



PETER FRITZ WALTER

PAMPHLETS

Another Innocence. Bitterness. Different Facets of Terror.
Directed Responsiveness. Fruits of Repression. Parental
Murder. The Jackson Case. Western Toy Child.

A production by Peter Fritz Walter.

The Collected Works of Peter Fritz Walter • February 2, 2016

CONTENTS

Another Innocence	1
Bitterness	5
Different Facets of Terror	10
Directed Responsiveness	19
Fruits of Repression	21
Parental Murder	27
The Jackson Case	30
Western Toy Child	32

ANOTHER INNOCENCE

Having known a few freely raised children, I have seen
that those little girls abound of another kind of innocence.



They may invite you to funny sex play that they are going to direct and orchestrate, but you are completely numb since they cannot arouse you. They are not at all sexy, they are not at all puppets, they are not at all passive. They are *active*, so active that your desire vanishes. In children from very poor but loving families in Asia, I have seen the same attitude.

Sex play can easily be engaged with them, provided it is organized into a game, not an act they have to suffer, while the *sexy child* here tends to make herself available to the man she likes, in a way much like a prostitute, crawling under the cover, playing around innocently with the cushions, so innocently actually that you can guess what she is trying to express, taking the dog posture and exposing her ass smilingly, suddenly dropping her shoes on the floor, then getting comfortable and taking the expression of a puppet, and eventually leaning back in a way that invites you to unbutton them.

When you proceed, they'll close their eyes, as if *all that* did not interest them for the least which is exactly what arouses you most. And they *know* that! They know that in our psyche sex is connoted as an act, and they organize, orchestrate that act, but not like a conductor.

They let you manipulate them so that you have the feeling you are the conductor while, of course, they are and remain the true leaders of the game.



This is how it happens with responsive girls, while with boys it is a bit different. I do not want to provide a cook book for childlovers here; what I do want to achieve with this writing is to shake some age-old rigid opinions that have no root in the actual constitution of children, and that can only be known by somebody who has experienced love with them, by somebody who knows how children *really are* behind the façade they have to wear by force in a totally hypocrite society that reserves sexual pleasures for people it privileges with the title *adults*.

The difficulty with girls is to know when they want you to stop. Boys are very clear, hyper-clear about it, provided they know you love them and you are not a sadistic dread out for violating them. The strange thing is that fear rather strangles them so that the violent dread more easily gets his pleasure from a non-consenting but too fearful boy, a fact that we can observe in all street boy cultures in the world. The boy who trusts his lover will stop him without a problem, by dressing suddenly, asking for a break, or just squeezing his bottom cheeks so hard that his lover painfully retreats.

Girls, when they love, do not say a word when they feel that their lover gets into the higher ranges of excitation and fulfillment. Thus, the conscious girllover is supposed to *feel* this lacking consent of his love girl in much the same way as the woman lover must feel it. *He has to intuit it*. By the way,



this is something valid for all females and independent of their age. It is something that can only be felt at a gut level for even if the lover asks his love girl if all is okay and he can continue, she will tend to nod silently or just say yes. An old adage says that a woman *who says yes can well mean no*. This is true and valid for little girls as well. I have found that it can be felt from the body language the girl uses, almost instinctively, the way she turns slightly away, the way she suddenly gets crisp and sweaty, the way she subtly stops to cooperate with her *total being*.

While many lovers have extended fantasy sex encounters, not many and not often times actually achieve sexual gratification with the girls or boys they desire. That's part of the hide-and-seek we have to play in this society, part of the fear that surrounds the whole topic for all of us, including the children. And that's something the child-protectors often forget. There may be many children who refuse sex for a kind of fear that actually is not theirs, but a *general fear of sex* that society, parents, educators have inculcated in them.

There is nothing to fear in sex, provided there is love and care for each other. And when that is the case, there is no need to use sex for satisfying one's power hangups, and two souls and bodies are mating and copulating in a game where both partners' chips have the same value. In many cases the



fear is not even a fear of sex, but a more general *fear of the unknown*, as Krishnamurti said, from the lacking knowledge this sex-hostile society has of the *mating games* between adults and children, and of the naturalness of those games for both children and adults.

BITTERNESS

Some of my well-meaning friends once in a while remind me that I come over to others as a *bitter person* or somebody who has set opinions about life and about other people. So I would like to publish these few lines for all those of my readers who wonder what vegetable I am while most of them never tell me what they think, being, as a whole, a mute mass of anonymous users to my sites that leave their traces only through numbers on my stats pages but not through a voice that is human, warm and affectionate. Which says actually all about them, so I can spare any comment. For the joke I would like to add that I am bitter only when I have to reside in the West while I am never bitter when I am in the East.

My bitterness is a vital reaction to a complex interaction of stimuli that contradict my inner nature to such an extent that I just cannot cope, cannot cheer up cheaply and comfortably. Some years ago, it's true, I still could. But now not anymore. Asia is now in my body and soul, not just only on my mind.



I do not expect to get immediate results but it happened that those of high intensity and power gave me more credits than I expected and perhaps even more than I have merited while those of mediocre intensity have given me no credits at all because they judge others by their appearance only, and not by their level of truth. If I am bitter, then please consider as bitter *all people* who try to lead a truthful life in a society that practices falseness and hypocrisy. However, what mediocre people call bitter is not bitterness in the sense of misanthropy, but simply a form of retiredness that functions as a protective shell for an artist's originality and creativity. Where the pigs set the order of the day, the jewels have to take guard not to get spoiled by their dirt.

Was Picasso *bitter* because he retired in a remote castle in the South of France? Was Dali *bitter* living years and years in his magic beach villa in Catalonia, Spain, refusing to see visitors? Was Ingmar Bergmann *bitter* who retired on a far-away island where only few friends would come, using a helicopter for transport? Was Edward de Bono bitter because he bought an island near the Lido laguna (Venice) for having his own realm, his own moon, his own galaxy and place from where he conducted his coaching empire? I am not living retired in any way but I do not mix and mingle with those of mediocre intensity, those parasites who suck others empty of energy for feeding their own shallowness and living lives



devoid of true meaning, those also who believe the thousand and one lies of the mass media.

My life has taken off only, after many years of emotional and intellectual blockage, when I had freed myself from the human cockroaches that plague the plains of human existence on this globe.

Needless to add that I do not mix either with those who persecute others, who are engulfed in a view on others and the world that is full of projections and contempt. I have no interest to get involved in their lifelong negative gossip, the downward spiral of their *defensive worldview*, their emotional outbursts or their pretendedly all-so-rational arguments that are but *defense strategies* they need for coping with their many undealt-with emotions and desires.

I also keep away from those who consider themselves as *liberal*. They are those who love indulging in prose clubs and gossip festivities, group sex orgies and psychedelic sessions, and who think their children need sex lessons for growing up healthily. Their paradigm is elitist and they enforce peer pressure in the form of forceful consumption. Their ideals are the filled belly and the concubine. Their lives are as devoid of sense as those who subscribe to lesser standards.

No question that I have nothing to talk with those who *own their children* as others own their cars, shoes and



furnishings. Their mindset is world-puritan and their lives are all-rational and devoid of vital emotions. They tend to believe that emotions are reserved for cattle and gorillas and that humans are human through the fact that they possess what they call a *reason*. I have nothing at all to do with such kind of people. They are robots and among the most dangerous species on this globe. Their mindset is producing murder, genocide and torture all over the world and it has cost innumerable lives.

Then, there are the modernist couples. Their modernism is but a cover-up of their complexes and their blocked affection that they compensate with a non-ending ferociousness for sex, porno, alcohol and mind-altering drugs. They become friends only with those who play the game the same way they do because they regard the outside level of people, ignoring inner qualities. They could make down individuals or groups in just the same sordid way as the world-puritans do, while they do it with other arguments. But their brutality is just the same.

So, after all, with whom can I be friends? I do not know. I only recount experiences. And those experiences were lessons for me.

This is not knowledge but a complex form of intuition that grows over years and that becomes sharper with every new experience, and every new frustration. I do not maintain



any set opinion about the behavior of people. It is true that most often human behavior is the result of human thought and certain character patterns. But still, the human being is unpredictable and can act out at any time in a way that was unforeseen by all. This is actually a natural ingredient of life because life is unpredictable, too. At least sometimes.

So, instead of knowledge, I can recount experience only. From experience I learnt that my potential friends are either among the outcasts, killers, psychotics, schizophrenics and autistics, terrorists or anarchists, artists and psychics, the *enfants terribles*, or else the kings and rulers and those above all categories—the saints.

I was respected by criminals, idiots and terrorists, on one hand, and by police presidents, ministers and gurus, on the other. But never by average humans who either despise me, hate me or treat me like a little boy—with a paternalistic clap on my shoulder.

Many years I suffered from this state of affairs and from the dreadful loneliness resulting from my isolation. For I am a very emotional soul and cannot stay cold in front of such an awkward destiny. *I do not want to live on an island.* I am not a misanthrope.

How many tears, suffering and how many thoughts of suicide all through my childhood and adolescence! The truth



is that integer humans do not have opinions as I myself have no opinion. I live my truth but *truth is no opinion*.

The great masses of average humans, by contrast, are afraid to search for their truth, and they are aloof to make out what is true in their lives, for themselves. They may either totally reject truth as a goal to achieve, taking a nihilistic position, or they may take the cynical turn saying that every truth is but 'another opinion.'

Their minds are so full of mental garbage that they cannot see the fundamental difference between an opinion and an expression of inner truth that often sounds like an opinion in the ears of superficial listeners.

DIFFERENT FACETS OF TERROR

What happened back in 1998 in Jakarta, Indonesia, to the Chinese minority? It was the mass rape and murder of women and girls. I have come across personal testimonies that shocked me deeply.

The terror of these cruel events of May 1998 in Jakarta is the same terror to which children are subjected in so-called *religious education* that alienates them for life from their bodies. It is the same terror that brings people or nations to start a war against another nation from one day to the other, and it is the same terror that condemns regularly a certain group of people, be they called witches, Jews or, nowadays,



pedophiles—these events are only facets of *one and the same terror*.

This terror is *moralism*.

Moralism means that a value system is based upon rigid *moral dogmas* instead of the direct perception of life, upon hypocrisy instead of truth, upon stupid imitation or *modeling* of others instead of self-realization, upon *blind obedience to authority* instead of personal power, upon the enslavement of the woman and the female, and the denial of nature. You can also say that we talk about the terror of *non-sense and dull-sense*. Because it is exactly that what mankind has bred until now: non-sense and dull-sense. And I say consciously *mankind* here—and not womankind.

A young woman reported the terrible events on a web site. A whole gang of men, about thirty to sixty, broke in their house. They raped all the children who were playing in the staircase and then went from flat to flat in order to rape all the Chinese women and children living in that dwelling.

Several men gang-raped every single child or woman. Some were little girls of eight or nine years. One child they killed was a baby of three. Some had their genitals mutilated, others were killed during the rape, others were burnt and thrown out of the window after being raped and beaten.



I do not report all the gruesome details here. All was so terrible that I was in a kind of trauma for entire two days after I had read those details on the Internet. And I had only read two of hundreds of reports and did not watch the photos. I think I could not have seen them without falling gravely ill.

One detail stood out. A woman reported that, when four men raped and killed her small sister, they shouted:

—*We have to rape you because you are Chinese ...* and they sang islamic songs while they did it, the same songs and texts that shout from all the mosques in Jakarta every four hours, *Ali Akbar, Ali Akbar, Ali Akbar.*

The same terror that these men exerted over the Chinese women and girls, religions exert over their believers, be it Islam or Christianity, at a time when the terror and the barbarous tyranny of the Christian Church were still unbroken.

Terror, that's also what I myself went through as a child when we were almost beaten to death and tortured by those old virgins who ran to Church three times a day and who mistreated us in the name of Jesus Christ.

Humans who grow in terror suffer from having lost a good portion of their healthy self-esteem, their self-worth and their *primary power*. They live in constant fear and it is this fear and a great need to compensate for the lost power that leads them to terrorize other humans. What is the difference



with a person who has been mistreated, who has been abused as a child, yet *who does not terrorize others*, who does not inflict upon others what they themselves have suffered?

The ego in the latter person is strong enough to cope with the inner turmoil, the emotional chaos, the strong feelings of revenge, the fear, and the rage. The ego however of those who retaliate and inflict on others the same they went through is poor, almost non-existent; they are overwhelmed by mass thinking, group thinking into which they have been molded from childhood.

They feel only strong in the group. Being around *complices*, they can feel great and powerful since they are able to exert total power over other humans.

The great confusion they are suffering from is a total misconception of the notion of power. The absolute power they are searching for as a compensation for their poor ego-feeling is what they take for power. They are not aware that this feeling is an illusion and that, in reality, they feel utterly powerless.

That is why they need to be so many in numbers to overpower harmless and helpless little girls and women.

Primary power is a quiet inner feeling of connectedness with all-that-is and a genuine feeling of strength. It is power



based upon respect of another and of life. It is constructive power. While the compensatory form of power is destructive.

This destructive form of power comes to life because of moralistic education and not, as religions tend to make believe, because man is wrongly programmed by nature.

A small child has natural primary power and uses it constructively. But what all those religions and moral systems are doing is to *constantly and systematically smash primary power* and degrade human beings to bundles of fear that are completely disintegrated inside.

In last resort, religions and moral terror are responsible for such acts as they happened in Jakarta not only that year but much worse, at several occasions during the 1960s. And it is something that happens everywhere, once in a while, but is not always reported. The blame here is surely not to put on Indonesia, as a culture, as a nation or as an ethnic group. To blame an individual nation would be a misunderstanding. This is a universal problem, and I mention this here because it's a global problem, and only as an example, and because I was in Jakarta in May 1998, and suffered from this situation. That's the reason I report it here. But what I am saying is that the root of this evil is in last resort to be found in what is called *strict education*, which is a nice word for something very ugly, namely *institutionalized violence against children*. Since times immemorial, religions and authoritarian governments under



patriarchy have treated women and children like cattle, and worse. In ancient times the father of a family could freely slaughter off his children or wife if they had merely acted against his orders. The will of children was broken and is broken in many families where the traditional male dominates with his usual arrogance and his insensitive stupidity.

Other people may have this feeling of super-power over others when they throw napalm bombs on villages populated by mostly women and children, as it happened so often in the Korea and Vietnam wars... And then, in the media, they talk about *sexual violence*. The sexual element is today easily taken for the culprit in order to hide the truth about the origins of violence, while this sexual element has only a *secondary function* in the vicious circle of violence.

Sexuality becomes a weapon in rape.

In German language the word for rape is *Vergewaltigung*. In this word, the word *Gewalt*, the German word for violence is obviously contained. *And not the word sex*. In French equally, *viol* is a short form of *violence*, and there is no association with sex in this expression. These expressions thus do not contain an element of desire. And this is so for a good reason!

Psychiatrists and sexologists have in recent years made clear that sexuality is not in itself aggressive. The penis



becomes a weapon where it is used in a hostile intention vis-à-vis another person, but not when it is used in order to experience mutual sexual fulfillment, in the form of the loving embrace.

The public debate of childlove is marked by the same kind of confusion. Childlove is seen as a synonym for rape, for violence. This shows an aberrant degree of misinformation about what childlove truly is. We can only talk about rape where the will of the other person is being smashed or disrespected, and where thus sexual penetration is forced upon the mate or done without force, but without the agreement of the mate.

In the present discussion that legally invalidates the consent of the child, the child is degraded to an object, to a slave. The child's will is thus not valid legally and socially it is considered to be *insignificant*. That fact alone shows evidently that society does not consider *the child being significant* in society, as their will is not. Hence, what sex laws actually protect is not the child, but a morality system. How can this legislation pretend to respect the child as it does not respect his or her will to say yes to sexual exchange? This is how the lobby of child protectors show their true face, in declaring the child a puppet, a simple object of what is called abuse, an imbecile *res sexualis*. Which is of course a myth for the child is neither imbecile in sexual matters nor unable to consent. We



are simply facing here a social order that is programmed for enslaving the child in order to maintain control, exclusive control in matters of sex, and thus in matters of *economy*.

Child protectors are *fascist* in their general attitude toward living and they act against the true interests of children. They profit financially from their worldwide media campaigns against the *sexual child* and for the pure castrated child, for they get huge government funding for their sordid moral wars against liberalism and emotional and sexual freedom.

The other reason for their sordid campaigns, and that is why I mention all this here, is to uphold terror, *constant terror*.

For *they need terror*, as a matter of their publishing strategy. They namely *use terror*, the public spreading of fear, as a psychological weapon for achieving their long-term goals. That is part of their tactics to distract from the true social cruelties that happen every day in the world and that we are all, if we want it or not, responsible for. And in addition, apart from social upheaval and unrest, let's not forget that the number of children mutilated and killed, raped and burnt, tortured and chopped to pieces by their own parents by far surpasses the number of children killed otherwise. The institution family is the *most cruel and the most destructive* institution ever created. It is for me honestly but a shell without content, something that people attach to



because of utter *fear*, because of desperation about the state of the world or because it is profitable for publicity, for selling goods, for consumption. If we only gave up this concept, we could surely find many other options for human togetherness that are much better and more healthy than this old rotten concept of the family.

And then true miracles could happen. And we could begin to establish what I call *spiritual families*, that are not based upon blood bonds but upon *soul relations* and a true care and responsibility for another, for children or elders or in general for people in need. And further, if we could bring about a new education without terror, without fear, without brutality, without religious or ideological indoctrination and without cruel punishments, we could change the world.

I am not against religion, but against religions. Religions are ideologies and they use brutality to achieve their power goals, their political objectives. Religions have not the good of man in mind, but the good of their own survival as organizations. In this sense, of course, communism is equally a religion and in general all what is ordained upon people for their best, for their salvation.

True religion is absence of terror, first of all.



DIRECTED RESPONSIVENESS

There is a phenomenon I have observed since long, more precisely since I travel to Asia. I found that the children who are really responsive to the charm of a childlover are in the West, not in the East, in the *repressive cultures*, not in the carefree ones. I would like to name this paradox in childlove *directed responsiveness*.

I am arguing that our culture, through the repression of the child's genuine sexuality, and the prohibition to live it freely with mates of their age, reinforces considerably children's *gerontophile emotions*, and thus creates in them a potential erotic attraction toward adults. I have often times felt and seen that little girls in Germany and France react very differently from Asian ones—provided I could get to know them in a safe way—since they are not innocent, and rather seductive. I have my little theories about the fact that in Western countries, children really need and search for closeness and sex with adults while in Asia I have seen, after years of experience, that they do not need it nor search for it. In the Asian and many other natural cultures, children are *really more innocent* and they do not behave toward adults in a sexy way.

Whereas in the West, the children do, after a short while you know them and under the condition they feel safe and that you truly love them. I have experienced it with little boys



and girls without, however, having had the sweet pleasure of fulfillment as that was not possible. So I can only imagine in my mind how wonderful it would have been with them since they really had this smooth touch, this eroticism I never found in Asia, not even in adult women.

The reasons why children in industrialized culture, where they are not supposed to have any sex appeal in theory, are sexy in fact is that

—they are not allowed to have sex with peers from young age;

—they feel adults value them to be sexy, to be sweet and available.

I do not know for sure which of both has more impact upon the upsurge of gerontophilia in children. But it is not excluded that adults' intimate love wishes for children and generally a culture that likes them to be sexy plays a certain conditioning role. While many people and not only childlovers have fantasy sex encounters with children, not many and not often actually achieve sexual gratification with the children they desire.

And this is really what makes much of the violence the whole discussion about childlove is bathed in. It is the paradox that, while society preaches the sexless child as the ultimate *modern achievement*, it is conditioning children into



sexy and erotically gratifying behavior toward adults, first of all their parents. The violence comes from this obvious contradiction and from the fear that is all around those issues. And therefore, only an *integrative approach*, that is non-judgmental and open to exchange and understanding can help to find a path out of this terrible confusion. It is the *approach of love* that will prove most effective.

FRUITS OF REPRESSION

I have observed that in a repressive culture, the first to revolt are the children themselves. Such a culture transforms them to such an extent that they are interested only in what is forbidden, not in what is allowed.

That is the true reason why sex is so easy with them, and so gratifying for childlovers, and this information, curiously so, I didn't get from personal reports of pedophiles, but from police records. It's much more difficult to seduce a child in a free culture, or almost impossible.

The corruption of genuine morality comes through the restriction of children's freedom to an extent they unconsciously feel is strangling them. Love children who endanger their lovers are not those who are conscious of the machinery, who look through the dirty veil of hypocrisy and understand the reasons why the social game has been setup that way. *Those children are discrete.* The dangerous ones are



those who have highly fearful and repressive mothers, authoritarian fathers and a life that is setup like a timetable, an agenda of duties and of well-observed free time activities. Those children are unconscious about what is happening and why it is happening that way. They stupidly attract always the negative pole, as a form of inner revolt, and thus want to do what is forbidden and find it utterly boring to do what is allowed and approved of. Thus, the lover-seducer who is not really interested in the welfare of the children he loves, has a ridiculously easy game. He puts up everything in his home at the disposition of the children he loves, I mean he *thinks* he loves. Which means that the children will come to him first because he is unusual.

How, we can watch TV in your house, play Nintendo, computer games or on your old Flipper, learn piano, get photographed, we can take what we like from the fridge, play with your cat and dog, participate in all your leisure, be your friend, spend the night in your house and even get some money once in a while? Well, well, let's go ahead. And then, suddenly, if it happens that way, they become insolent. They tackle the challenge and challenge the man.

You ass, why are you so good to us, are you an idiot? There is nobody we know who is like that. We get kicked or we get a well-apportioned cookie because we have been brave and polite and done our duties. *And you let us do all.* There's something wrong with you.



And then, as a logical consequence, the question, verbally or silently, will come up: So, what's the deal, really?

They do not say that verbally. They think it and express it non-verbally in many ways, through their complete disregard for your home, for your clean floor, for your quiet lifestyle. They express it through their loud talk, their violence, their way of behaving as if all in your home was theirs.

These children are dangerous for the lover because they are too immature to take their part of responsibility for the forbidden game they however like to engage in. They are not conscious why, after a short while, they find boring all that is offered to them in an environment of freedom, and they are searching as long as they find the one thing that is *not possible*. And, logically, the one thing they cannot do without cashing in serious consequences is to indulge in sex with a grown-up. They know that very well! Thus, from that point in the relationship that usually comes up after several weeks or months, depending on the force of the mutual attraction, there are only two ways out.

They test the adult and use their charm in such a way that he admits either his erotic disinterest in them, or his interest. In the first case, they will leave him instantly, and forever. In the second case, they will stay and from that moment stop to be insolent, stop to bother him, stop to make him down, stop to mess up his apartment, stop to talk



ridiculous things just to drive him crazy, stop to bring an unending chain of friends to him and perhaps stop talking at all. From that moment, they begin to enjoy and their behavior becomes loving and caring. They stop to be frogs in order to become princes and princesses. Their lover will be in 7th heaven, but he has forgotten *one thing*. He forgot that they are still under the magic spell of an *anxious mother* and that their initial willingness for sex was not based upon a conscious decision, but just another search for pleasure without a corresponding responsibility for it.

They searched for pleasure and found love. So they had been rewarded and got more than they deserved. Their lover, by contrast, had been cheated, for he had given love first and finally got as a reward a dangerous form of pleasure instead of a *shared love relation* that is based on an equally shared responsibility.

This is not invariably so. Children who search for love, and not for pleasure only, *are different from the start* and the relationship takes a totally different turn. And it goes in most cases well and not to court.

Why? I do not need to point it out at length how things develop from this moment. Let us assume that the guy says, the deal is soandso and I like you much more than you think and would like to kiss you, if you like it, too, and I want to be your lover and truly desire you for the game of love. And the



child, surprised and suddenly happy because feeling valued in a way he or she never felt before, says something like *Okay let's give it a try, let's see how that feels, I'm curious, to say the least. Just do it to me first, and then I'll tell you how it was and then, if I like it, maybe we can try something else.* And so it goes, to the satisfaction of both.

Only with the difference, when the child comes home, the lover sleeps well while the child thinks that something has strangely changed in his or her life and is more or less afraid of the secret to be revealed one day or the other.

And this fear which is repressed because it would become unbearable in a life-denying environment and society, is the drive for the fatal accident to happen. The child will talk to a friend to get rid of the pressure of the secret, and some adult will be around and get the story, or something of that sort. In very few cases, the child will talk directly to a parent, typically in cases where the games were of a kind the child disliked to a point to feel dragged into some kind of forced sex.

Now, let's see how it goes when there is *love on both sides*. A love child is not bothering the adult he or she meets, not the first time and not later on. Such a child is careful because they are emotionally intelligent and sensitive. They actually feel the loving current at their *soul level* and when they come, it's for exchange, verbal or nonverbal



communication, not for a one-sided kind of *I want this!*, and *I would like that!* And, the most essential, those children come alone for their individuality and sense of self-worth is high; they have the courage to expose themselves instead of hiding their weak little selves behind a group of protective peers.

Typically, they have loving and trusting parents who give them enough freedom in order to not crush their curiosity and their blossoming sense of independence.

These children are not afraid to show their vulnerability and it's exactly this *lack of defense* that immunizes them from suffering harm since the feeling of *spontaneous love* they engender in all goodhearted adults they meet is just overwhelming.

These children, if ever, live through highly satisfying and creative relations with their lovers and they *voluntarily take the part of responsibility* for their shared game of love. They are not afraid of any bad consequence because they think that neither themselves nor their lover has done anything bad.

They believe in love and think that love is always good, if it is love at all. They'll not jump right into a sexual relation since they are much more careful than the pleasure-seeking children, but if they get a feel that body pleasure will enhance the loving exchange they have with the lover, they will not



hesitate to engage in it or even initiate it from their own side. Strangely, it's their original innocence that makes them not being afraid of any bad consequences; this innocence is their protective shield, as if Goddess Aphrodite herself put a protective veil over such blessed relationships so that they are, and remain, distinct from the ordinary and somewhat vulgar mass of love relations.

That's why those relations are seldom or never reported in any case studies, statistics or sex research, for, as the adage says, true love is silent.

And, there is an additional argument. Those children tend to have parents who do not spy them out and who, even though they may learn or find out one day about the sexual part of the relation their child has with the lover, would not right away call the police, but first talk with their child and the lover in order to see what the matter was.

And then they would learn that it was *real love* and, in many cases, just smile and perhaps even get a closer and more affectionate relationship to their child's lover-friend.

PARENTAL MURDER

I am not talking about physical murder, although, when you look at this year's child murder statistics it has again been confirmed that parents, and especially mothers, are the most effective and passionate child killers.



I am talking about *emotional* murder.

To defend the generally incomprehensible and highly violent parenting paradigm that this culture fosters, the scapegoat group is once again called upon to help out and deliver a standard target and a comfortable archetypal image: the child killer belonging to the race of *The Common Pedophile*, the lurking wolf around the corner, the swine that turned into a perverse all-decided child terminator.

A society that represses much, needs to project much. However, where is the problem originally located?

Many parents murder their children emotionally. They call the process *education* or otherwise. The emotional murder of children is largely absolved by all churches and religions and by present mainstream consumer society.

Parents murder their children's sexual life because doing that, they murder a part of their own sex life that they cannot accept, namely the sex life they had as a child and that has never been their own, that they had *no right* to engage in, that they had even been punished and tortured for, and that as a result they have repressed deeply in their unconscious.

Thus, fulfilling the cycle, they in turn become the murderers of *their* children's sex life, and, perversely, do that in the name of the 'good of the child.' Which good, the hell?



How can intelligent parents believe the most imbecile of arguments provided by so-called professionals that work for the system, a system that cannot tolerate children's awareness since that very awareness acts counter to that culture's most manipulative strategies for transforming the child not into a complete human but into a reductionist consumer robot.

It's not single parents, but the majority of them, supported by the whole machinery that goes out to sordidly kill next generation's emotional and sexual life, and this without shame and without guilt and under the hypocrite pretext 'to do good' to the children in the world.

Seeing abuse everywhere, they typically do *not* see abuse where it's close to them, namely in what they do to their own offspring. They want to make the world ready for world puritanism and their declared mission is thus to desexualize all the children in the world, so that no adult can ever again enjoy the sweet taste of a consenting love child and of consenting childlove.

That's how they go out for the *last fight* to make the world ready for a new race of children that are safe, clean, sexless, obedient and, most of all, *hopelessly addicted to mass consumption*.



THE JACKSON CASE

Coming back from Asia after five years, I did not expect anything. I knew how things were going here. Hysteria, persecution, child murder at every corner, if you read the news.

I had no illusions. I would never have come back if my mother had not died and I had to overtake a little fortune.

Some years ago, before I went to Asia, things had been different. It was the time when neighbor children still could come to your house, or you could *cook for them*, or you would take picnics together in the garden.

Then, after the Jackson affair, all this suddenly stopped. The press had sordidly profited from this trial to spread out their violent irresponsible vulgar gossip because they found that nothing sold better than child-sex stories.

Jürgen Bartsch was dead since a long time and journalists must have found that the subject was kind of getting stale. They needed to revive the bottom layer of the masses' unconscious as it was from that layer that high sales and profits are generated. To make things more succulent, the police and the legislator helped and changed the laws so that every little body touch play between an adult and a child was considered a *form of virtual rape*.



So, instead of body touch plays, the newspapers were glad they could report about *rape* only. For, obviously, the first story was more for the kindergarten audience that did not bring sales, while the second promised new flourishing business. Their prognosis proved to be right. They had big business. Michael Jackson also had bigger business after his affair with the boy since now he could really take off into the marriage trip which was a new, hitherto untouched myth, the culmination of hypocrisy, neatly packaged and wrapped for ages 1 to 100! And they sold!

Police, lawyers, judges and prison guards got more to do and so everybody, at the end, was happier.

Only children, their parents and certain men who were in most cases forming part of the family, friends, helpers, children's best friends, second daddies, sport teachers, holiday acquaintances or just plain lovers were *not so happy* about the *Brave New World* that had in the meantime opened its gates. Once of a sudden children were deserted by their lovers because those went to jail by the hundreds and thousands.

No news ever reported that the child murder statistics had not changed over the years. The general atmosphere became one of a new witchhunt, for society deemed a myth to be fact, that is *that childlove equals child murder*. And of course, if I say as a legislator that masturbation with a child



regularly *equals child rape* and is legally to be considered in the same way as child rape, we've got a lot of so-called child rape where just months before we were talking about mutual masturbation.

That is what makes statistics change; and it's one of politicians' preferred games for manipulating public opinion.

Parents, educators and other passive television watchers and news absorbers, were agonized and stirred with fear.

They fell in the trap and watched out to the maximum. The result was achieved. The world made one big decisive step closer to total control.

The strategy had worked. The state did not have to do the work. Parents would do and help pervert the next generation to a large enough extent so that still higher sales would be engendered through still stupider consumers!

WESTERN TOY CHILD

I am disgusted every time I am in the West, disgusted in the streets, in the restaurants, in the supermarkets; even when at home and just looking out of the window I am disgusted.

There are not two minutes in a row that I don't see a mother shouting at her child while the child, caught in a sort of violent obstinacy, shouts even louder, screams of terror, of violence that everyone in the West finds completely normal.



The same misery that you see with smaller children you see with adolescents. However, they do not shout anymore—unfortunately. If they did, they would have perhaps a chance to survive as emotional beings.

In the West, children are the toys of their parents, the dolls and kiss-puppets of their parents, the fuck-puppets of their parents, the teddy bears of their parents, the parents of their parents. Or the poison containers of their parents.

In the West, it seems to me, children are all to their parents except what they are, *children*. For what they are they are defended to be, autonomous self-thinkers in their own right and their own desire.

Of course, you have that at times also in the East, but not to the extent as in the West. In the West, children are a social disease in a society that hates children.

In the East, children are a gift of nature, unquestioned in their existence, while unspoiled and rather outgoing in their living conditions. But I question all of that. Which children are more oppressed, and suffer more in the end? I do not have an answer because I don't really know but my intuition tells me that it's better to be poor and oneself than to be spoiled and to be forced to be another or a toy or savior for one's affectively deficient parents.