. Brongersma, & A. van Naerssen (Eds.), *Male intergenerational intimacy* (pp. 13–30). New York, NY: Huntington Park.
- Briere, J., & Runtz, M. (1989). University males' sexual interest in children. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 13, 65–75.
- Calderone, M. (1979). Parents and the sexuality of their children, *SIECUS Report*, 8, 5–6.
- Constantine, L., & Martinson, F. (1981). *Children and sex*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Conte, J. (1985). The effects of sexual abuse on children: A critique and suggestions for future research. *Victimology*, 10, 110–130.
- Crittenden, P. (1996). Research on maltreating families. In J. Briere, L. Berliner, J. A. Bulkley, C. Jenny, & T. Reid. (Eds.), *The APSAC handbook on child maltreatment* (pp. 158–174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cunningham, C., & MacFarlane, K. (1998). *When children abuse*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society.
- Dineen, T. (2001). *Manufacturing victims: What the psychology industry is doing to people*. Montreal, Canada: Robert Davies.
- Dribben, M. (1997, October 9). So what is he, a man or a boy? *Philadelphia Inquirer*, p. R1.
- Feierman, J. (1990). *Pedophilia: Bio-social dimensions*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Finkelhor, D. (1981). *Sexually victimized children*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). *Child sexual abuse*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Ford, C., & Beach, F. (1951). *Patterns of sexual behavior*. New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- Fournier, S (2008). Police being outgunned by Internet perverts. *The Province*. Retrieved from <http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=b41a3703-1715-4fda-b5a8-3613cba4479a&sponsor=>
- Frederiksen, A. (1993). What science tells us. In Trobriands collective of authors (Eds.), *Crime without victims* (pp. 53–67). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Global Academic.
- Freund, K. (1970). The structure of erotic preferences in the nondeviant male. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 8, 15–20.
- Furedi, F., & Bristow, J. (2008). *Licensed to hug*. London, UK: Civitas.
- Gaffney, G., Lurie, S., & Berlin, F. (1984). Is there familial transmission of pedophilia? *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 172(9), 546–548.
- Gebhard, P., Gagnon, J., Pomeroy, W., & Christenson, C. (1965). *Sex offenders: An analysis of types*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Gilligan, C. (1996). The centrality of relationship in human development: A puzzle, some evidence, and a theory. In G. Noam & K. Fischer (Eds.), *Development and vulnerability in close relationships* (pp. 237–262). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates United States.
- Goodyear-Smith, F. (1993). *First do no harm: The sexual abuse industry*. Auckland, New Zealand: Benton-Guy.
- Green, R. (2002). Is pedophilia a mental disorder? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 31, 467–471.
- Hare, E. (1962). Masturbatory insanity: The history of an idea. *Journal of Mental Science*, 108, 1–25.
- Hayes, A. (2008, April). *Not such splendid isolation: Developmental implications of limited opportunities for intimacy*. Paper presented

- at the 13th National Family Law Conference, Adelaide, Australia.
- Hertoft, P. (1993). Paedophiles don't hurt children. In Trobriands collective of authors (Eds.), *Crime without victims* (pp. 7–13). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Global Academic Press.
- Holt, J. (1974). *Escape from childhood: The needs and rights of children*. New York, NY: Dutton.
- Ingram, M. (1981). Participating victims: A study of sexual offences with boys. In L. Constantine & F. Martinson (Eds.), *Children and sex. New findings, new perspectives* (pp. 177–188). Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Jenkins, P. (1998). *Moral panic*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Johnson, A., & Steinem, G. (1997). *Girls speak out: Finding your true self*. Pittsburg, PA: Scholastic.
- Johnson, T. (1988). Child perpetrators—Children who molest other children: Preliminary findings. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 12, 219–229.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: Saunders.
- Klooger, J. (2009). Children, pornography and sex. *The Rationalist*, 82. Retrieved from <http://www.rationalist.com.au/archive/82/85-88-Henson+Poem.pdf>
- Laqueur, T. (2003). *Solitary sex. A cultural history of masturbation*. New York, NY: Zone.
- Leahy, T. (1992). Positively experienced man/boy sex: The discourse of seduction and the social construction of masculinity. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 28, 71–88.
- Levine, J. (2002). *Harmful to minors: The perils of protecting children from sex*. Duluth, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Malón, A. (2009a). Onanism and child sexual abuse: A comparative study of two hypotheses. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/14041830242336g3/>
- Malón, A. (2009b). On the iatrogenic nature of the child sexual abuse discourse. *Sexuality & Culture*, 13(2), 75–90.
- Mirkin, H. (1999a). The pattern of sexual politics. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 37(2), 1–24.
- Mirkin, H. (1999b). The prohibited image: Child pornography and the first amendment. In J. Elias, V. Elias, V. Bullough, G. Brewer, J. Douglas, & W. Jarvis (Eds.), *Porn 101: Eroticism, pornography, and the First Amendment* (pp. 501–519). Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Money, J. (1985). *The destroying angel*. New York, NY: Prometheus.
- Money, J. (1988). Commentary: current status of sex research. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 1, 5–15.
- Murray, S. (2002). *Homosexualities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Okami, P. (1991). Self-reports of “positive” childhood and adolescent contact with older persons: An exploratory study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 30, 437–457.
- Okami, P. (1992). “Child perpetrators of sexual abuse”: The emergence of a problematic deviant category. *Journal of Sex Research*, 29, 109–130.
- Ondersma, S., Chafin, M., Berliner, L., Cordon, I., Goodman, G., & Barnett, D. (2001). Sex with children is abuse. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 707–714.
- Percy, W. (1996). *Pederasty and pedagogy in archaic Greece*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Prescott, J. (1975). Body pleasure and the origin of violence. *The Futurist*, 9(2), 64–74.
- Quinsey, V. (1984). Men who have sex with children. In D. Weisstub (Ed.), *Law and mental health* (Vol. 2, pp.140–172). New York, NY: Pergamon.
- Riegel, D. (2006). *Self-reported effects and retrospective perceptions of sexually expressed boyhood relationships with older males: An Internet convenience sample*. Retrieved from <http://www.shfri.net/sebinform/sebrom.cgi>
- Riegel, D. (2009). Boyhood sexual experiences with older males: Using the Internet for behavioral research. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38, 626–630.
- Rind, B. (2002). The problem with consensus morality. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 31, 496–498.

- Rind, B., Tromovitch, P., & Bauserman, R. (1998). A meta-analytic examination of assumed properties of child sexual abuse using college samples. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*, 22–53.
- Rind, B., Tromovitch, P., & Bauserman, R. (2000). A chronology and refutation of the attacks and a discussion of threats to the integrity of science. *Sexuality & Culture*, *4*(2), 1–62.
- Salkin, A. (2006, December 13). Web site hunts pedophiles, and TV goes along. *New York Times*, p. A1.
- Sandfort, T. (1987). *Boys on their contacts with men*. Elmhurst, NY: Global Academic.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1958). *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* [The world as will and representation]. Supplements to the fourth book, Chapter XLIV, Meta-physics of the love of the sexes. In *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* [The world as will and representation], (pp.560–567). (Trans. E. F. J. Payne). Indian Hills, CO: Falcon's Wing.
- Seligman, M. (1993). *What you can change and what you can't*. New York, NY: Fawcett Columbine.
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. (1970). Psychosexual development. In J. Gagnon & W. Simon (Eds.), *The sexual scene* (pp. 3–37). Edison, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Stekel, W. (1952). *Psychosexueller infantilismus* [Patterns of psychosexual infantilism] (Trans. E. Gutheil). New York, NY: Liveright. (Original work published 1922).
- Tallman, F. (1953). *California sexual deviation research* (pp. 9–46). CA: Department of Mental Hygiene.
- Tindall, R. H. (1978). The male adolescent involved with a pederast becomes an adult. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *3*, 373–382.
- Trobrinds (Eds.). (1993). *Crime without victims*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Global Academic Press. (Originally published in 1986 as *Forbrydelse uden offer*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Tiderne Skifter).
- US Census (2000). Retrieved June 28, 2010 from <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>
- Vanggaard, T. (1969). *Phallos*. New York, NY: International University Press.
- West, D. (1980). Treatment in theory and practice. In D. West (Ed.), *Sex offenders in the criminal justice system* (pp. 141–149). Cambridge, UK: Institute of Criminology.
- Wilson, E. O. (1975). *Sociobiology*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Wilson, P. (1981). *The man they called a monster*. North Melbourne, Australia: Cassell.
- Wolak, J., Finkelhor, D., & Mitchell, K. (2004). Internet-initiated sex crimes against minors: Implications for prevention based on findings from a national study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *35*, 424.e11–424.e20.