

# Forbidden

*An empathetic and logical look at some of the  
most taboo sexual orientations and fetishes in  
our culture*

By Hongri Shade  
(2023)



# Introduction:

Many people like to claim that they are champions of acceptance and equality, imagining themselves paragons of justice for standing up for the most popular and commonly accepted sexual orientations within the LGBT movement. But taking a stand and fighting where the battle has already been won and these things aren't subjected to exceptional hardship, and that does seem to be where this usually happens, doesn't strike me as outstandingly noble. It's like standing up and taking the incredibly brave position that "Black people shouldn't be owned as slaves", it's obvious, nearly everyone agrees, and it seems more an attempt to increase their own perceived moral virtue than actual care for people struggling.

There are, however, still sexual orientations and fetishes that in many ways are subjected to the same unjustified discrimination and cultural taboos as much of the more popular aspects of the LGBT+ movement were previously. These are the places where I feel discussions are most useful, where there is still a sizable amount of progress to be made. Within this document I will touch on three topics I feel meet the previous criteria and I believe we would benefit from being more accepting of.

So I bid you, with an open mind, delve into some of the more reviled sexual orientations and fetishes of our culture.

# Incest

## Problems:

People seem to have inhibitions about incest that come from a variety of places. The most convincing of these seems to be the fact that a significant number of children born of these unions have serious health abnormalities, up to 43% in some cases (Baird, & McGillivray, B., 1982). I suspect this genetic issue then played into the religious condemnation of incest with the children being born with abnormalities being evidence that the act of incest was sinful in the eyes of whatever god the people currently worshiped. Thus resulting in the cultural push against incest as it is then ingrained within the minds of the people as a very negative act. Another problem that could also be raised is power dynamics within an incestuous relationship. For instance that between a mother or father and a child which could potentially lead to a problematic situation as even if they are both of legal age the parent could still have a notable amount of sway or influence in the child's life where this situation could be problematic and force the child into an uncomfortable position.

## Religious Freedom:

So since we in the west largely have religious freedom, the pressing of someone's individual religious beliefs is not acceptable. And thus I don't think an arbitrary religious or cultural taboo is necessarily a valid reason to condemn incest.



## **Same Sex Incest:**

We are therefore left with the problems of child medical anomalies and power dynamics. I would point out now that neither of these seem to push against same sex relationships between siblings of a similar age. Once they reach an age where they can both consent there isn't much of any power dynamics (no more than might be between close friends in a community) and obviously no chance for children as both the siblings are of the same gender. So there seems to be no reason for incest to be illegal or especially regulated in the case of same sex partners where there are not notable power dynamics

## **Birth Control:**

Another point in favor of the acceptance of incest is the invention of birth control and access to abortion services. Because, at least in Canada and many parts of the USA, these things are ubiquitous, the argument against incest because of issues with the children born from these unions seems lesser. We could firstly just simply require people who engage in incestuous relationships to utilize some form of birth control such as IUDs, which have over 99% effectiveness (Planned Parenthood, 2023). This would likely prevent any issues surrounding potential pregnancy effectively eliminating it as a problem (while there are of course people who may ignore the new rule, I will make the assumption that if they are willing to ignore the requirement of birth control they are likely also willing to ignore the current illegal nature of incest and thus this they are irrelevant to the discussion).

## **Ethics of Eugenics:**

To add to this, I am not entirely sure that the likelihood of a child having some defect is enough to merit us forbidding them from having offspring. This idea, effectively a form of eugenics, isn't practiced for other unions that have a significant likelihood of producing offspring with defects. For instance cystic fibrosis has a high degree of heritability (Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, n.d.). However, we don't make it illegal for two people having the genes associated with it to have children. Nor do we really do this with any other union that could result in genetic problems for the children. So if we don't practice a eugenic restriction for any other instance of potential genetically heritable conditions it doesn't seem ethically justifiable to do it in the case of incest purely based on the the chance that the children could have some type of issue.

## **Power Dynamics:**

So whether we allow all incest or restrict it to only people using effective birth control it seems that the issue of children is not a restricting factor, leaving us with only the argument that allowing incest could lead to issues with power dynamics. This is a fair concern, and we can see other issues with power dynamics within our society such as relationships between co-workers where one is in a more senior position than the other or in the case of teachers and students.



## **Power Dynamics Solution:**

We already solved this issue in Canada, here the age of consent is 16, however there are very clear restrictions stating that there cannot be one partner in a position of authority over the other or one partner reliant on the other for support or care. In cases where this is true the age of consent goes up to 18. Applying this rule to incestuous relationships seems like the logical conclusion to the potential issue of power dynamics, restricting the relationships to ones where there are no power dynamics until all parties are over 18. Because this is already the law, at least in Canada, nothing new would have to be done, that is, the issue of potentially harmful power dynamics from incestuous relationships has already been solved (and in places that haven't solved the issue already they could replicate this solution).

## **Conclusion:**

The conclusion of all of this appears to be that there is no ethical reason within the current framework we operate society to completely restrict relationships involving incest. The current taboo we have surrounding incest seems to be unjustified and it appears that either removing all restrictions on such relationships, or allow these relationships but with the restriction that they must use birth control (which could still be unethical but may allow the breaking down of current discrimination against these kinds of relationships and bring more acceptance among the general population).

## **Bestiality**

This is an interesting topic of what is acceptable to do to animals. There are some obvious hindrances surrounding sexual encounters with animals that mainly seem to revolve around two issues, harm to the animal and harm to the human.

### **Harm To Animals:**

With harm to the animals we have a strange situation where, for some animals, we kill and eat them without remorse, but for others the thought of harming them is unbearable. The harm to some of these animals is not seen as in any way problematic and we happily slaughter them, in the case of cattle and hogs, or hunt them with guns or bows, in the case of deer. But for other animals like cats, horses, and most notably dogs we dislike the idea of them being harmed or killed, at least in North America. So for this argument I will primarily discuss the animals we actually care about getting harmed and assume that if we are okay with the way one of these, more cared about, animals is treated we will also be okay if an animal we regularly kill is also treated in a similar manner. For these animals, like dogs, we can then ask the question of what harm an instance of bestiality would have on this animal.



## **Physical Compatibility:**

There is obviously the issue of physical compatibility. For example, in my mind I feel like a cat wouldn't be able to safely be a part of this kind of experience as its relative size would likely lend it to injury. So we could then say that it is fair to restrict sexual engagement with animals to only those of a similar size or compatibility, sexually, to humans. However there are animals, like dogs or horses, that some seem to have reported having sex with (though clear evidence of can be hard to obtain since it is currently illegal), and, depending on the circumstance, could engage in the act relatively safely, for instance a male dog and human women. So it's likely possible that some animals could engage in some kind of sexual experience with humans, even if that is a small minority of animals.

## **Limits On Species/Acts:**

This issue could be resolved by only allowing specific sexual acts with specific animals where harm is unlikely to come to them, and forbidding it in other cases that are more likely to come to harm. Additionally there could be provisions stating that the act can only continue so long as there is a reasonable expectation that the animal isn't being harmed, thus helping deal with edge cases. In this way we could eliminate the issue of animals being harmed by the process by limiting it to animals and acts that would be relatively safe.

## **Animal Consent:**

The other argument for harm, if we assume that physical harm is no longer an issue, is one of the animal not consenting to the sexual experience. This is not necessarily an issue however as we don't actually care about animals giving consent when it comes to sexual related things already. A great example of this is when we choose to neuter animals. This genital mutilation of pets such as dogs is something they themselves would likely never consent to, assuming they could understand what was happening. However that doesn't matter because doing something to their genitals, even if it's exceptionally destructive or brutal, is fine to us as long as it improves/makes more pleasurable our experience of owning them as a piece of our property. Given this, we can clearly see consent is not required. Additionally we could reasonably infer from the animals behavior what it is interested in or "consents" to. For instance, dogs will be happy to try to have sex with something like a couch pillow, so with that in mind a human is probably a more desirable option. I would say an easy way to make it more palatable, even though consent should not be required based on how we already treat animals, is to add a stipulation to the law only allowing sex while the animal is not actively resisting the interaction. While not a perfect proxy for consent as the animals can't verbally confirm their interest, since consent isn't really required at all this would be a nice middle ground allowing us to avoid instances where the animals very much don't want to engage in the sexual act.



## **Harm To Humans:**

For harm to humans we again have some problems. The first is that animals could physically harm or kill someone who tries to have intercourse with them. An extreme example of this is like a tiger, almost anyone who attempts to mate with one will likely end up dead, so it might be best to avoid these situations. We should allow for some informed taking on of danger however, as we do with most things in our society. People are allowed to smoke, eat chocolate cake, or go skydiving. Some of these like skydiving often require people to be informed and trained in executing the dangerous action, but others like smoking do not. So there seems to be some opportunity here, perhaps we only select animals unlikely to cause significant harm to humans during any sexual interaction, and require the people to be informed on how to safely conduct the acts without causing harm to the people or animals.

## **Diseases:**

The other potentially harmful situation is that of illnesses or disease. While many illnesses are species specific, some are not, and this could be exceptionally true for monkeys or other animals more similar to humans. Animals are of course less cleanly than humans as well so this does need to be addressed.

I think the best option for dealing with this and the previous issue would be to just require all animals who may be going to engage in sexual acts with a human be registered with a veterinarian and get some kind of permit. This would allow us to verify the animal is healthy and not carrying anything that could harm the human, is the kind of animal that could be safely had sex with without posing a significant health threat to the human or the animal, and ensure that the human understands how to safely engage in the act.

## **Conclusion:**

So overall it seems that there is an opportunity to be more accepting and remove some unnecessary taboos here. The best course of action would likely be to allow bestiality but require all animals to be registered with a veterinarian first to ensure that the act will be safe for all parties and the owner is properly informed of how to safely and ethically conduct the acts. This would allow the small number of people who do have sexual attractions to animals to actually have these experiences, assuming no one would get hurt, and not be needlessly hated by broader society.



# Pedophilia

## **Defining Pedophilia:**

This one is difficult because of the disproportionate amount of misinformation and discrimination against this group perpetuated by their depictions in the media. For this reason the first step to considering the situation surrounding pedophiles is to actually define what pedophilia is. For this document we will be defining it in line with official medical documentation such as that which can be found in the DSM 5 and defines a pedophile as someone with sexual preference or attraction to prepubescent children, and also makes the distinction that this attraction is not a mental disorder (Münch, Walter, H., & Müller, S., 2020). The definition is extremely important as we want to only include those who actually have an abnormal sexual orientation. Once a human goes through puberty the expected result is that other humans who have also gone through puberty would be interested in them (the same as what happens with most other mammals) and thus there is no abnormality.

Many people seem ignorant of this definition and conflate it with things like the age of consent, attempting to define pedophiles as anyone with a sexual attraction to someone younger than whatever age is decided (a number that varies a fair bit from 14 to 18) which doesn't make sense as the age is somewhat arbitrary and wherever you put it you would still expect normal healthy people to be attracted to other people below that line assuming they have gone through puberty.

An example of this that may help people struggling to understand this would be imagine we change the age of consent to 30 or 40, you could then understand that sexual attraction to someone below that line at say 29 would be completely reasonable to be attracted to despite it being illegal to act on such attraction. This distinction is exceptionally hard to explain because of the extreme cultural stigma surrounding it causing many people who have normal sexual interest patterns to lie about them in an attempt to seem normal, claiming that they have absolutely no attraction to anyone who is say 29 or younger and that it would be crazy for anyone to have that. Thus distancing themselves from the stigmatized group that finds people below that line attractive despite it being the expected outcome for most healthy people.

## **Child Predators:**

We also need to differentiate pedophiles and people who sexually offend against children which I will refer to as child predators. Pedophilia is simply the sexual attraction to children, the same way as a standard heterosexual person may be attracted to a person of the opposite gender who is sexually mature, or a gay person may be similarly attracted to someone of their own gender. However in the media it is heavily associated with child predators as that is the most shocking instance of pedophilia and the most likely to get people to interact with the news story. So the only depiction of pedophilia most people are exposed to is this sensationalized version of the small number who actually offend against children.



We can however see that while numbers vary, some studies estimate the number of child predators who commit sex crimes against children and are also pedophiles to be around 26.8% (Schmidt, Mokros, A., & Banse, R., 2013). So close to a third of those who offend against children are, in fact, pedophiles. The other two thirds are likely cases that could have happened for any number of reasons but from what I surmise seem to generally come down to ease of offending. If someone has the desire to, and is willing to, sexually assault/rape someone they may prefer a fully adult person, however children are far easier to manipulate and physically dominate so they may be targeted as victims instead to fulfill the fantasies of the attacker despite the attacker not actually being attracted to prepubescent bodies. To understand this better you can perhaps consider that many people masturbate while fantasizing about their desired sexual partners, despite not being explicitly sexually attracted to their hands or whatever toys they are using. The children in those other two thirds of cases likely fill a similar role as the child predators victims.

Still we have that one third of these offenses are committed by pedophiles. This is not all that surprising though, you would expect a fair number of the sexual assaults against a specific group to be committed by people who are sexually attracted to that group. For instance if we looked into male-on-male or female-on-female rape we may expect to see a large percentage of them, lets, for the sake of argument, say 80%, are committed by homosexual people.

The point here is to try to ensure that people understand the difference between the percentage of offenses committed by a group and the percentage of that group who offend. While it could be 80% of same sex rape is committed by people attracted to the same sex, not all people attracted to the same sex are rapists, in fact its likely hardly any of them are. The same with you and your sexual orientation, you likely are attracted to some subsection of people and yet do not go out and sexually assault those people. The same is likely true of pedophiles, we just never see examples of those who live normal lives, we only see the small fraction who also happen to be willing to sexually assault others.

### **Where Do They Come From?:**

Now that we have a unified idea as to who we classify as a pedophile, people who are sexually attracted to prepubescent children, we must next ask where do pedophiles come from? To understand this we can look to other fringe sexual orientations such as that of gay people. A meta-analysis of the research on sexual orientations found several interesting things in this regard, first we can see that homosexual people are significantly more likely to be left handed (Lalumière, Blanchard, R., & Zucker, K. J., 2000). This finding is important because, as the article points out, left-handedness is also associated with things like developmental instability and many mental disabilities such as autism.





Fetuses also seem to have hand preferences, and these preferences can be detected early after birth in children and are relatively consistent across age. All this points to left-handedness being related to disruptions in normal brain development, and potentially linking homosexuality to biological differences in the brain of individuals (rather than a societal construct). And to support this there have been findings that show that for men birth order affects the likelihood of being homosexual, with men being born after more brothers being more likely to be gay. The current best explanation for this is that the mother's body is likely mounting an immune response against the masculine aspects of fetal development and after repeated pregnancies has been able to mount a strong enough response to disrupt development, in the same way the body would get better at fighting off an illness that has been caught multiple times.

Finally we have that studies have shown some of these suspected differences in the brains of hetero and homo sexual people, as well as evidence gay men have brain activation similar to that of heterosexual women. So homosexuals' brains appear to literally be different from their heterosexual counterparts and provide an explanation as to why some homosexual people may be homosexual. It also provides an explanation as to why gay conversion therapy, that is the attempts to make homosexual people heterosexual, don't seem to work (Maccio., 2011; Shidlo, & Schroeder, M., 2002). If it was an aspect of society, we would expect to see greater success in changing sexual orientations through such methods.

## Source of Pedophilia:

We now turn our gaze to pedophiles and find some interesting discoveries. Pedophiles are notably more likely to be left handed and have lower cognitive/IQ scores than the general population (Fazio, et. al., 2014; Cantor, et. al., 2005). Additionally evidence of other stressors in prenatal development were found in pedophiles (Fazio, et. al., 2014). This, like the case for homosexuals, points to the possibility that it is differences in brain development that lead or predispose individuals to pedophilia. And indeed that is what the research has found, MRI scans of pedophiles brains show that they are in fact different from that of normal heterosexual people, with a notable difference being that there appears to be a lower amount of white matter in some areas of brain associated with the transferring of signals of sexual attraction (Cantor, et. al., 2008). It should be noted here that while pedophiles appear to have a different brain structure, not all who have this different brain structure are necessarily pedophiles. There are other factors correlated with pedophilia such as starting to masturbate at a very early age (Aella, 2023). Now this could be caused by these changes in the brain, but they could be an additional layer on top of it. We also see that pedophilia is linked with early childhood sexual abuse (Cantor, & McPhail, I. V., 2016).



This could mean that these brain changes simply predispose an individual to pedophilia, and the sexual trauma or experiences at an early stage of development is then a trigger to actually cause the person to become a pedophile. Regardless we see a similar result as gay people with conversion therapy, that is the current scientific literature indicates a pedophile cannot be changed into a normal heterosexual individual and rather the best treatment is a focus on minimizing risks of offending and controlling sexual urges (Cantor, 2018).

So it appears pedophilia results in a way similar to homosexuality and acts much like any other sexual orientation, in a large part biologically based and unchangeable by those born with its characteristics.

### **What Do We Do?:**

We now have a much more clear idea of what a pedophilic person is, the next step is how do we improve our current situation. It's important as studies, largely using self reporting of interests, estimate that around 1% of men have some pedophilic interests, though the exact percentage varies and for women the values are even less consistent (Cantor, & McPhail, I. V., 2016). So there are likely a fairly large number of people suffering with this on a daily basis who aren't offending and just trying to live normal lives. We then have two jobs ahead of us, make life better for those put in this situation, and minimize the risk of any children ever getting hurt.

### **Why Persuing Pedophilia Is Unethical:**

I think most people likely have an intuitive sense that having sex with children is wrong, however the why often escapes people. The crux of the argument against it is that children are not yet mentally developed enough to fully understand what they are agreeing to and far too easily manipulated as most people exist in positions of power over them. Thus there is a high potential for sexual interactions with children to have a very negative outcome for those children, and because of this we restrict the act until such a time as the child is developed enough to rationally make these choices and the likelihood of harm is decreased to a sufficient extent. Child porn is also wrong for this reason. This is why it is ethical to allow people with conditions like dwarfism, or other things that cause their bodies to not be fully developed, to have sex despite them physically resembling children in many ways. It isn't the attraction to the childish form but rather the mental underdevelopment and weakness of children cognitively that makes it wrong. With this understanding there are a couple possibilities for pedophiles to pursue their interests in an ethical way without ever harming anyone.



## Ethical Peruit of Pedophilia:

- Child Sex Dolls - Fairly simple, like regular sex dolls except designed to resemble a prepubescent girl or boy. As discussed earlier its not the body but the mind that is the unethical part so this would be no different from say a representation of a body of someone with dwarfism.
- Lolicon Hentai - More niche, but there are varieties of the erotic Japanese animation style that focus on younger looking figures. With it being a drawn cartoon medium, assuming a prepubescent person isn't used as a model, there really isn't any problem as no one is hurt with the production or consumption of the content.
- AI Generated Porn - With the advent of AI image generation we have already had some instances of AI generated porn. It wouldn't be prohibitively hard to design an image generator tailored to creating porn depicting prepubescent subjects. Again eliminating any possible harm to actual people with its creation and consumption benefiting everyone involved.

All these potential options would allow people who are pedophiles to pursue their interests in an ethical way without harming others. They would also likely decrease demand for child porn created by harming actual children as now the people who would usually seek out (and thus fund) this kind of media would instead go to more easily accessible and legal options for their desires.

By reducing demand for actual child porn we can likewise decrease the profitability of its creation and, hopefully with time, make it almost entirely obsolete and nonexistent, helping both the children that may have been used for the filming and people who live with pedophilia in the process.

## Common Hangups:

One potential issue people have with this is the idea that if we had these they may somehow make "more" pedophiles by normalizing the sexualization of children. As you already know this doesn't make sense as we can literally see the difference in pedophiles and non-pedophiles brains, and the links to early childhood abuse. To help those struggling to understand think the following intuition may help:

If a man is straight, the thought of another man sticking their dick in his ass is probably revolting and something they want to avoid, and no amount of availability of videos depicting that exact thing happening is going to change that.

And even if you believe that people's sexual orientations can change just by having media available depicting other orientations (and thus take the position that conversion therapy does work if you show people sexual content of the orientation you want them to have) there are simple ways to resolve this this eliminating the chance of this ever happening I will explain in the solutions section.



## Reducing Child Rape:

Reducing the number of children harmed in the filming of pornographic content is nice and certainly a worthy cause. However there are also the cases where someone with a pedophilic sexual orientation is willing to sexually assault someone they are attracted to and as we can see with normal heterosexual people, the existence/availability of porn doesn't completely eliminate these people. So what could we do to decrease the likelihood that someone offends. There are some obvious things:

Removal from locations with children - This sounds simple but obviously if someone is sexually attracted to children it's probably best if they don't become a school teacher or school bus driver. However because we have stigmatized pedophilia so much no one is willing to say they have pedophilic inclinations. We therefore don't know who is a pedophile until the ones willing to assault children actually sexually assault one (or many children) and then we realize after the fact that it was a big mistake allowing them to be a school teacher or whatever. We continually force children to pay the price of our taboos, using them as metaphorical canaries in a coal mine for finding child predators.

Limiting alcohol consumption - Alcohol use may be a potential risk factor for sexual assaults. The lowering of inhibitions that come with alcohol use could potentially lead people who had desires to act on them, and if these desires were problematic, such as that of pedophiles, this could be quite negative.

About half of all sexual assaults do involve the perpetrator drinking (Abbey, et. al., 2001). So it could potentially be beneficial to limit or completely eliminate the consumption of alcohol from some individuals, such as pedophiles, if we deem that the sexual assault of children is significantly more distasteful than that of adults (a sentiment that seems to be shared by most). This is, however, also impossible to implement due to the stigma surrounding all pedophiles, causing us to have no idea who they are and thus cannot implement policy like alcohol bans to decrease the likelihood of offending.

Reducing Stigma - The final option we will discuss is the potential of reducing the stigma surrounding pedophilic sexual urges to reduce offending. There is research showing that in addition to potentially leading to alcohol use (making the previous point worse), stigma and social isolation may also lead to pedophiles sexually offending (Cantor, & McPhail, I. V., 2016). To help understand this consider the following analogy:

Imagine a group of people are all on a team and they say you are absolutely not on their team, they never want you on their team, and they all think you're disgusting and horrible. Then suppose this group of people starts going around saying that everyone should only wear orange shirts and anyone not wearing an orange shirt is a terrible person. They all begin wearing exclusively orange shirts. Do you listen to them, do you conform to their demands and wear an orange shirt?



While the answers of each individual may vary, I don't think it's hard to imagine some people answering "no". And for good reason, if you are not part of the group, why would you listen to the group's rules. You will never be accepted regardless so you might just do whatever you want, whatever personally makes you happy, and ignore the insults coming from the people in the group.

So to bring it back to our discussion, we have an extreme stigma surrounding pedophiles, making it very clear they are part of an out group and not accepted in our society. It would then be logical to assume that if they understand this, they may not care very much when we say "don't have sex with children". Why would they listen to us when we will reject them all the same.

This issue, unlike the previous ones, isn't something we are just doing nothing about, we are actively supporting it. We actively perpetuate it in an effort to appear morally virtuous and part of the group, not caring if we are pushing for more children to be raped. Every time someone issues a vague and unwarranted statement about how much they hate pedophiles, it is effectively stating "I don't care what happens to the children, as long as you think I'm a good person". However most are understandably ignorant of this and mistakenly believe that their targeted discrimination/hatred is somehow helping the situation.

## **Solutions:**

One of the main things that needs to be done is just reducing stigma. Like the discrimination against homosexual orientations in the past (and to some extent still into the present), pedophiles are hated and misunderstood. By creating a culture of hate surrounding them we have driven them and any helpful discussion surrounding pedophilia, underground. Thus it is incredibly difficult if not impossible to make any progress, we seemingly hate pedophiles more than we care about helping children. So I think the first step in making any progress is beginning to have discussions like this surrounding the issue. Promoting more honest depictions of pedophiles in media and possibly adding it into the LGBT+ movement similarly to homosexuals to bring more attention to the issue.

Another beneficial option, perhaps once stigma is decreased slightly, would be to have a medical registry where people with pedophilic sexual interests can voluntarily sign up. The registry should obviously not be accessible to the general public to prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation. Being put on this registry should likely require a professional medical/psychological evaluation to ensure the person is actually sexually attracted to prepubescent children so it is only pedophiles. We could then restrict people on this list from holding jobs that closely work with children such as daycare workers or school bus drivers, decreasing the number of situations where an assault could occur.



We could potentially limit the ability of these people to purchase or consume alcohol, either legally limiting it to specific contexts (such as in their own home) or making it completely illegal in all cases. This would hopefully reduce the number of cases where a pedophilic individual would have lowered inhibitions/control around sexual actions when in the presence of a prepubescent child. And finally having this registry would allow us to more easily develop understandings of what methods could be used to help these individuals as we would then have a much larger sample size of pedophiles to analyze.

We could also implement a website hosted by a governmental or other large body to distribute ethical erotica or toys depicting prepubescents (as described previously using things like animation or AI generation) to both allow pedophiles a safe way to engage with their sexuality and reduce demand for child porn where actual children are harmed in its creation. We could also restrict access to this site to only those registered in the previously described list. This would decrease the beneficial effects the site could have on actual child porn, however it could then make more people willing to volunteer to be on the list and thus have the positive effect of keeping pedophiles out of spaces with many children, and could also have the effect of pacifying the general public who are likely to be uneducated as to what pedophiles actually are or the data surrounding them. So limiting to only registered people, at least until some of the stigma and discrimination towards pedophiles has lessened, seems to be a good option.

By combining all of these options we can help those who end up being pedophiles lead better lives while also taking real steps towards protecting children from sexual abuse.

### **Closing Statements:**

I understand that what I have discussed here is unpopular and carries with it heavy cultural stigmas. I do not expect you, the reader, to fully accept this new information with how contrary it is to current narratives surrounding these sexual orientations or fetishes. All I ask is that you try to critically reflect on the arguments made withing and try to conduct yourself with honesty and integrity within our society.

Thank you,

Hongri Shade



# Reference List

Abbey, Zawacki, T., Buck, P. O., Clinton, A. M., & McAuslan, P. (2001). Alcohol and sexual assault. *Alcohol Research & Health*, 25(1), 43–51.

Aella. (2023). The Personality and Childhoods Of Pedophiles. Substack.com.  
<https://aella.substack.com/p/the-personality-and-childhoods-of>

Baird, & McGillivray, B. (1982). Children of incest. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 101(5), 854–857.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3476\(82\)80347-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3476(82)80347-8)

Cantor, & McPhail, I. V. (2016). Non-offending Pedophiles. *Current Sexual Health Reports*, 8(3), 121–128.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-016-0076-z>

Cantor, Kabani, N., Christensen, B. K., Zipursky, R. B., Barbaree, H. E., Dickey, R., Klassen, P. E., Mikulis, D. J., Kuban, M. E., Blak, T., Richards, B. A., Hanratty, M. K., & Blanchard, R. (2008). Cerebral white matter deficiencies in pedophilic men. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 42(3), 167–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2007.10.013>

Cantor, Klassen, P. E., Dickey, R., Christensen, B. K., Kuban, M. E., Blak, T., Williams, N. S., & Blanchard, R. (2005). Handedness in pedophilia and hebephilia. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 34(4), 447–459.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-005-4344-7>

Cantor. (2018). Can Pedophiles Change? *Current Sexual Health Reports*, 10(4), 203–206.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-018-0165-2>

Cystic Fibrosis Foundation (n.d.). CF Genetics: The Basics. Cff.org.  
<https://www.cff.org/intro-cf/cf-genetics-basics>

Fazio, Lykins, A. D., & Cantor, J. M. (2014). Elevated rates of atypical handedness in paedophilia: Theory and implications. *Laterality (Hove)*, 19(6), 690–704.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1357650X.2014.898648>

Lalumière, Blanchard, R., & Zucker, K. J. (2000). Sexual Orientation and Handedness in Men and Women: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(4), 575–592.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.4.575>

Maccio. (2011). Self-Reported Sexual Orientation and Identity Before and After Sexual Reorientation Therapy. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 15(3), 242–259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19359705.2010.544186>

Münch, Walter, H., & Müller, S. (2020). Should Behavior Harmful to Others Be a Sufficient Criterion of Mental Disorders? Conceptual Problems of the Diagnoses of Antisocial Personality Disorder and Pedophilic Disorder. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11, 558655–558655.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2020.558655>

Planned Parenthood (2023). How effective are IUDs?. Plannedparenthood.org.  
<https://www.plannedparenthood.org/learn/birth-control/iud/how-effective-are-iuds>

Schmidt, Mokros, A., & Banse, R. (2013). Is Pedophilic Sexual Preference Continuous? A Taxometric Analysis Based on Direct and Indirect Measures. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(4), 1146–1153.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033326>

Shidlo, & Schroeder, M. (2002). Changing Sexual Orientation: A Consumers' Report. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice*, 33(3), 249–259.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.33.3.249>

