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Introduction

This collection of a dozen items has the theme that all touch on boy-love in one way or another and several are specifically about NAMBLA (North American Man/Boy Love Association). They were published in 1981–1991 and are given here in the order of publication. One is a news report of a NAMBLA conference, two are reviews of books of fiction, nine are reviews of non-fiction books. Nine of these items originally appeared in The Advocate (San Mateo, later Los Angeles), one in the NAMBLA Bulletin, and two in OurStories (San Francisco). Although I tried to report honestly on the books, my own views and prejudices will be obvious enough. I make no apology for that. Indeed I am surprised—and pleased—that my views have changed so little in the meantime.

What has surprised me is the extent to which the view that all sexual contacts between adults and children is harmful to the child has become accepted fact. This view is, of course, patent nonsense. To make it the basis of any discussion of the matter is to preclude any rational discussion. And rational discussion is what is sorely needed, for in its absence, real harm is being done to children—and the men (and women) who love them. I hope that recalling the books reviewed here will contribute to a better understanding of this controversial subject.

Hubert Kennedy
Early in the morning of December 8, 1977, 20 men in the Boston area were arrested and charged with involvement in what became known as the “Revere Sex Ring” (Revere is a suburb of Boston). Garrett Byrne, the 80-year-old district attorney for Suffolk County announced to the press that 24 men had been indicted on over 100 felony counts involving sex with boys aged eight to 13. These 24 men, he said, were “just the tip of the iceberg,” and he established a special “Hotline” telephone for anonymous tips about homosexuals suspected of having contact with anyone under 16. The Boston Herald-American published a photo of five of the indicted men being led into court in shackles, along with their names, addresses, places of employment and some of the charges against them. The Globe, the other Boston daily, ran the headline “24 Men Indicted in Child Porn.” In fact, none of the men were indicted on pornography charges, but this points up the assumed connection between child molestation and pornography that Pat Califia noted in her article on “The Great Kiddy Porn Scare of ’77 and Its Aftermath” (The ADVOCATE, Issue 303. Califia thanked Mitzel for sharing his “voluminous files” with her.)

Byrne expected the arrested men to plead guilty and their easy conviction to lead to his re-election as D.A. But this time, for the first time, there was resistance from Boston’s gay community, led by staff members of the gay paper Fag Rag (including author John Mitzel), who met the day after the arrests and organized the Boston/Boise Committee. (The name recalled the book The Boys of Boise by John Gerassi, who later endorsed the work of the Committee as a “courageous fight for genuine freedom for all Americans.”) The first half of Mitzel’s book, “The Year of the Witch-hunt,” tells the story of the events that led to the arrests, the formation of the Boston/Boise Committee, its immediate—and successful—effort to have the “Hotline” dismantled, and its concern for the civil rights of all homosexuals during this homophobic witch-hunt, which broke out again three months later with the arrest of 103 men in the Boston Public Library.
In telling this story, Mitzel downplays his personal involvement, but it is clear that he deserves the comment of David Thorstad (on the book cover): “A brilliant and disturbing piece of investigative journalism.” Mitzel’s snappy, breezy style of writing, with his wry (and sometimes camp) humor, makes reading easy.

But the book is hard-hitting, and he reveals the thorough sordidness of our legal system (not of the indicted men—most of the 100 “felonies” involved the voluntary sex acts of two 15-year-old hustlers).

Mitzel then analyzes in some detail the only trial so far of any of the so-called “Revere Sex Ring.” In a section entitled “The War for Liberation,” he enlarges his view to discuss the connection with some apparently unrelated cases, and he concludes with a penetrating, if not detailed, analysis of the current oppression of homosexuals in general and of boy-lovers in particular. His viewpoint appears to be basically anarchistic, but his analysis is general enough to serve as common ground for discussion between gay male radicals and activist women.

Mitzel deserves our thanks for his extensive investigation of the background of the events described, for bringing all this together in a book written with verve and commitment, and for pointing out the implications for all of us. A must read.

—Hubert Kennedy
Daniel Tsang, energetic editor of Philadelphia’s *Gay Insurgent: A Gay Left Journal*, has put together an excellent anthology on the topic of man/boy love. This up-to-date collection (four of the 18 brief articles are original, and none were published before 1978) is drawn from a variety of sources, although leftist and progressive views predominate. The tone is generally favorable; the virulent anti-man/boy love editorial from New York’s *Lesbians Rising* appears to be included as a foil for the more reasoned examination of pedophilia by England’s Gay Left Collective and the argument by NAMBLA (North American Man/Boy Love Association) for abolishing age-of-consent laws.

The intended audience is not the general public but rather the gay and lesbian community, whose sometimes tenuous unity is threatened by the current man/boy love controversy. That this serves the divide-and-conquer strategy of the heterosexual dictatorship is brought out clearly in several articles, most succinctly in the original essay “Whose power? Whose consent?” by Eric Presland, who helped to start Britain’s first gay switchboard in Oxford in 1973.

An interview with a very articulate 15-year-old lover of men leads off the collection, whose highlight is the condensation of Pat Califia’s “The Age of Consent: An Issue and Its Effect on the Gay Movement” from *The ADVOCATE* (Issue 304). But most of the articles are not readily available, and given the negative attitude and self-censorship of much of the establishment press, we can be grateful to editor Tsang and Alyson Publications for bringing the essays together in an attractive and modestly priced volume. It deserves wide circulation.

—Hubert Kennedy
Paedophilia: The Radical Case by Tom O’Carroll
Peter Owen Ltd. (73 Kenway Rd., London, England SW5 ORE) hardbound, 280 pp., 14.95 pounds (U.S. price $40)

On Friday, 13 March 1982, Tom O’Carroll, chairperson of England’s Paedophile Information exchange (PIE), was sentenced to two years imprisonment in solitary confinement, after being convicted of “conspiracy to corrupt public morals.” This book, written while O’Carroll was awaiting trial, was cited by the judge as one reason for the long sentence. In fact, the book is as reasonable and sane as the state’s charge, the jury’s verdict, and the judge’s sentence are irrationally prejudiced. The real conspiracy is, rather, the massive effort of the Establishment to prevent any open discussion of paedophilia, the erotic love of children.

Paedophilia: The Radical Case is a carefully thought out and well-written book, and unexpectedly restrained, given the savage attacks on PIE and O’Carroll personally: Twice during the writing of the book police raided his home and seized his research material. The subtitle is almost a misnomer, for O’Carroll accepts many traditional values of family life. His “radical” idea is that families should not “deny children their sexual life, including the possibility of sexual contact with adults.” In our excessively sex-negative society that idea must be considered radical.

After a biographical opening chapter, the major portion of the book systematically discusses the philosophical, legal and practical questions that have been raised, beginning with the myth of childhood “innocence” and the notion of a “molester” and his “victim.” O’Carroll shows that many questions spring from fundamentally antsexual anxieties, the classic example being “Won’t seduction by a man make a boy homosexual?” “The radical answer,” O’Carroll replies, “is not to point out that copious research shows otherwise (which it does), but to say ‘So what if it does? What’s wrong with being gay?’ Only when such an answer becomes acceptable will we be well on the way to a sexually liberated society. Only when people stop asking the question will we have achieved it.” But then
he goes on to present in detail the evidence that paedophilic seduction does not make boys (or girls) gay.

PIE’S approximate opposite number on this side of the Atlantic is the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA), which, however, has a narrower scope than PIE. Although man/boy love is the principal concern of O’Carroll’s book (and of PIE), his arguments arc meant to apply to heterosexual paedophilia as well. While both organizations advocate abolition of age-of-consent laws, the emphasis in NAMBLA is on love between men and adolescents, whereas O’Carroll finds the “barrier” of puberty a sacred cow. Indeed, many of his examples are of prepubescent children.

O’Carroll is at his best in discussing the notion of consent. Here he meets the various objections head-on, beginning with the simplistic argument that unequal power excludes the possibility of consent. He makes a convincing case that the powerful side in a paedophilic relation is not automatically, or generally, the adult. In answer to those who say that abolition of an age of consent would leave children unprotected, PIE has proposed legal safeguards that have as their aim the strengthening of the child’s right to say yes or no. PIE’s proposals seem unduly complicated but are clearly better than the current no-win situation in Britain and North America (where a boy is often forced to testify against the only man who ever showed him real love, while the man is confined for life as “sexually dangerous”) and could well serve as a basis for further discussion.

There is a tendency to think that things are better elsewhere, so it may come as a surprise to learn in the last section of the hook, which traces PIE’S history since its founding in 1974, that O’Carroll envies NAMBLA’s position. (He was writing, of course, before knowing of the FBI’s involvement in the harassment of NAMBLA officers.)

Holland is the country that has gone the furthest in the acceptance of paedophilia, though I do not find O’Carroll’s reasons why this is so entirely convincing. He does not, I think, give sufficient credit to the individualism of the Dutch. As the German writer John Henry Mackay wrote in the preface to the 1924 edition of his boy-love writings (published in Holland): “At bottom, each person only understands his own love, and every other is foreign and unintelligible to him, if not repugnant. Here, too, only an understanding of the right to equal freedom, the tolerance of different life-styles as the last and highest result of civilization, can have a beneficial effect.”
A final word about the high price of the book, which is more than twice that of others in the series on Contemporary Issues: The publisher is quoted as having said, “It is an academic book and we don’t want it read by the wrong people.” Just who the “wrong people” are is not clear. For anyone willing to keep an open mind on the subject, the book cannot be recommended too highly. It is both passionate and calmly reasoned, the best on its topic.

—Hubert Kennedy
Kit by Alan Edward
Coltsfoot/Spartacus (Box 3496, 1001 AG Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
paperback, 171 pp., $8

The reality of man/boy love is never (well, hardly ever) the mutual understanding and perfect agreement of my favorite TV couple, Bogg and Jeffrey in Voyagers. But it can be tender, light-hearted and fun. Coltsfoot Press (now a division of Spartacus, publisher of the International Gay Guide) has answered a need for fiction reflecting this joyfulness with two collections of short stories, Panthology One (1981) and Panthology Two (1982), as well as with its reprint of the classic Asbestos Diary by Casimir Dukahz. Kit by Alan Edward, one of the earlier short-story authors, presents a grimmer picture.

The novel is set in a mental hospital in England, where the 12-year-old Kit is confined as an “autistic” child, and tells of his “cure”—not through the efforts of the hospital staff, but through his acquaintance with Baxter, whom Kit meets after discovering a hole in the wall separating his group from the adult section. Baxter is confined for treatment as a result of having “molested” another 12-year-old boy. But the novel is less about their meetings than about their separate, but similar, conflicts with the medical/psychiatric establishment. The story reaches a climax with the boy spread-eagle and naked, being held by two policemen so the rubber-tipped finger of a doctor can “examine” him, while a psychiatrist and a social worker stand by as feebly reluctant witnesses. The point is hard to miss.

On another level, the novel is a metaphor of the reality in the wider world. The hospital staff argue conflicting social philosophies as they jockey for power, with the authoritarian chief nursing officer (male, of course) apparently coming out on top. The one thing they agree on is that individualism must be crushed. Kit and Baxter are in confinement, after all, because they followed their own lights. The happy ending of this story is fantastic, but it does reflect a note of hope in the face of this grim reality.

—Hubert Kennedy
It may well be, as San Francisco gay historian Allan Bérubé has said, that Horatio Alger Jr. (1832–1899) was “19th-century America’s most prominent boy lover.” Author of over 100 books for boys, Alger is perhaps the best-selling author of all time in America. That Alger was a boy lover was not publicly revealed, however, until 1971 (by Richard M. Huber in *The American Idea of Success*) and was made generally known in 1974 by Edwin P. Hoyt in *Horatio’s Boys* (this new edition is an unchanged paperback reprint). The gay public was reminded of the fact by Jonathan Katz in his *Gay American History* (1976).

A graduate of Harvard College (1852) and the Harvard Divinity School (1860), Alger was minister of the Unitarian Church in Brewster (Cape Cod), Mass., for only 15 months, his position being abruptly terminated in March 1866 by the revelation of a three-man investigating committee that he was guilty of “a most heinous crime, a crime of no less magnitude than the abominable and revolting crime of unnatural familiarity with boys.” Alger was presented with the charge and the evidence of his guilt, “which he neither denied nor attempted to extenuate but received with the apparent calmness of an old offender,” though he did admit “that he had been imprudent.” The committee reporting to the American Unitarian Association in Boston added that he “hastily left town on the next train for parts unknown—probably Boston.” Instead, Alger went on to New York, determined to continue his writing career, which had begun while he was still an undergraduate. With the publication in 1867 of the popular *Ragged Dick*, Alger’s success was assured.

Alger has been ill served by his biographers. The first full-scale biography (1928) was a deliberate hoax, based on an imagined diary containing sensational reports of affairs with women. The hoax was publicly admitted in 1973. In the 1960s three more biographies were published, all more or less flawed, and none taking Alger’s homosexuality into account. Since the original publication of Hoyt’s book, there has appeared a schol-
early study by Gary Scharnhorst of “the evolution of the idea of success in the writings of Horatio Alger, Jr.” (*Horatio Alger, Jr.*, Twayne United States Authors Series, 1980). Both Scharnhorst and Hoyt see Alger’s attitude toward the Brewster affair in his poem “Friar Anselmo’s Sin,” which was submitted for publication only a few days later. To Scharnhorst it “suggests that during this brief period Alger contemplated suicide, then resolved to expiate his ‘sin.’” In light of the report of the Brewster committee it seems more likely that he simply resolved to be more prudent. At any rate, Alger’s prudence apparently did not prevent him from discussing the affair in 1870 with William James, brother of the novelist Henry James. Later a Harvard professor, William James was then a recent graduate of the Harvard Medical School.

*Horatio’s Boys* is superficial and occasionally inaccurate (which is perhaps not surprising in view of the fact that Hoyt, like Alger, has written more than 100 books), but it does give something of the flavor of Alger’s writing. As a corrective to Hoyt’s excesses, one should read the 31-page biographical section of Scharnhorst’s book, which claims to be “the first book about Alger to be fully documented.” This is a fair statement, but what good are documents if one is incapable of interpreting them? Scharnhorst shows a woefully inadequate understanding of homosexuality and none whatever of boy love. In the few passages in Alger’s writings that he sees as references to homosexuality he confuses sexual orientation with sexual identity. After quoting Alger’s description of the title character in *Tattered Tom* (one of the few books in which the hero is a girl)—“It was not quite easy to determine whether it was a boy or a girl”—Scharnhorst adds: “as if referring to himself.” Both authors agree that Alger spent much time with boys and personally helped them with money and in other ways, but while Hoyt hunts for scandal and finds none after the Brewster affair, Scharnhorst ignores the obvious influence of Alger’s interest in boys on his writing and concentrates instead on his Harvard training in Unitarian principles. A better biographical and literary analysis is needed than is furnished by Scharnhorst and Hoyt combined.

Roger Austen wrote in *Playing the Game*, (1977): “A good case could probably also be made for veiled homoeroticism in all of the Alger novels.” This may be an exaggeration, but as Bérubé has noted, “Read from a gay perspective, Alger’s novels are full of surprises.” He gives as an example the remark of the dandy in *Ragged Dick*, “I’ve seen
you before,” to which Dick responds, “Oh have you? . . . then p’r’aps you’d like to see me behind.” Or in the same novel—and it is Alger himself who tells us, “Names are important”—consider the evolution in names to mark the changing status of the hero: from Ragged Dick to Richard Hunter Esq., with Dick Hunter in between. Rags to riches indeed!

—Hubert Kennedy
Streetboy Dreams by Kevin Esser
The Sea Horse Press/Calamus Books
paperback, 172 pp., $7.95

A realistic treatment of man/boy love is rare in fiction. Most novels on the topic range from amusing soft-core porn to out-and-out sexual fantasy. One of the more successful novels of recent years was the late Wallace Hamilton’s Kevin, whose unexpected happy ending, Hamilton assured me, was based on a true situation. Kevin Esser, author of several man/boy love short stories, has dedicated his first novel, Streetboy Dreams to Hamilton, and it is a welcome addition to the literature.

Turning the “dirty old man” stereotype around, the central characters meet when 14-year-old Gito comes up to 35-year-old Peter in a bar and says, “Want some candy, mister?” Gito, a streetwise Hispanic in their large city—unnamed, but apparently Chicago—is peddling, but only candy. And that is all that Peter gets in the beginning, for Peter is unsure of his motives in pursuing the boy, and Gito, despite an obvious—to the reader—hunger for affection, is determinedly independent. Besides, and this is the strongest barrier between them, Gito has absorbed his society’s rules of what one “should” and “should not” do. This does not prevent him, however, from coyly manipulating Peter for his own, even sexual, gain. Here, the book’s episodes, especially in the first half of the novel, ring absolutely true.

It is often typical of man/boy love situations that the boy, not the man, is in control. How this operates is beautifully illustrated by a scene on the beach where Gito, with a hard-on under his bikini trunks, insists that Peter masturbate it. Peter is afraid that others will see them and they will be arrested, but puts his hand on the bulging crotch when Gito assures him he really wants it and no one will notice. Yet two minutes later the unpredictable Gito is shouting, “Cut it out! . . . Just fuck off!”

The realistic tone of the first half of the novel is not continued, however, and despite some colorful episodes with other boys—the most interesting is Gito’s compliant cousin Chico—the characters never really develop. The novel ends in a bit of wishful fantasy. It
is, after all, *Streetboy Dreams*. But many boy-lovers will find their own experiences accurately and sympathetically pictured, and for them the novel can be highly recommended.

—Hubert Kennedy
NAMBLA Bulletin, 6.9 (November 1985): 2

NAMBLA: Ein Porträt der “North American Man/Boy Love Association”
edited by Friedrich Kröhnke and Helma Börgartz
Kiel (Federal Republic of Germany): Frühlings Erwachen, 1985. 64 pp. DM 7.00
(in German).

reviewed by Hubert Kennedy

“We intend this book as a contribution to the discussion of pedophilia, a discussion
that has often been carried on brutally and without a knowledge of the facts. With our
book NAMBLA we present an organization made up of both youths and adults. Our wish
is that the publication will further the discussion of man/boy love and pedophilia, a nec-
essary discussion in which, up to now, a justifiable rejection of the omnipresent rule and
power of men has been confused with the retention of religious and bourgeois taboos”
(cover blurb).

The publisher Frühlings Erwachen (i.e., Spring’s Awakening—the name recalls
Frank Wedekind’s play of 1891, subtitled ‘A Children’s Tragedy’, which included a
happy homosexual scene) began their regular series of brochures in 1981 with a reprint of
Klaus Mann’s forgotten article of 1934 in which he castigated the Soviet Union for rein-
stating its harsh antihomosexual law, which had been dropped after the revolution. This
fine series also includes a translation of Lauritsen and Thorstad’s The Early Homosexual
Rights Movement (1864–1935). NAMBLA is No. 9 in the series.

Following a brief Introduction by Kröhnke, who tells about taking part in NAMBLA
activities in New York in September 1984, and a longer article by co-editor-translator
Börgartz, who reminds her feminist sisters that ‘women do it too’, the bulk of the bro-
chure is made up of translations of American documents from the period 1982–1984.
These include: the introduction to NAMBLA Journal No. 6 (1983); David Thorstad’s dis-
cussion paper from the 1982 NAMBLA conference; several resolutions that were ac-
cepted at the 1983 conference; the statements of Tyrone (NY) and George (SF) In “Boys
speak out on man/boy love”; the Unicorn’s (favorable) judgment of NAMBLA In the
July-August 1984 *NAMBLA Bulletin* and his (unfavorable) review the following month of Sonnenscheln’s *How to Have Sex with Kids*.

These are followed by two newspaper articles describing the NAMBLA news conference in New York in December 1982, at which Thorstad revealed the FBI’s Etan Patz scam, and the reaction to his public appearance the following summer in Minneapolis. The final document is the statement Thorstad distributed at the August 1983 meeting of the New York Community Council of Lesbian and Gay Organizations when they voted on the application of the New York City chapter of NAMBLA for membership. (The application was approved by a vote of 15 to 13, with 4 abstentions.)

The last section of the brochure contains a couple of contact addresses and a list of books for further reading. (It is notable that the only two writers of fiction mentioned—John Henry Mackay and Peter Schult—were both anarchists.) Finally, two pages give the official statement of the various laws in the Federal Republic of Germany that treat sex with minors. (Basically, no sex is allowed between a man over 18 and a man under 18.)

For interested Germans, this brochure should give a fair “portrait” of NAMBLA, and despite differences between their and our legal, religious, and social situations, there are enough similarities that it could indeed fulfill its purpose of furthering the discussion of man/boy love in Germany. We can be proud that NAMBLA’s leading role in this discussion is being more and more recognized.
A Witch-hunt foiled: The FBI vs. NAMBLA, introduction by David Thorstad
North American Man/Boy Love Association (Box 174, Midtown Station, New York, NY 10018), paperback, 93 pp., $5.95

On Dec. 28, 1982, the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) held simultaneous news conferences in New York and Boston to answer questions that had been raised by police and the FBI and reported sensationally in the press.

Ten days earlier the Boston Herald American, in a headline that nearly filled its front page, had asked, “Did Sex Club Trap This Boy?” The boy in question was Etan Patz, who was six years old when he disappeared three years earlier. The “evidence” connecting Patz and NAMBLA was a photograph, seized in a raid on a cottage in Massachusetts occupied by a NAMBLA member, which police said “looked like” Patz. The boy’s parents denied that it was a photo of their son, but that did not stop the sensational reporting, which was promoted by a daily ration of “new” information from the police. The owner of the photo could not be reached by NAMBLA for he was held incommunicado by the state—in “protective custody,” where he lost two teeth in the process of being beaten up. How could this small organization with its limited resources fight back?

At the New York news conference, NAMBLA’s David (Thorstad) took on the Goliath of our state secret police, the FBI, by doing the work they were unable or unwilling to do, producing the original of the seized photo. It was on the January page of a 1968 calendar, thus proving conclusively that the model was not the missing boy. The FBI then admitted it was not a photo of Etan Patz, but there is good reason to believe that they knew this all along and had merely used the photo to stir up hatred and suspicion of NAMBLA, a campaign that was shamefully aided by the media, who, instead of doing any investigative reporting of their own, accepted the police statements at face value. Why? What is this organization the authorities seem determined to crush by any means?

NAMBLA was founded in December 1978 at a conference in Boston on “Man/Boy Love and the Age of Consent” in response to the mounting hysteria about kiddie porn in 1977. This had led to the arrest in the Boston area of 24 men who were accused of run-
ning a “sex ring” (the men did not even know one another) and a police raid on The Body Politic in Toronto for merely publishing an article [noncondemnatory] on man/boy love. Although NAMBLA is a legal civil-rights organization whose goal is “to end the long-standing oppression of men and boys involved in a mutual consensual relationship” it continues to be vilified by the FBI as a “sex ring” involved in kidnapping and the production of pornography.

As part of its program of “educating the public on the benevolent nature of man/boy love” NAMBLA has produced its first book-length publication. A Witch-hunt Foiled is a carefully documented account of the 1982 witch-hunt of NAMBLA by the FBI and local law enforcement agencies, exposing it for the fraud that it was. It details the technique by which bits of “new” information were given one by one to the media and the way they were used to arouse fear and hatred of a group that was never given a hearing. Then comes the most ominous statement in the book: “If NAMBLA had not made its exposé of the police on Dec. 28, the police juggernaut would have inexorably crushed the group.” It is chilling to think that only by good luck was the original calendar identifying the photo found so quickly and to realize that the police had it in their possession all the time. It is encouraging to know that NAMBLA is still here to tell this story.

The narrative concludes: “NAMBLA weathered this assault on its constitutional right of free association and free speech. Its members gained experience in defending themselves against state oppression. The group has reaffirmed its commitment to the goals of liberation for which it was founded.”

Part of the documentation included is an excerpt from the heavily censored report of the U.S. Postal Service on NAMBLA, which found no evidence of illegal activity. The FBI has refused to release any of its files, saying that NAMBLA is still “under investigation.” They too have found no illegal activity, but perhaps their files would document their own violation of the civil rights and liberties of a legal organization. A Witch-hunt Foiled is must reading for everyone concerned about civil liberties and especially for those gay activists who still think that man/boy love has nothing to do with gay liberation.

—Hubert Kennedy
MAN/BOY LOVE ASSOCIATION HOSTS 10TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IN LOS ANGELES

With the theme “Securing Sexual Freedom for Tomorrow’s Youth,” the 10th International Membership Conference of NAMBLA (North American Man/Boy Love Association) was held in Los Angeles, Nov. 7–9. Some 40 members attended; the total membership of this sexual rights organization is about 400. Under the guidance of Conference Chairperson Pete Nicholas of the Southern California chapter, which hosted the conference, the program included lectures and small group workshops, as well as an opportunity for members to become better acquainted.

The formal program opened with the keynote speech of Jim Kepner, founder and curator of the International Gay and Lesbian Archives (Los Angeles). A longtime gay activist, Kepner recalled that “half of gay history is pedophile history.” Although he believes “boy love to be a beautiful tradition connected with many of society’s highest ideals” he urged restraint of sexual expression in the face of the current AIDS epidemic.

Dr. Walter Williams, president of the same archives and author of the recently published book *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture*, discussed some findings of his research among American Indians, especially as they related to man/boy love.

Dr. Frits Bernard, of The Netherlands, spoke on “Current International Aspects of Man/Boy Love–Pedophilia.” A clinical psychologist and author of several books and numerous articles on the subject, Bernard is also a member of the board of directors of the Association for the Advancement of Social Scientific Sex Research (West Germany) and adviser to the Netherlands Association for Sexual Reform.

Dr. Hubert Kennedy, gay historian and a member of NAMBLA from its founding in December 1978, discussed the early gay movement in Berlin in the first decade of this century, in particular the state censorship that suppressed the efforts of the German writer John Henry Mackay to organize boy lovers.
Following an “AIDS Update” by a representative of the AIDS Project/Los Angeles, there was a panel discussion of the continuing censorship efforts of the federal government and the post office, including their continuing program of entrapment. The panel included NAMBLA members Robert Rhodes and Daniel Tsang, as well as longtime gay activist Harry Hay, who recalled the censorship of his sign “NAMBLA walks with me” at the last gay pride parade in Los Angeles. Tsang noted that the FBI still refuses to reveal its files on NAMBLA, even though an August 1986 report of the U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigation, following a two-year probe into pedophilia and pornography, “states that NAMBLA did not engage in any criminal conspiracy to violate laws against the sexual exploitation of children. Nor was NAMBLA engaged in any organized distribution of pornography depicting minors.”

An Open House at the International Lesbian and Gay Archives was followed by an Awards Banquet, at which several NAMBLA members and others were recognized for their contributions to the sexual rights movement. Bernard received the Lifetime Achievement Award.

Several speakers at the conference mentioned the opposition to NAMBLA even by some elements of the gay movement, pointing up NAMBLA’s position on the cutting edge of sexual liberation. But all agreed that the basic problem lies with society at large. As Bernard said:

> As long as society continues to make a problem out of sexuality, no solution to the problem it has created is possible. As long as sexuality is seen, consciously or unconsciously, as being harmful or dirty, adults cannot acknowledge that children have their own love-life, with sexual and erotic tinges. Children have no rights, not least in the field of sexuality. They are screened off. Their affective life is oppressed and their sexual feelings are considered to be nonexistent. Only when the sexuality of children is accepted as a reality, a positive reality, will contacts between them and adults no longer be considered negatively.

> Our attitude with regard to pedophilia may well provide the touchstone for the way in which we can and dare accept sexuality in general, and that of the child in particular.

– Hubert Kennedy
Under the pseudonym Sagitta, the German writer John Henry Mackay published in the early part of this century several writings on man/boy love or, as he called it, “the nameless love”. Deeply committed to his cause, he wrote to his American friend Benjamin R. Tucker in 1908, “I shall never give up this battle,”¹ This was during the trial of his publisher Bernard Zack on charges of publishing Sagitta’s “immoral” writings. That process lasted nineteen months and ended on 6 October 1909 with Zack being fined and assessed court costs, and the “immoral” writings ordered destroyed. All costs were paid by Mackay, of course, who also wrote to Tucker, “if they had known who Sagitta was, logically they would have had to sentence me to prison.”² We may wish that Mackay had revealed his identity later, but keeping the secret of Sagitta at this time had a distinct advantage!

As a result of the trial, however, there were probably many, at least in homosexual circles, who knew his identity. The police certainly suspected it, for they searched his house several times for the Sagitta books. But they found nothing; since Mackay kept all Sagitta material in a room with a separate entrance that did not appear to be part of his apartment. This is one of the many facts about Mackay revealed in John Henry Mackay als Mensch (John Henry Mackay, the Man) by Mackay’s longtime friend Friedrich Dobe, which was written in 1944. The manuscript is in the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin (DDR); this is its first publication. The book sheds light on a part of Mackay’s life that has been rather obscure, not least because of Mackay’s insistence on keeping Sagitta ‘officially’ secret until his death in 1933.

Dobe relates that Mackay considered including one of his early poems, “Walter oder: Das Gelage”, in Sagitta’s collection of poems on the “nameless love” so as to make his identity known to his readers. But the poem was not included and, despite Dobe’s pleas,

1. Mackay to Tucker, 11 May 1908; Benjamin R. Tucker Papers, New York Public Library. Mackay wrote to Tucker in English, since Tucker did not read German.
2. Mackay to Tucker, 12 October 1908; BRT Papers, NYPL.
Mackay even refused to “come out” as late as 1932 when he published a final volume of memoirs. Only in his will did he direct that when the Sagitta books were reprinted they were to bear his true name and state, “I was SAGITTA. I wrote these books in the years when people believed my artistic strength had expired.” His “artistic strength” had not expired, but it must certainly have seemed so when no new writings appeared under his name, for at the turn of the century he was already well known as a poet, novelist, anarchist propagandist, and rediscoverer of Max Stirner, the philosopher of egoism.

The son of a Scottish father and German mother, John Henry Mackay was born on 6 February 1864 in Greenock, Scotland. Only nineteen months old when his father, a marine insurance broker, died, Mackay was taken to Germany by his mother, who later remarried there. Thus Mackay grew up in Germany, with German as his mother tongue, although he did not become naturalized until around 1900, after he had decided to settle permanently in Berlin, which was to remain his home until his death on 16 May 1933.

Mackay began publishing in 1885, but instant fame came to him in 1891 with Die Anarchisten (The Anarchists), which had an American edition that same year and was quickly translated into six other foreign languages. Subtitled “A Portrait of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century”, this was a work of propaganda in fictionalized form. By the turn of the century his poems and short stories had appeared in the leading German literary journals and he had also published several volumes of lyric poetry, anarchist verse, novellas, short stories, and the only biography of Max Stirner. This activity culminated in 1901 with the novel Der Schwimmer (The Swimmer), one of the first literary sports novels. Then Mackay’s mother died the following year, and he was only brought out of his depression by his determination to champion the cause of the “nameless love.”

In 1905 Mackay conceived his project of using his literary ability to rally other boy-lovers to the cause with a series of “Books of the Nameless Love”. The first two booklets appeared in 1906, but he apparently “tested the waters” in early 1905 with four poems in the Berlin monthly Der Eigene. Begun in 1896 as an anarchist journal that reflected the

---

4. For example: Die Gesellschaft, Das Magazin für die Literatur des In- und Ausländes, Pan, Jugend, Simplizissimus, Die Zeit (Österreichische Rundschau).
philosophy of Max Stirner ("Der Eigene" = "The Self-owner" in the meaning given that word by Stirner). Der Eigene became an openly homosexual journal from 1898. As such it continued, with occasional interruptions (mostly due to police interference), into the 1930s, making it the first successful gay journal.

Mackay did not reveal his identity as Sagitta even to Adolf Brand (1874–1945), publisher of Der Eigene, although they were personally acquainted. He even went so far as to have all correspondence as Sagitta sent to Brand from Dresden in the handwriting of his friend, the actress Luise Firle (1865–1942). Brand, however, was able to guess that Mackay was the author of the poems and, ironically, it was precisely because of the poem "Walter oder: Das Gelage", mentioned above, that he could do this. He first read this poem, which he immediately recognized was about boy-love, shortly after receiving the first Sagitta poem; the similarity of the two convinced him.5

Although Dobe did not learn that Mackay was Sagitta until 1914, they became acquainted in April 1905 at an evening gathering at the home of Mackay’s friend, the well-to-do private scholar Benedict Friedlaender (1866–1908), where a young medical student named Hartwig read a poem about a recent unhappy love affair with a boy. These evenings, to which the men could also bring their younger friends—Dobe compares them to Plato’s Symposium—continued in other homes during Friedlaender’s severe illness, a few times at Mackay’s, and later in a rented room of a small tavern near Mackay’s house.6 Although Mackay was twenty years older than Hartwig and Dobe, the three were to become close friends. Dobe also reveals that the three occasionally attended sessions of the Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee, where Dobe also lectured on various topics.

The Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee (WhK, Scientific Humanitarian Committee) was founded by Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935) in Berlin in 1897 and was the leader in the political struggle for homosexual emancipation. A primary goal of the WhK was the revision of the anti-homosexual law, Paragraph 175. To this end a petition was drafted, signatures collected, and the petition more than once (without any political ef-

6. It is interesting that Dobe nowhere mentions the Gemeinschaft der Eigenen (Community of Self-owners), founded on 1 May 1903 under the leadership of Adolf Brand. Several men at the evenings described by Dobe were also co-founders of the GdE, e.g., Benedict Friedlaender, Walther Heinrich and Wilhelm Jansen.
fect) presented to the legislature. It has been known that Mackay was an early signer of the petition (giving his address as Zurich, although he was already living in Berlin), but Dobe furnishes the first evidence that several times he attended sessions of the WhK.

The last session at which Mackay was present was on 14 October 1906 at Hirschfeld’s house. Friedlaender was too ill to attend, but had entrusted Dobe with his presentation. Head of an “Arbeitsausschuss” (advisory committee) of the WhK, Friedlaender had not only raised objections to Hirschfeld’s theory of homosexuality (his so-called Zwischenstufentheorie, or theory of sexual intermediates), but also objected to his handling of the finances of the WhK. Unknown to Friedlaender’s friends, Hirschfeld had called for an informal meeting of his supporters the evening before to prepare their response. The result was that the four members of the Executive Council attending the formal meeting together proposed the expansion of that council and proposed the simultaneous dissolution of the committee headed by Friedlaender. This measure carried (“almost unanimously”, according to Hirschfeld’s report),\(^7\) thus eliminating Friedlaender’s influence without even having to name him.

Mackay was outraged at the tactic and rose to leave in protest, followed by his close friends Herbert Stegemann and Dobe. Hirschfeld diplomatically tried to stop them, standing before the closed door, spreading his arms, and saying, “My dear Mackay!” But Mackay, red with anger, replied, “I’ll break the glass in the door, if you don’t let us out!”\(^8\) According to Dobe, the three protesters retired to a tavern to discuss the matter; he gives that hour as the birth of what Friedlaender later named the Sezession des Wissenschaftlich-humanitären Komitees (Secession of the Scientific Humanitarian Committee).

In fact, the Sezession was organized with Stegemann as president and attracted some members of the original WhK. But it depended on the support of Friedlaender and quietly died out after his suicide on 21 June 1908, following his long and painful illness. Also contributing to its demise were the public “scandals” of the so-called Eulenburg affair,\(^9\) which also affected Hirschfeld’s WhK, and the reception of Mackay’s Sagitta writings.

---

9. In 1906 and 1907 several advisors of the German emperor were accused of homosexuality. This resulted in libel suits that kept the attention of the public for months. An excellent account is in James D. Steakley, “Iconography of a Scandal: Political Cartoons of the Eulenburg Affair”, *Studies in Visual Communication* 9, No. 2 (Spring 1983), pp. 20–51.
When his long trial was over in the fall of 1909, Mackay walked through the night in the woods near Berlin. He slowly recovered from his immediate depression and when he returned to the city in the morning and “read in the trusting and pure eyes of my boy the eternal confirmation of this love, he found me calm and cheerful as always.”\textsuperscript{10} Although much in the Sagitta writings has been believed to be autobiographical, this is the only place where he speaks directly of “my boy”. Dobe assures us that the Sagitta writings are indeed based on Mackay’s experience, particularly the novel \textit{Fenny Skaller}, which he calls Mackay’s “confession of life and love”. He also describes several of Mackay’s boys, especially the Berlin schoolboy Atti, with whom Mackay fell deeply in love in the spring of 1916. Atti was a pupil at the famous Franckesche Stiftungen in Halle; Mackay met him in Berlin during a school holiday.

Mackay talked of his feelings for Atti with Hartwig, often in notes that he left in Hartwig’s mailbox. When Hartwig emigrated to South America in 1933, shortly after Mackay’s death, he gave the collection of notes to Dobe, who quotes several of them. For example, sometime before Easter in 1916, Mackay asked Hartwig to find out at which school the boys wore light brown velvet caps, and shortly after he wrote:

\begin{quote}
I found it—the light brown cap! It is charming, this brown cap, but much more charming are the brown eyes under it, and the whole boy from which they look out. If I had not become so terribly mistrustful of every happiness, I would again hope to have something once more; but I no longer dare to rejoice! Still, I did want to write you, for you will rejoice a bit with me all the same. This really is something special!\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

Sometime later he wrote:

\begin{quote}
And today, when I was together again with this bit of happy and cheerful life, I almost believed that there can be something like happiness.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{11} Dobe, op. cit., p. 71.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 72.
\end{flushright}
But alas, Atti did not live up to Mackay’s expectations, and in a note that can be dated 12 June 1916, Mackay wrote to Hartwig:

The last days have left me no more doubt that, even if he stays and does not leave me tomorrow, it has not been and will not be what I hoped for; he, too, is after all a Berlin boy, and they beat us in love [die sind uns in der Liebe ‘über’]. Perhaps, if I always had him with me—but that would also be more than I could still manage now. He has been almost my last hope. I will not let it go, but it also no longer supports me.

I believe I shall not live much longer. I feel it this evening more than ever.\(^{13}\)

But not all of Mackay’s relationships with boys were unhappy. He often told Dobe that the struggle with his sexual orientation as described in *Fenny Skaller* was true to life, but he always added, “Because of it I had to do without much love in my younger years—I’m making up for it now!”\(^{14}\)

Hartwig and Dobe also often accompanied Mackay in 1924 during his research for his final Sagitta novel *Der Puppenjunge* (The Hustler), which is set in the milieu of the boy prostitutes of Berlin. Mackay systematically visited all of the “schwule Kneipen” (gay bars) of Berlin that advertised in *Die Freundschaft*, and during that summer and fall he could be found every evening in the Marienkasino, treating the “Pupenjungen” (Mackay wrote the word with the spelling “Puppenjunge” only in the title of his novel)\(^{15}\) to food, beer and cigarettes, and listening to their stories. Faithfully described, this is the bar called Adonis-Diele in the novel;\(^{16}\) it was later closed because of the traffic in cocaine there. Dobe also insists that all characters in the novel were actual persons, except the two leading figures, Gunther and Hermann Graf.

\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. 75.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., p. 65.

\(^{15}\) The euphemistic spelling on the title page of *Der Puppenjunge* suggests a derivation from “Puppe” (doll) and “der Junge” (boy); but the word is rather derived from “pupen” (to fart), as is indicated by Mackay’s use of the spelling “Puppenjunge” throughout the novel. This word is no longer used in Germany, where the ordinary term for a male prostitute is now “Strichjunge”. “Hustler” is the current American term.

\(^{16}\) In fact, there was at that time an Adonis-Diele in Berlin, which I incorrectly assumed was the bar described by Mackay. See the notes to my translation *The Hustler*, by John Henry Mackay (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1985), p. 294.
In a brief afterword Kurt Zube, Secretary of the Mackay Gesellschaft, clarifies and corrects some statements of Dobe; in particular, he notes that Otto Hannemann, one of the two executors of Mackay’s will, was the person mentioned by Dobe as the one boy of Mackay who remained a friend for life. Despite Dobe’s “somewhat slovenly and unrefined manner of expression”, Zube notes that nothing was changed in the manuscript, “for of course it was meant to give his personal impression of Mackay.” And that is indeed its value. For students of the period most of the new information has been pointed out above, but Dobe’s portrait of Mackay helps bring him alive for us, and his insight into the situation of boy-lovers in the early years of this century will be of value to anyone interested in the early gay movement in Berlin. Thus the book may be recommended not only to fans of Mackay, but also to a wider German-reading public.

Dobe’s memoir, part of the publication program of the Mackay Gesellschaft, is a welcome addition to our knowledge of the writer, the individualist anarchist, and especially the boy-lover John Henry Mackay. Besides Dobe’s manuscript, the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin (DDR), also has some 120 postcards and letters from Mackay to Dobe. They will perhaps shed further light on this courageous fighter for the “nameless love”.
Drum Beats: Walt Whitman’s Civil War Boy Lovers edited by Charley Shively
Gay Sunshine Press, paperback, 267 pages, $10.95

Drum Beats, like its companion volume Calamus Lovers (1987), consists primarily of letters from young men who loved Walt Whitman. But whereas the earlier volume gathered evidence of the poet’s many male lovers and the extent of their sexual contacts, the present volume concentrates on Whitman’s beloved soldier boys, demonstrating the strength and durability of their love. Their memory of Whitman was deeply important to them; indeed, a number later named their own sons Walt.

After Calamus Lovers, there are no startling revelations about Whitman in Drum Beats, but it beautifully complements the other book, as Shively further reinforces his arguments and conclusions about Whitman as poet, homosexual, and lover. Inevitably there are some overlaps, but they are few and bear repeating—the reference to Whitman’s interest in fellatio, for example. Here Shively again notes the use of the term “French,” which was surely international by the end of the 19th century. When the German playwright Frank Wedekind, in his Earth Spirit (1895), had Lulu’s “father” ask her, “Are you still doing French?” his audience knew exactly what he meant.

Shively’s statements often appear extravagant—his presentation has been described as “high-class gossip”—but the evidence is there; his scholarship, too, is high-class. As in his studies of other American individualists—Josiah Warren, Stephen Pearl Andrews, Lysander Spooner—Shively has brought his scholarly and poetical insights to the great poet. The result is a genuine and valuable contribution to Whitman studies. It is also a contribution to Lincoln studies; Drum Beats contains fascinating glimpses into Abraham Lincoln’s homosexual interests. In his review of Calamus Lovers (Issue 473), Arnie Kantrowitz, who sees Whitman as “the father of gay liberation,” suggests that Shively “tries especially hard for the pederasts.” Indeed, Whitman’s daybooks record contacts with several boys in their early teens and even one “boy of 10 or 12” (perhaps of interest because he was also “rough”).
In the same review, Kantrowitz complains, mildly, that *Calamus Lovers* might be improved by the addition of an index and a bibliography. Alas, *Drum Beats* does not furnish the index that might have been given for the two volumes together. But a bibliography is included that covers both, and an index is not so important here, since the letters to and from Whitman’s correspondents are arranged in alphabetical order.

With the publication of these two companion volumes, Shively has given the Good Gray Poet his definite transition to Good Gay Poet. The effect can only be liberating for us all.

–Hubert Kennedy
Sexual Hysteria—Then and Now

Male Intergenerational Intimacy: Historical, Socio-Psychological, and Legal Perspectives, T. Sandfort, E. Brongersma, and A. van Naerssen (Eds.).
New York: Haworth Press. 325 pages; $17.95

In 1869 a committee of health experts was formed in Berlin to advise the Prussian Minister of Justice on whether the Prussian anti-homosexual law should be retained in the legal code for the new North German Confederation. (In fact, this law, renumbered 175 on the formation of the German Empire, remains on the books in Germany.) Noting that the High Court had decided that cases of mutual masturbation did not fall under the current law, the committee remarked: “With reference to health, only onanism can be considered important, whereas an act imitating coitus between male persons, apart from some local injury that may come about, is essentially just like ordinary coitus in that only through an excess can it be harmful” (quoted in Hirschfeld, 1914, p. 961–963).

But this opinion, as the German ethnosociologist Gisela Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg pointed out in 1978, “although it clears out some old prejudices, it quickly replaces them with the new one of the dreadful harmfulness of onanism (without, of course, giving any proof whatever of it)” (p. 339).

Eight years later Dr. Kellogg (1877) of Battle Greek, Michigan, besides producing corn flakes, also produced the book Plain Facts About Sexual Life in which over 100 of its 350 pages were devoted to the “Solitary Vice,” which he called “the most dangerous of all sexual abuses” (p. 233). Doctors in general simply defined it as a disease for which they had many treatments. One popular treatment of the time, for men, was electricity applied to the genitals by either inserting electrodes into the rectum and urethra or between the thighs and on the penis. As one physician said, this makes “very powerful local impressions.” This 19th-century prejudice against masturbation has been cleared up, just
as the danger of anal intercourse was cleared up earlier, but, like the latter, has been re-
placed in the late 20th century by a new one, “child sexual abuse.” The parallels are com-
pelling; for one taking a longer historical view, nothing resembles the current hysteria
over “child molestation” so much as what has been called the 19th-century “masturbatory
insanity.” (Not least among the parallels is the continued use of electricity, now in the
treatment of the “disease” pedophilia.)

Male Intergenerational Intimacy is one of a very few academic publications (it
originally appeared as an issue of the Journal of Homosexuality) to approach the subject
of man/boy love—and it does so very cautiously. Rather than asserting the non-
harmfulness of contacts between men and boys, many of the authors here call for further
empirical study. The three co-editors and several of the authors are Dutch, in part reflect-
ing the fact that empirical study is possible to some extent in the Netherlands—and nearly
impossible in the United States, where qualified researchers cannot promise anonymity,
but rather are required by law to report any suspicion of sexual contact that might be ille-
gal.

The large number of articles in this volume precludes discussing them in detail, but a
brief description of each of them should give an idea of their contents. Following the in-
troduction by the co-editors, Gisela Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg traces the study of institutional-
ized pederasty in primitive societies. Then Edward Brongersma argues (against Kenneth
Dover) that an ancient Greek inscription—“By the (Apollo) Delphinios, Krimon had sex
here with a boy, the brother of Bathykles”—was testimony of a sacred ritual act and not
vulgar graffiti. These two articles appear to suggest that man/boy sexual relations are di-
verse and occur cross-culturally and across time. A brief note by Martin Killias traces
“The Historic Origins of Penal Statutes Concerning Sexual Activities Involving Children
and Adolescents.” The remaining articles refer to the 19th and 20th centuries.

Thijs Maasen draws on his doctoral dissertation on the German pedagogue Gustav
Wyneken to illustrate the shift in the discourse on boy love in Germany in the early 20th
century from a (limited) acceptance of “pedagogical eros” to its rejection as a topic of
discussion in the prevailing anti-homosexual climate.

Two articles on the boy in art give a wider dimension to the volume. Will Ogrinc
avoids the earlier Freudian interpretation of the paintings of his son by the Swiss painter
Ferdinand Hodler by viewing them in the light of the painter’s Rosicrucian beliefs. Tariq Rahman sees the eccentric books written and illustrated by the Englishman Ralph Chubb as creating an exonerative myth to reconcile his sexual interest in boys with his desire for spiritual fulfillment. While Rahman’s ideas are interesting, they are somewhat muddled as, for example, he is at pains to show that Chubb fits into a category Rahman calls “ephebophile,” whereas the category itself appears to have been created for the purpose of accommodating Chubb.

Chin-Keung Li presents samples of taped conversations with 27 men in England who “had sexual contact with children” to illustrate how they, as individuals, experienced their sexual feelings for children.

Four Dutch authors follow. Edward Brongersma gives anecdotal evidence to correct distorted research on the influence on boys of boy-lovers, culled from his recent 2-volume work *Loving Boys*. Although Brongersma is occasionally ahistorical, his vast erudition and the extent of his evidence are compelling. Later in this volume there is the inevitable article on the social construction of sexualities, this time by Ken Plummer, a leading exponent of this view. It is very convincing and furnishes a partial corrective to Brongersma.

Alex van Naerssen reports his clinical experiences with 36 males who “felt an enduring sexual attraction for boys.” He comments: “Counseling and psychotherapy with pedophiles are severely restricted by society’s legal and moral views that positive relationships between men and boys are not possible.” And he adds: “One can only hope that in the course of time emotional relationships between adults and children become socially acceptable.” Gertjan van Zessen reports on counseling support groups of pedophiles, where “goals are defined in terms of enlarging the autonomy of the men and not ... in terms of regulating socially unacceptable or illegal behavior.” He notes that, “sexual contacts with boys 15 years old and under are illegal in The Netherlands,” but “there is no law in The Netherlands forcing therapists or counselors to report sexual acts with minors to the authorities.” This and an excellent historical article on the Dutch experience of toleration of sexual minorities by Jan Schuijer point up several cultural differences. The Dutch experience is very different from the American for various reasons, among them the freedom to express opinions—the Dutch are much more tolerant than we are—and
the fact that their penal system “has traditionally been liberal.... Grass root sentiments do not easily creep into the criminal procedure: judges and prosecutors are not elected and juries do not exist.”

Speaking more directly to the interests of American readers is David Thorstad’s excellent summary of the history of “Man/Boy Love and the American Gay Movement.” A former president of New York’s Gay Activists Alliance and a founding member of the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA), Thorstad is uniquely qualified to write on this topic. If one wishes that several articles had been expanded, it is especially so of this article, for Thorstad carefully documents the shifts of political opinion, especially regarding NAMBLA, both within the gay movement and in the larger society. We are given a fascinating, if all too brief, glimpse of the machinations of the FBI in their often highly illegal attacks on NAMBLA. Thorstad also points out the role of the recent “child sexual abuse” hysteria in serving “to soften up public opinion for right-wing attacks on civil liberties and ‘vice.’” (The existence of this hysteria in the gay community is illustrated by a letter in the San Francisco Sentinel in March 1991 protesting the publication of an article on tennis great Bill Tilden: “I don’t believe a gay publication should include a pedophile in its volumes of personality profiles without drawing distinctions between homosexuality and the criminal rape of minors.” Tilden, it may be noted, was convicted of “contributing to the delinquency of a minor,” although it is clear that the boy in question had no objection to the relationship.)

The final article by Gerald P. Jones further discusses the rhetoric of the “child abuse industry,” noting the lack of scientific evidence and the suppression of research, and suggests some directions for the future study of intergenerational intimacy.

One of the obstacles to a rational discussion of this topic is the widely held moral prejudice that a sexual relationship between a man and a boy is always harmful to the boy. Hence the importance of a study of 25 boys published in 1982 by co-editor Theo Sandfort, who concluded: “For virtually all the boys ... the sexual contact itself was experienced positively and had no negative effect on how the youngster felt in general” (p. 85). His findings were criticized by several American researchers. In a concluding section of this volume Robert Bauserman comments on the views of three critics, pointing out
their moral prejudices and lack of scientific justification. There are brief and rather lame replies from two of them, David Finkelhor and David A. Mrazek.

On the whole Male Intergenerational Intimacy is a good antidote to the hysteria of the moment. No doubt this hysteria will recede, but before it does, like the masturbatory insanity of the 19th century, it will have robbed countless individuals of the joy of living, cruelly forced children into a crippling conformity, and restricted the civil liberties of us all. For the thoughtful reader, one with a longer historical perspective, this book can lead to an appreciation of the sanity expressed by Gunter Schmidt in the preface:

“A person’s age, or the difference in age between the partners, says too little about the nature and quality of their relationship to justify making laws against such partnerships merely on the strength of this information. Each individual case must be looked upon on its own merits and, for this reason, the threat to make all pedophile acts punishable by law can barely be labeled civilized; on the contrary, it is unjust, for it implies the discrimination and persecution of a minority and should be abolished” (p. xx).
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