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Abstract

Paedophilia has become a major social issue in modern society; however, there remains considerable ambiguity in how society understands and perceives this phenomenon. This chapter will first examine the current theoretical and research positions surrounding paedophilia in modern society, through examining its aetiology, behaviours, personalities, cognitive distortions, grooming, potential treatments and current, as well as possible policy/legal changes, particularly in the UK. This will then lead into a discussion of the social construction of paedophilia and the current crisis in modern society, through examining the literature on moral panics and social risks, as well as addressing the impact of the media. This chapter will conclude by offering some suggestions for how the current ambiguity surrounding paedophilia maybe alleviated, including a need for greater research, an increase in funding, alternative approaches to treatment, a different media approach, possible future policies and a change in public awareness.

Introduction

Paedophilia has been defined as ‘a severe public health problem of staggering proportions’ (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000; 248), with the paedophile being construed as a major bogeyman in modern society (Silverman and Wilson, 2001; Cohen, 2002; McAlinden, 2006A). Research suggests that the current public concern/’outrcy’ surrounding paedophilia, which has developed over the last 10 years or so in the UK (Cohen, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2002), has been partly created by the increasing media interest in sex offences (Thomas, 2005); particularly in regard to high profile cases like Sarah Payne (Critcher, 2002), Holly and Jessica, as well as
more recently Madeline McCann; and the resulting media campaigns, like the News Of the World and The Sun’s ‘for Sarah’ campaign (Critcher, 2002; Greer, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2002; Cohen, 2003; McCartan, 2004; McAlinden, 2006A). Hence, suggesting that the current media climate has contributed to paedophilia becoming a central concern in modern society (McAlinden, 2006A), a moral panic (Cohen, 2002; McAlinden, 2006A) and a social risk (Furedi, 2002).

Despite the media impact in the development of the current climate surrounding paedophilia, the media is not the sole explanation for said social outcry as there seems to be ambiguity surrounding understandings of paedophilia, best demonstrated by a lack of expert consensus (Silverman & Wilson, 2002), government indecision, particularly in regard to policy changes (Assinder, 2006, June 20: bbc.co.uk; ‘Sarah’s Law to Start in Months’, 2007, April 9:TheSun.co.uk; Dodd, 2000, July 24: Guardian.co.uk; Morris, 2000, July 31: Guardian.co.uk; Travis, 2007, April 11: Guardian.co.uk; Home Office, 2007). Even though there is disparity and ambiguity surrounding current understandings of paedophilia, this is not from a lack of research, for paedophilia has developed into a hot research topic within the social sciences, particularly Psychology and Criminology, focusing on understanding paedophilia, its causes, behaviour and treatments (Howitt, 1995; Silverman & Wilson, 2002). Unfortunately, contemporary research on paedophilia has not provided a sense of academic and applied cohesiveness to current understandings paedophilia (Howitt, 1995; Leberg, 1997; O’Donohue, Regev & Hagstom, 2000; Silverman & Wilson, 2002).

This chapter will focus the current conceptions of paedophilia and why it has become a major social crisis, which will be done through examining current theoretical and research positions on paedophilia (aetiology, behaviours, personalities, cognitive distortions, grooming, offending behaviour, treatments and legislation); what the public understanding of paedophilia is and why this has developed into the current crisis that paedophilia currently is (social constructionalism, moral panics and social risk, the role of the media); before concluding with a brief discussion of future directions for paedophilia in modern society.
Paedophilia

Despite the current high-profile nature of paedophilia there is no easily accessible or widely accepted definition of paedophilia, its aetiology, antecedents, personality, behaviour or treatment (van Dam, 2001). Child sexual abuse, and by default paedophilia, is thought of as one of the most misunderstood crimes in modern society, with society denying its occurrence and underestimating the frequency with which it occurs (O’Grady, 2001). Hence, current theories of paedophilia are a combination of strongly held beliefs and relatively few facts (Musk, Swetz & Vernon, 1997), which is problematic, leading to public safety and criminal justice problems (the Paulsgrove riots in 2001). Contrary to this some authors believe that current understandings and conceptions of paedophilia are not poor, suggesting that both society and professionals have become more aware of, and therefore developed a better understanding in recent years of the prevalence, victimology and forms of paedophilia (van Dam, 2001).

Defining paedophilia

A paedophile is generally defined as a person who gains sexual gratification from contact with pre-pubescent children (La Fontaine, 1990; Howitt, 1995; Leberg, 1997; Silverman & Wilson, 2002), but the paedophile does not necessarily have to offend against children (Howitt, 1995; Leberg, 1997; American Psychological Association [APA], 2000), or even come into contact with children (Child sexual abuse imagery and the use of the internet) (Taylor & Quayle, 2003). However, both clinical (APA, 2000) and legal (Sex Offenders Act, 2003) definitions of paedophilia are more restrictive than the academic definitions; as such this disparity in expert definitions of paedophilia exacerbates the current confusion.

The American Psychological Association (APA) has constantly redefined its classification of paedophilia in every edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders [DSM]. Paedophilia has ranged from being a sexual deviation and a sociopathic condition (APA, 1953); a sexual deviation and classified as a non-psychotic medical disorder (APA, 1968); a paraphilia with the offenders being
defined as people who were interested only in sexual acts with pre-pubescent children (APA, 1980); and which was later adapted to include paedophiles who also had an interest in adult-adult sexual relations (APA, 1987). Recently, this was changed so as to define paedophilia as a sexual paraphilia, stating that the offender has to be at least 16 years of age as well as being at least five years older than the victim; that the victim is not older than 12 or 13 years; and that the offender has serious sexual urges/fantasies that are causing them distress or that they have acted on (APA, 2000). These constantly adapting and conflicting definitions of paedophilia have resulted in expert opposition to the DSM classifications of paedophilia, referring to it as vague, poorly defined and lacking reliability as well as validity as a tool (O’Donohue, Regev & Hagstom, 2000), resulting in calls for it to be abandoned by practitioners (Marshall, 1997). This clinical ambiguity and inconsistency surrounding paedophilia is reinforced by the World Health Organisation (WHO) (World Health Organisation, 2007) who, in contrast to the DSM define paedophilia, as a mental and behavioural disorder, describing it as a disorder of sexual preference indicating that it is ‘a sexual preference for children, boys or girls or both, usually of pre-pubertal or early pubertal age’.

In contrast to the clinical definitions, the legal definitions of paedophilia in the UK are more stringent; with current sex offender’s law defining paedophilia as a sexual relationship between an adult’ (over the age of 18) and a ‘child’ (under the age of 16) (Sex Offenders Act, 1997). The current UK law also states that because children below the age of 13 cannot give consent, any sexual relationship with a child of this age is automatically statutory rape (Sex Offenders Act, 2003). This legal definition is both stricter and vaguer than contemporary clinical and academic definitions of paedophilia, focusing on the offence rather than the offender. Hence, the legal definition seems to leave out important criteria, such as the understanding that an offender does not have to be over 18 to have paedophilic tendencies, or commit a paedophilic offence (Howitt, 1995; O’Carroll, 1980). In recent years there has been significant changes in the law in the UK in regarding the prosecution of sex offenders, to include offences such as grooming, making a child watch yourself or others have sexual relations, or arranging for a child to have sexual intercourse with another person (Sex Offenders Act, 2003).
The ambiguity surrounding definitions of paedophilia are exacerbated when paedophilia is compared to other forms of childhood sexual abuse, particularly those which are not necessarily paedophilia, but that seen as being similar or are often confused with it (incest, hebophilia, child molestation). This is significant because the terms child sexual abuse and paedophilia, are often used in the literature, as well as in the public domain, as a blanket term to cover all forms of child sexual abuse and all types of child sexual abusers (Rind, Tromovitch & Bauserman, 1998). However, not all forms of childhood sexual abuse are similar, with different types of offenders (child sexual abuser, paedophile, incest abuser, hebophile) who all offend in different ways. For instance, a child sexual molester/abuser is someone who sexually abuses a child for their own personal gratification, using the child as a sexual aid to bring them pleasure (Goldstein, 1999). Although, a paedophile may not necessarily be classed as a child sexual molester, for they may not choose to offend against the child (Howitt, 1995; Leberg, 1997), or they may not wish to actually harm the child and they may believe that they are actually in ‘love’ with the child (O’Carroll, 1980; Brongersma, 1984). Alternatively, because incest offenders tends to offend within the family, as such the abuse is not just limited to the adult/child relationship (brother-sister incest), and this abuse usually has little to do with sexual attraction, unlike paedophilia, incest is generally focused around adolescent children (La Fontaine, 1990); therefore you may have a paedophile who may not offend against their children, but will offend outside of the family (Howitt, 1995). Also a hebophilie is a person who gains sexual gratification from contact with children aged between 14-17 years (Blanchette & Coleman, 2002), as such they are not strictly a paedophilia, but hebophilia does seem to fall into the remit of what the public (McCartan, 2004), the government and the media seem to regard paedophilia as. However, despite the fact that the hebophile is legally classified as a paedophile, the law does seem to indicate a separation between the two, even in passing, for sexual relations with a pre-pubescent child (13 or under) is considered statutory rape (Sex Offenders Act, 2003), whereas this is not the case if the child is post-puberty.

**Gender and paedophilia**

Paedophiles are generally known to be, and thought of as being, male offenders (Finklehor & Russell, 1984; Howitt, 1995; Dobash, Carnie & Waterhouse, 1997;
Silverman & Wilson, 2002); although this does not dismiss the possibility of female paedophiles, but they are thought to be rarer (Howitt, 1995) and believed to offend in a different manner (Elliot, 1993; Howitt, 1995). Even though all child sexual abusers are perceived in a negative light, this feeling is amplified in regard to female child sexual abusers (Denov, 2003), who are perceived to be committing the ultimate sexual taboo, for they are going against the natural instincts of women and feminism (Elliot, 1993). Previously it was widely thought that females only sexually abuse children when they are the compliances of male child sex abusers (Jennings, 1993), however research has discounted this as the sole explanation of female child sexual abuse, suggesting that past histories of physical and sexual abuse in their own childhoods can lead females to sexually abuse children (Fehrenbach, 1988). Female child sexual abuse tends to be reported less than that of male child sexual abusers (Jennings, 1993), possibly because victims do not believe that their claims will be taken seriously (Jennings, 1993; Saradjian, 1996), that they feel they will be ridiculed (Longdon, 1993) or that their offences are not construed as abuse (that the ‘victim’ sees the abuse as a ‘rite of passage’) (Howitt, 1995). Regardless of this it is salient to recognise that paedophilic abuse can have an effect upon the victim despite the gender of the perpetrator (La Fontaine, 1990); as such it would be remiss to believe that sexual abuse by female offenders would have a less impact upon victims (Saradjian, 1996), when in fact offences by female offenders maybe more harmful to the victim (Howitt, 1995).

Typologies of paedophiles

Currently there is no distinct typology for identifying paedophilic offenders, hence reinforcing the ambiguities surrounding paedophilia in modern society. This confusion is then added to because there is no distinct profile(s) for child sexual offenders either (Prentky, Knight & Lee, 1997). Explanations for this ambiguity include the heterogeneous nature of child sexual offenders (Bickley & Beech, 2001: Taylor and Quayle, 2003), especially because the majority of research with paedophiles, and child sexual molesters, is carried out with known offenders (Bagley & Thurston, 1996), who may not be representative of all child sexual abusers, especially when research indicates that reporting of child sexual abuse are under represented (Finklehor, 1984: Bagley & Thurston, 1996). Hence, previous attempts to
create child sex offender typologies has met with mixed results (Bagley & Thurston, 1996); but researchers believe that there is a need to build on existing and develop new child sex offender typologies (Prentky, Knight & Lee, 1997; Bickley & Beech, 2001).

Research suggests that there are three distinct types of child molesters (Blackburn, 1995; Prentky et al, 1997; Bickley & Beech, 2001); fixated, regressed and aggressive (Cohen, Seghorn & Calmas, 1969). Fixated child molesters are those who are primarily sexually attracted to children, this sexual interest in children starts in adolescence, resulting in a mal-adaptive sexual development. They tend to have poor social skills, therefore they preferring the company of children and not having age appropriate sexual relationships. Hence, fixated child molesters tend to engage in premeditated and pre-planned offences with children, generally focusing on male victims, usually having no previous history of alcohol abuse (Groth, Hobson & Gary, 1982). Whereas the regressed child molester has a primarily sexually attraction to people their own age, having a normal sexual history and usually being married; as such their paedophilic tendencies seem to develop in adulthood, usually as a result of stressors. They do not tend to have poor social skills; however they are seen to have under-developed peer relationships. Regressed child molesters tend to engage, particularly in the first instance, in impulsive offending, usually with female victims, which is generally alcohol fuelled (Groth et al, 1982). Finally, the aggressive child molester is a sadistic and violent offender, who sexually abuses child because of the sense of power and control it gives them.

Cohen et al’s research has been adapted and built on over the years, with latter research focusing on the fixated-regressed dichotomy (Bickley & Beech, 2001), with preferential child molesters mirroring fixated child molesters, and situational child molesters mirroring regressed ones (Groth et al, 1982). Later research suggests that the regressed-fixated dichotomy can be used to differentiate between extra-familial and interfamilial child molesters (Beech, 1998), for incest offenders are best defined by the situational/regressed typology, whereas extra-familial abusers, including paedophiles (O’Carroll, 1980; Howitt, 1995; Silverman & Wilson, 2002), seem better defined by the preferential/fixed typology (Beech, 1998). Granting the fixated-regressed dichotomy is widely used, it is not without its faults; the main one being
that there is no exact measure scale available so to be able to succulently categorise an child molester distinctly as one typology or the other (Bickley & Beech, 2001); leading to suggestions that the dichotomy should actually be a continuum (Bagley & Thurston, 1996; Bickley & Beech, 2001).

Knight, Carter and Prentky (1989) built on Cohen et al’s typologies when developing their ‘Massachusetts Treatment Centre Child Molester Typology, Version 3’ (MTC:CM3), which is described as a typology for classifying and understanding child molesters. The MTC:CM3 has two distinct axis with both being important in the classification of child molesters. Axis I divides child molesters along has two dimensions, fixation and social competence, both of which have developmental antecedences that impact upon the offender, producing four separate typologies: High fixation, Low social competence; High fixation, High social competence; Low fixation, Low social competence; Low fixation, High social competence. In conjunction with this Axis II divides the child molesters in regard to the amount of contact they have with children; with high contact offenders being classified as either interpersonal or narcissistic types; whereas low contact offenders are first sub-divided into high or low physical injury and then again into either sadistic or non-sadistic. The second axis produces six separate subtypes: interpersonal, narcissistic, exploitative, muted sadistic, non-sadistic aggressive and sadistic. This model has good reliability and validity, as such it the most comprehensive typology of child molesters’ currently available (Knight et al, 1989; Bickley & Beech, 2001); although the authors realise that more could be done to improve it (Knight et al, 1989).

Research into the development of typologies relating to child sexual abusers, particularly paedophiles, works to reinforce the ambiguities already present in regard to understanding the heterogeneous nature of both offender and the offence. Hence, raising the question; if research cannot define paedophilia, its offenders or their offences, then what can it reveal about them?

Instigators of paedophilia

Research indicates that no-one is sure of the cause of paedophilia (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000; Nurcombe, 2000), but it is thought to develop via a multitude of
factors (Howitt, 1995). Hence, there has a variety of differing explanations for the causes of paedophilia including; that paedophilia is a mental illness (Bagley, Wood & Young, 1994), a mental deficiency (Blanchard, Waston, Choy, Dickey, Klassen, Kuban & Ferren, 1999), an abnormality in developmental (Lee, Jackson, Pattison & Ward, 2002) or as the result of the ‘Cycle of Abuse’ (Bagley et al, 1994; Howitt, 1995; La Fontaine, 1990).

*Family background, socio-economic status and IQ*

Known paedophiles are generally from working-class backgrounds (La Fontaine, 1990), with a disorganised family system in childhood (Howitt, 1995), middle-aged (Blanchard et al, 1999), with a number of them being married at some point (Groth & Burnbraum, 1978). Interestingly, paedophiles seem to work in a diverse number of careers including professionals (38%), white-collar worker (34%), blue collar workers (14%) and unemployed (12%) (Wilson & Cox, 1983); although this seems to contradict alternative research stating that paedophiles come from working-class backgrounds (La Fontaine, 1990), especially when their levels of intelligence are examined (Weiner, 1962; Peters, 1976; La Fontaine, 1990; Lowenstein, 1998). Research on paedophiles’ intelligence is disparate, with some authors arguing that paedophiles have a lower degree of intelligence than the rest of the population (Peters, 1976; La Fontaine, 1990; Lowenstein, 1998), whereas others argue that degrees of intelligence vary between different typologies of childhood sexual abusers, with incest offenders being quite intelligent (Weiner, 1962). Although it seems unlikely that paedophilia is solely a working-class phenomenon, it may be that non-working class offenders are more adept at silencing victims of paedophilia (La Fontaine, 1990). The majority of paedophiles arrested and prosecuted are from working-class backgrounds, which contributes to the skewed perception and comprehension of paedophilia in modern society.

*Bio-psychological explanations*

It has been argued that paedophiles can suffer from neurological issues, including exposure to neurotoxins and genetic disorders in childhood/infancy (Blanchard et al, 2002); and a strong correlation with head injury (Blanchard et al, 2002; Fruend &
Kuban, 1993). This premise is reinforced by research suggesting that paedophilia maybe related to biology, hormones and neurotransmitters (Mc Donald Wilson Bradford, 2000). Interestingly, it may not just be paedophiles who can suffer from brain damage and mental retardation, but research indicates that child molesters may do so too (Musk, Swetz & Vernon, 1997); thereby suggesting that adult sexual involvement with children maybe a result of brain damage or head trauma.

Interestingly, research also suggests a link between paedophilia and handedness, as paedophiles are more likely to be left-handed (Bogaret, 2001). Although, this is a fascinating claim because handedness and brain asymmetry do seem to play a role in development and personality (Scott & Spencer, 1998); it does seem dubious that handedness is a definitive explanation of paedophilia, and more research would be needed to confirm this explanation.

Social & Psychological explanations

Paedophiles as well as being sexually deviant are also thought to be socially and psychologically abnormal (Silverman & Wilson, 2002; Howitt, 1995; La Fontaine, 1990). Paedophiles and child sexual offenders in general, tend to have higher levels of psychopathic disorders (Nurcombe, 2000; Plotnikoff & Woolfson, 2000) as well as being prone to more psychological disorders than ‘normal’ people (Lowenstein, 1998). These disorders include borderline personality disorders, somatisation disorders, pseudo-seizures, medical/surgical procedures and sexual dysfunctions (Nurcombe, 2000). Hence, paedophiles tend to suffer from higher levels of social introversion, sensitivity, loneliness, depression; as well as suffering from lower levels of obsessive-compulsive behaviour, lower concern with appearance, poorer sense of humour and a poorer relationship with their mother (Wilson & Cox, 1983); in conjunction with lower levels of self-esteem and poorer estimations of there own self-worth (Musk et al, 1997). Suggesting that paedophiles and child sex abusers, tend to have poorer interrelationship and social skills (Blanchette & Coleman, 2002); leading to them becoming socially isolated (Taylor, 1981). The paedophiles lack of social skills may go someway of the way to explaining why they partake in inappropriate sexual relationships with children, for paedophiles may feel emotionally rejected by adults and have an inability to cope with adult relationships; which may be partially
explained because as children paedophiles had poor relationships with adults (Lowenstein, 1998; Wilson & Cox, 1983; Cassati, Mc Glurg & Browne, 2002). Which is best demonstrated in regard to both fixated (Groth et al, 1982) and elderly paedophiles (Whiskin, 1997), both of whom tend to have poorer relationships with adults than they do with children, hence believing that children understand them better than adults do, and that children are less demanding and judgemental than adults (O’Carroll, 1980).

The social and psychology explanations of paedophilia are reinforced in research by Finklehor (1984). Finklehor believes that there are four central explanations for why people sexually offend against children; including that paedophiles feel an emotional congruence with children, that paedophiles have a sexual arousal to children that paedophiles are unable to have age appropriate relations and that paedophiles have lower levels of sexual inhibitions. Finklehors model attempts to give a more rounded and complete explanation of why adults sexually abuse children (Finklehor, 1984), which seems plausible as Finklehors research fits with alterative research findings (Howitt, 1995; Silverman & Wilson, 2002), including what paedophiles themselves state (O’Carroll, 1980).

Cycle of abuse

Another antecedent of child sexual abuse, with a long and rich research history, is the cycle of abuse argument (Finklehor, 1984). The cycle of abuse explanation of child sexual abuse states that individuals who have been sexually abused in childhood will go on to reciprocate the abuse in later life (Howitt, 1995; Leberg, 1997; Silverman & Wilson, 2002). This explanation postulates numerous explanations for why a victim of child sexual abuse may become a perpetrator, including; (1) identification with the aggressor (2) anger over the abuse that they suffered acted out on other children (3) that the transition from victim to abuser is merely a career progression, or (4) psychological damage as a result of the previous abuse which has lead to a sexual fixation on children (Howitt, 1995).

Research suggests that there seems to be a relationship between being abused, becoming an abuser and links to mental disorders (Nurcombe, 2000); suggesting that
the cycle of abuse seems to be rooted in the psychological development of the offender, as the paedophiles lack of empathy, addiction to deviant sexual behaviour and their social learning of a deviant sexual behaviour, all play an essential role in how the cycle is developed and maintained (Bagley et al, 1994). Nurcombe indicates that victims of childhood sexual abuse (whether it be incest, paedophilia or child sexual abuse) have tendencies towards low self-esteem, impulsivity/poor behavioural control, self-blame, emotional distress and dissociate syndrome; which can lead the offender to have lower self-esteem, relationship problems, chronic emotional distress and substance abuse issues in adulthood. Although, it is essential to recall that not all victims of childhood sexual abuse react in the same way, use the same coping mechanisms or become an abuser (Nurcombe, 2000; Howitt, 1995); as such none of explanations mentioned are definitive answers for the continuation of the cycle of abuse (Howitt, 1995; Lane, 1991); demonstrating the inherent complexities surrounding paedophilia.

Paedophiles may use the cycle of abuse as a legitimate argument to explain their abusive behaviour (Howitt, 1995; Taylor and Quayle, 2003), however there are issues with the credibility of this argument. Research indicates that the cycle of abuse argument falters on a number of fronts, particularly when explaining female paedophiles, for although girls are more likely to be victims of child sexual than boys (La Fontaine, 1990; Leberg, 1997) paradoxically there are more reported male paedophiles and child sex offenders than female ones (Bentovim, 1993). This paradox once again raises the issue of whether or not female paedophile sexually offend differently than males; or does society actually perceive female offending, particularly paedophilic offending, as being markedly less serious than that of male paedophiles? This suggests that females are not perceived to be as dangerous as males and, as such, the public do not require the same degree of protection.

Another major criticism of the cycle of abuse argument is that paedophiles use it as a defence mechanism, a lie, or an exaggeration of the truth, in order to get more leniency in court or to justify their behaviour when in treatment (Kleinhaus, 2002). However, some researchers dismiss this explanation and state that at some point we should start listening to the paedophile, because one cannot assume that they are lying all the time (Li, 1991). This issue is complicated by the paradoxical interpretation of
the cycle of abuse demonstrated by some offenders, where they claim that when they were abused it was traumatic but now that they are the abuser it is a demonstration of love and affection (Taylor & Quayle, 2003). This paradoxical interpretation leads to the question of whether we should believe the offender’s explanations of their abuse as well as the potential explanations that they offer for how they abuse.

Paedophilic offending and grooming behaviours

Patterns of abuse

Research reveals that paedophiles do not offend in the same way, or even always sexually and/or physically abuse children (Howitt, 1995; Taylor and Quayle, 2003); for some can achieve sexual arousal from chatting online with children, looking at child abuse imagery, or though having non-contact time with children (Silverman & Wilson, 2002; Taylor and Quayle, 2003). This raises the question of how and why do paedophiles start to offend against children? The main cycle of offending behaviour was developed by Wolf (1984; Cited in Silverman & Wilson, 2002; 58). Wolf believes that paedophilic offending commences in regard to the offender’s poor self-worth, which leads to self-rejection, withdrawal, the development of fantasies, escapism, grooming which in turn leads to sexual offending, guilt and acceptance of guilt. When the cycle starts again the offending always increases, becoming more dangerous. Bentovim (1993) developed an alternative model for the development of paedophilic behaviour, which despite being similar to Wolf’s, there are some major disparities between the two. Bentovim starts from the premise that the paedophile has a sexual interest in children which leads to them becoming sexually aroused, partaking in masturbatory activity, in turn leading them to target/groom children, which results in the paedophile feeling guiltily about there sexual arousal, however at this stage they enable mechanisms to overcome this guilt and justify their feelings (cognitive distortions); at this point the paedophile starts to use pornographic material which leads into the sexual abuse of children. Bentovim, as with Wolf, believes that the cycle is self-reinforcing, leading to more violent and sexually aggressive behaviours with each cycle. Unlike Wolf, Bentovim goes on to state that the paedophile in question can become involved in an extensive paedophilic ring, which works to reinforce their distorted beliefs allowing them to justify their deviant
behaviour as a group norm that is a natural part of social and sexual development. This rationalisation process allows the cycle of paedophilic behaviour to continue indefinitely.

Interestingly, Bentovim (1993) sees the use of pornographic material as being an essential aspect of the paedophilic cycle of offending; which seems contradictory to the claims of paedophiles, who state that are anti-child sexual abuse imagery and that fantasy alone is a powerful motivator for them (O’Carroll, 1980; Howitt, 1995). However, it should be noted that the pornographic material used by paedophiles may not be the deviant pornography (photos/videos of child nudity, of children being abused), but may be more mundane (ordinary photos of children, movies / TV programmes / magazines aimed at children); and as a result may encourage greater use of fantasy by the offender (Howitt, 1995). There is a taxonomy of child abuse imagery that ranges from the non-erotic/non-sexual images to sadistic/bestial imagery, all of which can be accessed via the internet. However research fails to establish a direct link between viewing child sexual abuse imagery and committing child molestation (Taylor and Quayle, 2003). Although, there always has to be a child sexually abused to produce said images or movies, ipso facto it is always child sexual abuse, even if it is indirectly and the paedophile is not abusing the child themselves (Taylor & Quayle, 2003).

Apart from Wolf and Bentovim’s models of paedophilia offending, another important model of the paedophilic cycle of offending is the four factor pre-condition (Finklehor, 1984). Finklehor’s model indicates that there are four compulsory pre-conditions necessary before child sexual abuse can occur: (1) motivation to sexually abuse (including: emotional congruence, sexual arousal and blockage), (2) overcoming internal inhibitions, (3) overcoming external inhibitions, and (4) overcoming resistance by the child. Finklehor argues that this model is linear, with each of the four factors occurring sequentially, and that the four pre-conditions can be used to explain all forms of childhood sexual abuse, which seems likely as the model is general in content and as such easily applicable.
Even though these cycles of child sexual offending behaviour are individual, they all indicate a particular pathway that paedophiles, and child sexual abusers, go through before and during their offences, and that cognitive distortions play a central role in this process (Howitt, 1995; Leberg, 1997). Hence, the cycle of paedophilic offending seems quite similar to that of other offenders, particularly that of a serial killer; for they too pass through stages of dejection, withdrawal, fantasy, offending, distress over the offence, justification leading to distorted thinking and then repeat offending (Mitchell, 1997). This reiterates that distorted thinking is central, not only to paedophilic offending, but also criminal offending in general (Hollin, 2002).

**Grooming**

The start of the grooming process has similarities to the formation of normal adult sexual relationships, with the paedophile going through the same stages as adults: attractiveness, proximity, familiarity, reciprocity and similarity (Hogg & Vaughan, 1995). However, unlike normal adult relationships the paedophilic relationship is not a balanced relationship, which is best demonstrated by the nature of the relationship, the grooming process and the offender’s cognitive distortions. Despite the disparity between paedophilic and adult sexual relationships; the realities of paedophlic abuse and grooming seem to coincide with relationship theory, possibly explaining why paedophiles are sexually attracted to certain types of children, certain age groups (Howitt, 1995; Bagley & Thurstone, 1996), especially in regard to fixated paedophiles (Groth et al, 1982). The paedophiles justification that this is approximate to an adult relationship (O’Carroll, 1980) results in the paedophile viewing their behaviours not as harmful, but as acceptable and that they are helping the child to develop sexually and provide them with a mutually loving relationship (O’Carroll, 1980; Brongersma, 1984). Hence, many ‘true’ paedophiles (not incest offenders or child sexual abusers) state that they do not wish to harm the children that they are involved with and do not use child pornography (as they find it degrading and humiliating to children); leading many of them to state that they can not understand why people would want to ‘abuse’ and harm children (Howitt, 1995). These cognitive distortions (that the child enjoys it, they are helping the child develop, etc) enable the abuse to continue; for they allow the offender to justify their behaviour, in turn allowing them to protect themselves.
from perceived social disapproval, avoid cognitive dissonance and protect their self-esteem (Milhaildes, Devilly and Ward, 2004). These cognitive distortions are seen as the central factor in the commencement and continuation of child sexual abuse (Burn & Brown, 2006), and they are thought to develop from underlying causal theories that the paedophiles have about themselves, their victims and the surrounding world (Ward & Keenan, 1999; Burn & Brown, 2006); and are thought to develop across the lifespan starting in childhood (Burn & Brown, 2006); and are propagated when the offender comes into contact with other paedophiles that positively reinforce their deviant lifestyle (O’Carroll, 1980; Taylor & Quayle, 2003).

Different typologies of paedophile, fixated and regressed, may target different children for different reasons; however research indicates that paedophiles generally target vulnerable children that are emotionally deprived with absent fathers and illness prone mothers (Burton, 1968; Taylor, 1981). Which is reinforced through alternative research showing that children who have been sexually abused tend also to be physically abused (Briere & Elliott, 2003), have poor family bonding (Crassati et al, 2002), are generally more sexually experienced that ‘normal’ children (Larsson & Svedin, 2002; Taylor, 1981) and as such may have be sexually abused on more than one occasion, often by different abusers (La Fontaine, 1990; Erikson, Wabley & Seeley, 1988). One possible explanation for why vulnerable and isolated children are selected by child sexual abusers maybe that these children tend to feel unwanted and as a result seek attention elsewhere (Burton, 1968; Taylor, 1981), as such it maybe easier for the abuse to continue, for these children maybe less likely to refuse the attention that they are being given during the grooming process, and therefore be more accepting of the eventual the abuse (Leberg, 1997; Taylor, 1981).

The grooming process reveals that paedophiles can be quite skilled at manipulation, gaining trust and deception; therefore presenting an air of potential infallibility to other people outside of the abuse and maintaining their vale of ‘normality’ (Howitt, 1995; Leberg, 1997; Talyor, 1981). Hence grooming is thought to be a process that the offender moves though, rather than a random set of behaviours (Wyre, 1987); with the main focus being to separate and isolate the child from their surroundings, including friends and family, therefore emphasizing the importance of the relationship
with the offender (Wyre, 1987; Leberg, 1997). The grooming process comprises of physical as well as psychological techniques; with the physical grooming techniques consist of a ‘reach and retreat’ method, whereby the offender will progress the sexual/physical activities, if the child becomes uncomfortable or distressed the offender will stop and then retreat to a safe point. It is important to note that the paedophile wants the child to remain comfortable in the relationship (O’Carroll, 1980), as, if they are not comfortable, they may report the abuse and therefore end the offending (Leberg, 1997). This is why psychological grooming plays such a vital role because if the offender can convince the child that no-one else cares for them and that they ‘love’ them, they will be in complete control of the relationship. Psychological threats are used to reinforce this idea, for instance, if child tells about the abuse they will be separated, that the offender may go to jail and that no one will believe them anyway (Leberg, 1997; La Fontaine, 1990). As such the child now may suffer from a distorted worldview as a result of the grooming process and therefore believes that he/she has no one to turn to and that the abuser is the only one that cares for him/her. This belief may result in the child permitting the abuse to continue because they may desire the attention that it brings (Leberg, 1997), indicating that the abuser has coerced and brain washed the victim to a point that they no longer see the ‘relationship’ as wrong or destructive. In turn this may lead to the victim seeing the relationship as a natural part of their development and thus establishing a starting point for the cycle of abuse (Howitt, 1995).

The grooming process is not just related to the child, but is a three-pronged approach, affecting the child, the community (parents, friends, family, and community) and the institution (working with children); with the important aspect being trust (McAlindend, 2006B). Which reinforces that grooming is a well thought out and carefully planned process; suggesting a level of intelligence on the part of the paedophile, reigniting the debate surrounding paedophiles levels of intelligence, with some research suggesting are less intelligent than ‘normal’ members of the public (Leberg, 1997; Langevin, Wortman, Wright & Handy, 1988), whereas other research proposes the opposite (Musk et al, 1997).
Paedophilic offending

Research indicates that paedophiles have no typical offending behaviour (Bagley & Thurston, 1993), that they do not all offend in the same fashion, with the same frequency or level of intensity (Howitt, 1995; La Fontaine, 1990). Although, it is thought that female child sexual abusers abuse in a different way from males (Elliot, 1993), this chapter will focus on research done with male paedophilic offenders.

Paradoxical to public consensus (McCartan, 2004), research suggests that sexual intercourse is often not the most prevalent form of child sexual abuse (Baker & Duncan, 1985); research suggests that non physical sexual abuse was most common (51%), followed by sexual abuse using physical contact (but not intercourse) (44%) and that the least common form of abuse was sexual intercourse (5%) (Baker & Duncan, 1985). These findings have been replicated in other research, claiming that physical and sexually related abuse is quite low (oral sex (4%), sodomy (4%), vaginal intercourse (14%), rape (7%)), compared to those that had partaken in some other form of abuse (lewd behaviour (19%)) (Dobash et al, 1996).

Interestingly research also found that the type of sexual abuse used by the perpetrator is also related to the type of victim that they abuse, especially in regard to gender and age. Research shows that for girls under 10 years old fondling (34%) was a more commonly reported offence than vaginal contact (17%), as opposed to boys of the same age group were anal contact was more prevalent (28%) than fondling (24%) (Erickson, Walbey and Seeley, 1988). This was built upon for that when the age of the victim increases so to does the severity of the offences; for girls aged 11-13, fondling (35%) and vaginal contact (23%) were still more prevalent (although more common), but attempted intercourse (6%) was also present. However, for boys in the same age group there seems to have been a decrease in anal contact (14%) and an increase in fondling (27%). Suggesting that younger children maybe viewed as ‘masturbatory aids’, whilst older children maybe viewed as ‘sexual partners’ (Erickson et al, 1988).

Research of paedophilic sexual practices seems to suggest that the majority of paedophilic abuse may not be violent or forced (La Fontaine, 1990), which although
contrary to public opinion (McCartan, 2004) seems to reinforce the distorted beliefs of paedophilic offenders (O’Carroll, 1980). However, the psychological, physical and sexual relations between the paedophile and the child is not equal, for its purpose is to give sexual gratification to the abuser often at the expense of the child, who does not and is not able to give consent the same way another adult would (Howitt, 1995). However, it is important to remember that research on offending behaviour generally been done with forthcoming victims of abuse and/or convicted paedophiles, as such it cannot be deemed to be representative of all forms paedophilic abuse; particularly because not all paedophiles necessarily sexually abuse children, with some only viewing child abuse imagery (Howitt, 1995; Taylor & Quayle, 2003).

Impact of the abuse upon the child

Despite the impact of the grooming and resulting sexual abuse, not all sexually abused children react in the same way. Research suggests that even though the majority of children do react negatively to sexual abuse, some do react positively (Baker et al., 1985), and not all go on to sexually abuse in later life (Howitt, 1995). Hence, the sexual abuse may affect the child in a number of ways, including that the child may see the abuse as a natural part of development, thus starting a cycle of abuse (Howitt, 1995); the child may become aroused by the abuse and this will therefore impact upon future emotional and/or sexual relationships (Bader, 2003); or it may produce a ‘stigmatising effect’ resulting in the child blaming themselves for the abuse (Haywood, Kravitz, Wasyliw, Goldberg, & Cavanaugh Jr, 1996).

Hence, the coping stratagem used by the child post-abuse will determine the long-term effects of childhood sexual abuse. Nurcombe (2000) identifies four factors that impact upon how the child reacts to the abuse; first, the level of family functioning before, during and after abuse; secondly, the important aspects of the abuse (relation to abuser, duration of abuse, frequency of abuse, type of abuse, whether coercion was used), thirdly, the effect of post-event factors (counselling, advice) and finally, the child’s attitude to the abuse as well as the coping strategies they use. Nurcombe (2000) then goes on to identify some of the major coping strategies used by the child, these including the Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder model where the effects of the abuse are delayed for an extended period, only to be recalled at another time of stress.
in the victims life, as with regressed paedophiles. The Developmental coping model is where the abuse leads to lack of/disruption of primary attachment therefore leading to lack of self-regulation, inability to trust others and self-defence, as with the fixated paedophile. Finally, the transactional model indicates that the outcome of the abuse is determined by the transactional matrix of abuse (environment, community and the child’s reaction). Hence, there is no definitive coping model enabled by victims of child sexual abuse; suggesting that the likelihood of becoming a paedophile in later life as a result of childhood sexual abuse seems to be as much to do with the individual differences of the offender as it does with their history of being a victim of abuse.

The treatment of paedophiles

As with all aspects of paedophilia and child sexual abuse, the treatment of paedophilia is a complex, ambiguous and difficult issue to resolve; particularly in that no-one is sure of the cause of paedophilia (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000; Nurcombe, 2000). It is argued, that because sex offending develops via a multitude of factors, the optimal approach to counteract this phenomenon effectively should be a multi-disciplinary approach (Howitt, 1995). Consistent with other aspects of paedophilia, there is a lack of professional clarity on successful treatment of paedophiles, for some authors believe that paedophilia is a long-term condition and intolerant to treatment (Freud, Cited in Hari, 2002, March 25: New Statesman) and as such when treatments do work it should not be assumed that all treatments work equally well for all offenders (Howitt, 1995), and hence the role of treatment is merely to help manage behaviour (Howitt, 1995). Whereas, other authors believe that paedophilia is not incurable and that we should not think of it as so (Hari, 2002, March 25: New Statesman). Ultimately, despite the consternation surrounding the potential for the successful treatment of paedophilia, it is suggested that all treatment should based be on the assumption that paedophilia is treatable and that the condition could be cured (Howitt, 1995).

Research suggests that the most effective treatments for paedophilia are those that attempt to suppress psychological and physiological aspects of paedophilia (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000), and emphasise both victim empathy and victim
understanding (Howitt, 1995). For that reason sex offender treatment programmes are based on offenders’ admissions of guilt (Howitt, 1995; Silverman & Wilson, 2002), although non-admission may not bar them from treatment, but require extra counselling (Silverman & Wilson, 2002). A number of barriers to successful inclusion on sex offender treatment programmes do exist including; if the offenders are foreign, if they have an IQ lower than 80; if they are mentally ill; or on appeal (Silverman & Wilson, 2002).

Paedophile treatment programmes in the UK are generally based on Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (CBT) (Silverman & Wilson, 2002), and these programmes (the Sex Offender Treatment Programme (SOTP), force the paedophile to confront and rectify their distorted thinking patterns (Silverman & Wilson, 2002). As such, the CBT programmes for paedophiles/sex offenders have been compared to the 12 step Alcoholic’s Anonymous (AA) programme for alcoholics (Valcour, 1990). The vast majority of sex offender treatment programmes exist within the prison system; however research shows that SOTP has a very good short-term success rate, but long term results show high levels of relapse outside the prison (Beech, Fisher, Beckett, and Scott-Fordham, 1998). Research reveals that high success rates for offenders on SOTP are for offenders from low deviancy and low denial groups; whereas the opposite is true for offenders from the high deviancy and high denial groups (Silverman & Wilson, 2002). Longitudinal research shows that the effectiveness of sex offender treatment programmes remains unproven, although there are some indications of a decline in relapse rates for those offenders who have received treatment (Brooks Gordon et al, 2004). All the research carried out on sex offender treatment programmes has been conducted in modern westernised countries; as such there is no evidence to suggest that these approaches are applicable or work in other cultures.

There are a number of community-based treatment programmes/centres for treating paedophilia, including, until recently, the Wolvercote Clinic (‘Top paedophile clinic shuts’, 2002, June 31: bbc.co.uk; Harrison, 2007). A new community support scheme has been developing out of Canada in recent years, Circles of Support and Accountability, in which lay people volunteer to aid paedophiles in the community upon release by providing them with support and helping them to regulate their
behaviour (Silverman & Wilson, 2002; Wilson, Mc Whinnie, Picheca, Prinzo & Cortoni, 2007). This strategy has been seen as an effective mechanism for encouraging restorative justice within communities towards sex offenders; and as such discouraging those offenders from going underground and/or re-offending (Wilson et al, 2007). Initial research shows that the Circles of Support and Accountability programme has had some success (Silverman & Wilson, 2002) within Canada, the USA and the UK (Wilson et al, 2007) and as such the programme has been adopted both nationally and internationally (Wilson et al, 2007). The Circles of Support and Accountability programme supports previous research indicating that offenders who receive support, personal and public, especially during treatment will be at a reduced risk of future re-offending (Silverman & Wilson, 2002).

Another potential approach to the treatment of paedophilia is drug treatment, with the main outcome of being similar to that of CBT, in that the drugs work to suppress sexual desire, suppress deviant behaviour, and reduce victimisation (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000). How do the drug treatments achieve this? Research shows that certain areas of the brain can have an impact upon sexual behaviour and therefore the targeting of these areas can have positive effects (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000; Stone, Winslade & Klugman, 2000). For example, Serotonin impacts on sexual drive and therefore increasing the Serotonin levels of paedophiles will result in a reduction of their sexual drive (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000). There are a number of pharmaceutical treatments available for paedophilia including, Estrogens, Narcoleptics, Antoadrogens, Mexdroxyprogesterone Acetate and Specific Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors, all of which have been shown to effect paedophiles testosterone levels, decreasing their sexual drive and their sexual offending (Stone, Winslade & Klugman, 2000). However, serious side effects linked with some of these drugs, particularly Estrogen and Neropleptics, have led to a decease in there use (Stone et al, 2000). Although, there is evidence that drug treatments do work in controlling paedophilia (Stone et al, 2000) some professionals believe that more research is needed, by both the government and drugs companies, to examine the effectiveness of using drug treatment in regard to treating paedophilia (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000).
Research indicates that the UK does not currently have an effective treatment programme for paedophilic offenders (Harrison, 2007) pointing out that the majority of existing treatments remain unproven, sometimes with a lack of success (Brooks-Gordon et al, 2004). In conjunction with this, the potential for the widespread implementation of treatment for paedophiles and sex offenders has been curtailed because of the social denial of paedophilia/child sexual abuse (Howitt, 1995). Treatment is expensive and has to be constantly justified, and funding is easily lost (Howitt, 1995). However, it is still important to try to help these offenders; recognising that re-offending rates are generally reduced in those offenders who have received some form of treatment as opposed to those who have received none (Bagley & Thurston, 1996). It is important to realise that unproven programmes can potentially be as damaging, or more damaging, to the offender as no programme (Brooks-Gordon et al, 2004). Ergo, if there is not a successful treatment currently available and unproven treatment maybe dangerous, then what is being or can be done with these offenders, especially upon release?

**Paedophilia and Government Legislation**

In recent years there has been a change to government policy and practice in regard to child sexual abuse in the UK (Home Office, 2007), which has lead to changes in the law surrounding sex offenders resulting in more clarity. The current shifts in government policy are thought to stem from current media coverage of paedophilia (Thompson, 2005), public reaction to paedophilia (Thompson, 2005) and evidence based research on paedophilia (Gurbin, 1998; Pawson, 2001; Pawson, 2002A). However, the current policy shifts in regard to sex offenders have had mixed reactions, with the government admitting that the current law is not perfect (Home Office, 2001) and a lot can be done to improve child protection (Home Office, 2007).

A major shift in sex offender legislation came as a result of the Sex Offenders Act (1997), which introduced the sex offender’s register, which requires the compulsory registration for all convicted sex offenders in the UK. However, the sex offender register only catalogues known sex offenders prosecuted since its implementation in 1997, and not prior to this point because of human rights legislation as well as the
scale of the task. Despite this loophole the UK currently has one of the most successful sex offender registers internationally, with the national rate being at 94.7%, whereas registration with individual police forces fluctuates between 85.4% and 100% (Plotnikoff & Woolfson, 2000); which outstrips America (Fitch, 2006). Despite the success of the sex offenders register, the UK Government has suggested that it can still be built upon, epically in regard to the transfer of the information contained on the register, with there still being poor information flow (Plotnikoff & Woolfson, 2000).

Later legislation has built on the foundations laid down by the 1997 act, including the Crime Sentences Act (1997) which introduced that anyone prosecuted for two or more sex crimes could be given an automatic life sentence. The Crime and Disorder Act (1998) enforced the importance of public protection in regard to sex offenders, by stating that post-release an offender could be supervised in the community for up to 10 years, and, if they broke their supervision order, could be returned to prison again. The Crime and Disorder Act (1998) also provided police with stronger controls in regard to sex offenders in the community through Sex Offenders Orders (S.O.O.), which allow the police to make whatever restrictions they believe necessary to protect the public from committed or suspected sex offenders. Although, the Sex Offender Orders were regarded by the police as a positive step in helping to contain and control sex offenders (including paedophiles) in the community (Knock, 2002).

The government has also improved child protection though the development of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB), which works to prevent unsuitable people from working with children (Home Office, 1998). This is done through disseminating information, about the previous convictions of candidates for jobs with children, to relevant parties (headmasters, community leaders and employers); as such not preventing offenders from gaining meaningful employment, merely appropriate employment.

In conjunction with this the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act (2000) changed the way that sexual and violent offenders are managed in the community; making it the joint responsibility of both the police and the probation service, though the establishment Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA). The
MAPPA system works on three levels: the first level being a single agency, generally the probation service, managing an offender; the second level is where more than one agency is involved in offender management, however this management can sometimes be done on referral when the offender management plans are not complex and do not require senior management involvement. The third level is the Multi-Agency Public Protection Panel (or MAPPP), which occurs in the few circumstances where the offender poses a high risks of causing serious harm or their management so problematic that multi-agency co-operation at a senior level is a necessary. Hence, the role of the MAPPA is to co-ordinate the contribution all the agencies who are involved with the offender, directly and indirectly, providing a forum in which all agencies can offer advice on the assessment and management of offender, meaning that offenders can be more effectively managed. Recently there have been more changes to the MAPPA system introduced by the Criminal Justice Act (2003) including changes to the role of the prison system in regard to MAPPA and the addition of ‘lay advisers’ to MAPPA panels.

Research (Fitch, 2006) and statistics (Home Office, 2006; National Probation Service, 2006), show that the MAPPA system seems to be working, particularly with high risk offenders, who seem to be showing lower rates of re-offending (Fitch, 2006; Home Office, 2006; National Probation Service, 2006). However, the success of MAPPA does not apply to other new sex offender management provisions implemented by the UK government, including the success of CRB checks (‘Kelly denies sex offender claims’, 2006, January 20: bbc.co.uk) or background checks in cases of adoption (Taylor, 2006, June 22: TheSun.co.uk).

Despite the positive changes brought in by the UK government a more conservative and punitive manifesto has been proposed in regard to sex offenders, mainly by the News of the World in regard to the Sarah Payne case. Sarah Payne was eight years old when she was abducted from outside of her grandparents home, where she was on holiday with her parents, in West Sussex on the 1st July 2001; her body was finally found on the 17th of July, after which it was revealed that she had been sexually abused before death. This resulted in a nationwide manhunt for her killer, resulting in the capture, trial and prosecution of Roy Whiting. The News of the World led a media campaign surrounding the Sarah Payne case, wanting to see the introduction of
Sarah’s Charter which there where successful in, seeing the implementation of 12 of their 13 conditions (Critcher, 2002). Despite the News of The World campaigning the Government rejected the final condition of Sarah’s Charter, the full public disclosure of all registered sex offender information in the UK (Critcher, 2002); which the News of the World called ‘Sarah’s law’ after ‘Megan’s Law’ in America. The Government initially rejected Sarah’s Law claiming it would drive paedophiles underground, off the register and make them a bigger potential threat to children (Plotnikoff & Woolfson, 2000); particularly because Sarah’s Law was in direct opposition to the Human Rights Act (2000), which guarantees people, among other things, a right to privacy. However, the government’s opinion on the viability of this controversial law has changed in recent years, becoming complex, confusing and worryingly inconsistent; for although they initially rejected it (Dodd, 2000, July 24: Guardian.co.uk; Morris, 2000, July 31: Guardian.co.uk), they then reconsidered their position (‘No.10 admits Megan’s Law problems’, 2006, June 19: bbc.co.uk; Assinder, 2006, June 20: bbc.co.uk), agreed to implement it (‘Sarah’s Law to Start in Months’, 2007, April 9: TheSun.co.uk) and then quickly backtracked rejecting the entire premise (Travis, 2007, April 11: Guardian.co.uk); before agreeing to partial public disclosure (Home office, 2007).

The government in attempting to combat paedophilia directly established the Child Exploitation and Online Protection Centre (CE0P), with a mandate to tackle child sex abuse both nationally and internationally, focusing on the internet as a system to do this. Since its inception in 2006 the CEOP has been high profile, often courting controversy, with the public disclosure of sex offender information (Laville, 2006, November 18: Guardian.co.uk.), successes in apprehending paedophiles (Lewis, 2007, June 12: Guardian.co.uk.; Tran, 2007, June 18: Guardian.co.uk.) and recently the chief executive, Jim Gamble, stating that paedophiles should be treated in the community and not necessarily sent to prison (‘Child sex offenders plan condemned’, 2007, June 1: bbc.co.uk). The creation and the development of the CEOP reveal’s that the UK government understands the importance of the internet in facilitating child sexual abuse, and is committed to combating it (Taylor & Quayle, 2003).

Ergo, the law in regard to sex offenders, particularly in the UK, is constantly adapting, seemingly becoming more conservative, possibly as a reaction to the current air of
popular puntativeness in regard to paedophilia (Thomas, 2005). The Government continues to develop new policies and legal changes in regard to paedophilia, including: limited public disclosure of sex offender information to parents/guardians, a review of the use of satellite tracking to monitor high-risk sex offenders, an increase in the use of drug treatments with high risk offenders, compulsory polygraph tests, a strengthening of the sex offenders register and MAPPA system, as well as promoting community awareness of child protection strategies (Home Office, 2007). This suggests that although there is a great deal of ambiguity surrounding understandings of paedophilia in modern society, both the government and professionals are attempting to counteract this major modern crisis. Despite this professional and policy response to paedophilia, how the public understands and perceives paedophilia will also impact upon how the current crisis is dealt with by society.

The current crisis of paedophilia and public attitudes

Research suggests that both public and professional knowledge and understanding of paedophilia has grown in recent years (Van Dem, 2001; McCartan, 2004), although in saying that paedophilia has simultaneously become a major social crisis (Greer, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2002; Cohen, 2003; McCartan, 2004; McAlinden, 2006A). Hence, raising the question; why has the current crisis surrounding paedophilia developed when paedophilia has existed for centuries? This chapter will now attempt to address this issue by examining what the current public perception of paedophilia is, the social construction of paedophilia, paedophilia as a social risk and a moral panic, as well as looking at the role of the media in the establishment of the current crisis.

Public perceptions of paedophilia

In modern society nothing angers and provokes the public as much as paedophilia (Silverman & Wilson, 2002), with paedophilia becoming ‘a severe public health problem of staggering proportions’ (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000; 248), society’s darkest taboo (Cloud, 2002) and a major modern moral panic (Cohen, 2002; McAlinden, 2006A). When society becomes aware of threats to their children they
often respond emotively, rashly taking the law into their own hands (the riots and protests in Paulsgrove, Portsmouth 2001) and condemning these ‘monsters’ to harsh as well as improbable punishments (castration) (Kleinhaus, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2002; McAlinden, 2006A). In recent years there has been a significant increase in public awareness surrounding paedophilia (Taylor and Quayle, 2003; Thomas, 2005) and an intense media focus on sex offenders (Greer, 2002; Thomas, 2005); both of which have lead to change in the public perception of sex offenders, from being a sad pathetic individual, to that of a clever, cunning, intelligent and dangerous offender (Thomas, 2005).

Previous research has produced mixed findings on the public’s comprehension of paedophilia, with some findings suggesting that the public has a realistic and comprehensive understanding of paedophiles and paedophilia (McCartan, 2004); however other research contradicts this (Taylor, 1981; La Fontaine, 1990; Howitt, 1995). These differing viewpoints suggest that there is a great deal of ambiguity surrounding definitions and explanations of paedophilia in modern society (O’Grady, 2001), reinforcing earlier research suggesting that current perceptions of paedophilia are a combination of strongly held beliefs and relatively few facts (Musk, Swetz & Vernon, 1997). The current social misperceptions surrounding paedophilia seems to be fuelled by expert ambiguity, media misreporting and distortion (Silverman & Wilson, 2002) as well as government’s indecision and contradiction; all of which are salient as expert understanding of issues help to shape public perceptions and understandings of said issues (Giddens, 1991). Expert dissemination of knowledge is thought to occur through many routes, including the media. The media is central to modern life (Giddens, 1991), playing a role in the dissemination of information, the shaping of public perceptions and reinforcement the societal attitudes (Greer, 2002). The media approach to reporting sex crime is particularly problematic, especially in regard to paedophilia, because the media acts in a paradoxical fashion (Thomas, 2005). Although previous research has not investigated the possible explanations for non-expert understanding of paedophilia, ideas present in the literature seem to suggest that these understandings could be derived from both the media (Cohen, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2002), as well as changing notions of risk in society (Furedi, 2002) and the related psychological paradigms (fear, uncertainty, etc).
Social construction of paedophilia of paedophilia in a risk society

Definitions of, and understandings of, sex offences change over time (Thomas, 2005), reflecting the belief that society is a socially constructed reality that adapts and changes depending on the cognition of the individuals involved (Giddens, 1991). As such social constructionalism is defined by the twin concepts of meaning (the act of defining) and power (the motives for the definition); that all concepts are transitory and specific. Hence, as society modernises so too does its social constructions, which evolve and adapt though a process of ‘reflexive modernisation’ (the ability to look back on the self/society and adapt appropriately), through the media, leading to an increased perception of risk in modern society (Giddens, 1991). One of the main ways that social constructionalism can work is though the ‘Double-hermeneutic’ model of reflexive modernity, whereby professional knowledge spirals in and out of concrete sites of knowledge, that are constantly being re-cast, and existing knowledge always adapting. Hence, there is a disembodiment of expert knowledge, allowing an increase in knowledge by lay people, in turn allowing all members of society to become experts. This means that Science does not provide comprehensive truths, only ‘until further notice’ truths, that are open to falsification (Giddens, 1991), resulting in a link between modernity and radical doubt, which creates uncertainty and anxiety for people living in the ‘risk society’ (Giddens, 1991); which is crystallised through specific issues, like paedophilia and child protection (Scott et al, 1998).

This increase in risk awareness and the resulting uncertainty surrounding childhood and related issues (childhood sexuality), has lead to a recent outburst in public scares and moral panics over child-related issues (paedophilia, stranger danger) (Ridell, 2002, March 17: Guardian.co.uk). The notion of certain practices being constructed as deviant and dangerous comes to play a salient role in modern society, which has become characterised as a ‘risk society’ (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1992; Scourfield & Walsh, 2003). Beck argues that the current modern ‘risk society’ is a result of the industrialisation and modernisation of society, including advancements in technology, which produce a series of unpredictable side effects, which in turn threaten our everyday life. This proposes that society’s realisation of the negative outcomes of modernisation is post hoc society, and therefore the only course of action left is damage limitation. However, the solutions that society creates to cope with the
current problems, in turn, aid the development of future problems and the risk never really disappears; it just adapts and fades. The core factors of the ‘risk society’ are; that the problems are complex in terms of causation, they are unpredictable, they are not limited by time and space, they are not detectable by physical senses and that they are a result of the development of human society (Beck, 1992). These five factors revealed to be intrinsic to the ‘risk society’ can seemingly be applied to social (paedophilia) as well as physical (climate change) risks.

The issues that evolve in the ‘risk society’ are intrinsic to the construction of modern society and therefore are manageable, but not reversible (Hier, 2003). Which is salient in regard to paedophilia, for some authors argue that the panic surrounding paedophilia is unsolvable (Kinard, 1998), while others state that paedophilia is an easy topic to ignore in order for us to feel safe within society (Cloud, 2002). However, it is difficult to reject and deny knowledge once it has been released into the public arena, as we are constantly aware of it and this changes our perception of the original issue. The manageable but not solvable nature of risk results from the shared responsibility for the negative outcome; this negative outcome is spread across all of society and not limited to one group (car pollution and the decay of the ozone layer, or the sexualisation of childhood and paedophilia). As such, overwhelmingly child protection has now become the focal point of risk discourse in modern society, with risk management becoming central to how the social services deal with child related issues (Scourfield and Welsh, 2003). Modern society has developed an ‘audit culture’ in general, but especially in relation to child services which has moved us away from merely a child welfare orientation to that of child protection (Scourfield and Welsh, 2003). This shows an interface between public concern and policy surrounding childhood and child abuse, on all levels (Scott, Jackson & Beckett-Milburn, 1998).

However, Giddens (1991) has argued that there is no evidence to indicate, and that it is unrealistic to assume, that modern society is riskier than previous ones; but that modernisation has simply made it impossible for anyone to be potentially unaware of threatening issues. Giddens believes that it is no longer possible for members of society to live in ignorance of danger, and therefore potentially everyone is at risk. As modern society’s core values (childhood, democracy, education, morality) adapt,
in turn these changes influence individuals’ opinions towards related matters (child abuse, childhood sexuality, human rights, voters’ rights). This is particularly potent in relation to paedophilia, with many authors arguing that children currently are not at more risk than previously, but that we are simply more aware of the frequency of this abuse within society (Howitt, 1995; Jenkins, 1996; Taylor and Quayle, 2003). However, this societal reaction to risk is best reflected though the current threat and outcry surrounding the concept of stranger danger. For, even though, paedophiles are seen as the major scapegoat of modern society (Brongersma, 1984; Kincard, 1998; Silverman & Wilson, 2002; Taylor & Quayle, 2003), there is little knowledge of the actual numbers of paedophiles in the at large in the community; but there an expectation that these numbers are high (McDonald Wilson Bradford, 2000). This proposition is actually false, because other forms of childhood sexual abuse, as well as other forms child abuse (domestic violence, incest, physical abuse), are actually more prevalent in society than paedophilia (La Fontaine, 1990; Howitt, 1995).

Moral panic and paedophilia

One of the ways that modern risk society copes with the inherent uncertainty, fear and anxiety is though the use of moral panics, which allows the population to feel confident and in control (i.e., the introduction of the USA Patriot Act [2001] which allows for increased control over the population in order to protect it from the terrorist threat (Moore, 2003)). As such moral panics can be viewed as a social construction that helps to deal with the problem at hand (Hier, 2003).

Cohen (2002) defines a moral panic as an event/group/situation that has had a greater degree of significance attached to it by society than it actually warrants, either in relation to itself, or, in relation to other events. Moral panics are focused around specific groups of ‘folk devils’, which, are vilified and branded as deviant by society. The ‘folk devils’ suffer from a form of ‘offender apartheid’ (whereby society excludes and morally rejects them) (Kleinhaus, 2002), which then reinforced by ‘deviancy amplification’ (that the issue is so salient in society that anything that is related to it is seen as it) (Cohen, 2002), leading to an extreme social response that often overshadows the threat of the actual problem (Silverman & Wilson, 2002). This in turn creates a need for a solution, generally an emotional response that is not always well
conceived and usually has severe repercussions for the current ‘folk devils’ (Klienhans, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2002; Soothill et al, 2002). Which is what has happened in regard to paedophilia in recent years (West, 2000; Cohen, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2002), with the public, media and governmental concern being focused on this group of folk devils, leading to paedophiles being morally rejected by society, which is perpetuated by the media (Silverman & Wilson, 2002). The media present a distorted view of paedophilia by focusing on stranger danger, ignoring the realities of paedophilia and child sexual abuse (Howitt, 1995; Silverman & Wilson, 2002), contributing an increase in public and governmental puntiveness towards paedophiles (Thompson, 2005). Hence, the current panic surrounding paedophilia focuses on one extreme variation of paedophilic offender, ignoring research indicating that most child sexual abuse occurs within the home (La Fontaine, 1990; Howitt, 1995). This demonstrates that the moral panic surrounding paedophilia reinforces existing social beliefs and cultural fears around childhood, the breakdown of the family and the decay of traditional ways of life in modern society.

However, Goode and Ben-Yehuda (1994) suggest that there are alternative explanations for the creation of moral panics, of which Cohen’s thesis is only one. Cohen’s theory is closely linked to Goode and Ben-Yehuda’s concept of the ‘Interest group model’ of moral panics, which perceives moral panics as unintended and unplanned outcomes of crusades perused by moral groups. The second theoretical perspective is the ‘Elite-engineered model’ where the moral panic is a conscious/deliberate outcome of manufactured campaigns designed to divert attention away from the actual crises. This is closely linked to the work of Hall, Critcher, Jefferson, Clarke, & Robert (1978) who argued that moral panics are mechanisms employed by the ruling classes to mystify the existing crisis in society and as such the media disseminates these panics, but does not create them. The third definition of moral panic that Goode and Ben-Yehuda mention is the ‘Grass-roots model’ where the moral panic is created though the anxieties of the normal public (maybe reinforced and/or perpetuated by the ‘media’ or government), but they are persuaded and sustained by the public and as a result the media and government can not create public anxieties that do not already exist. Hence the current moral panic of paedophilia seems to be an amalgamation of the interest group model and the grass roots model of moral panics, for both the media and moral entrepreneurs have helped to create and
sustain the current moral panic of paedophilia (Silverman & Wilson, 2002), which they able to do because it reinforced existing public concerns surrounding paedophilia. This indicates that the construction of moral panics is aided by the media, which dominates modern society and plays a major role in the social construction of deviance (Cohen, 2002), helping the UK has become a breeding ground for moral panics in recent years (Thompson, 1998), particularly paedophilia (Cohen, 2002).

The media and the moral panic of paedophilia

The media plays an important role in the modernisation of society (Giddens, 1991). The media acts as the dominant means of communication in society, allowing for development and maintenance of ideas relating to risk in modern society (Tulloch & Lupton, 2001), as well as the accompanying moral panics (Silverman & Wilson, 2002; Cohen, 2002); highlighted through the current crisis of paedophilia.

The role of the media in society can be viewed as the dissemination of information, the shaping of public perception and a mechanism to reinforce the societal attitudes (Greer, 2002). In doing this the media has the dual function of reporting as well as creating the news (Cohen & Young, 1981). This potentially results in the media having a great deal of power and influence, in that it can shape and influence public opinion, while at the same time informing society in a quick in depth fashion that is done in a way that legitimises the subject, thereby re-establishing the creditability of the story (Mc Quail, 2000). Howitt (1998) states that the media can affect public opinion by utilising one of three potential models, the first model being a ‘cause and effect’, where the media has an impact on the public (positive or negative) as a result of its reporting of the story. The second is ‘uses and gratification’ model, which suggests that the use of the media is limited, its impact is limited to the degree in which the public adheres to the information it provided, as in how it effects their lives and helps them understand their current situation. The third model is the ‘cultural ratification’ one, which states that the role of the media is to stabilise society by reinforcing society’s core beliefs and maintaining the status quo. These models highlight the interaction between the media, the government, professionals and the public; especially in relation to the social constructionalism of reflexive modernisation in the risk society.
The media acts as one of the main mechanisms in the development and maintenance of moral panics (Goode & Ben-Yehuda, 1994; Thompson, 1998; Cohen, 2002), working to sustain social order and reinforce current belief systems (Hier, 2003). However, this is not a simple casual relationship because the public has to be accepting of the media before any moral panic can take hold (Cohen, 2002). The media is partly aided in the creation of moral panics by moral entrepreneurs (Becker, 1963). These are individuals or groups that push for social change on the premise that the moral foundations of society have failed and as such need to be fixed (Mary Whitehouse, Child Line) (Becker, 1963). Moral entrepreneurs work to address their own agendas under the pretence of helping society, and help turn social issues into moral crusades (Becker, 1963). The role of the media in the creation of moral panics is crystallised by the current crisis surrounding paedophilia in modern society, which has been partly created by the News of the World. The News of the World ran a series of anti-paedophile campaigns, campaigning for stricter government procedures and public disclosure of sex offender information in the wake of the death of Sarah Payne in 2000. The paper campaigned on behalf of the Payne family with their permission and support (Day, 2001, 12 December; Guardian.co.uk), wanting to see the introduction of Sarah’s Charter (Critcher, 2002), the final aspect of which was the full disclosure of sex offender information in the UK, which was named ‘Sarah’s law’; after ‘Megan’s Law’ in America. The News of the World campaigned for this under the title ‘for Sarah’, which eventually led to their ‘name and shame’ campaign.

In the News of the World’s 23rd of July 2000 edition, the paper launched its ‘name and shame’ campaign. This was intended to highlight some of the countries worst and most prolific paedophiles as well as child sexual abusers, as such the paper argued this information would enable parents to appropriately and successfully protect their children from child sexual abuse. The News of the World published two sets of paedophile details on the 23rd and 30th of July, with the later leading to the Pauls Grove riots (Critcher, 2002); before the called of their campaign on the 6th of August after their ‘summit on Sarah’, so that they could focus on obtaining ‘Sarah’s charter. At the time the News of the world’s campaign received mixed reactions; for although the media supported Sarah’s charter they condemned public disclosure (Critcher, 2002), particularly by the Sun (Hodgson, 2001, December 13; Guardian.co.uk.), the
guardian and the observer (‘Don’t betray Sarah Now’, August 6th, 2000; The Observer). The News of the World was also condemned by policy makers and the government; with the Association of Chief officers of probation threatening court action (Morris, 2000, 31 July; Guardian.co.uk), the Association of Chief police officers condemning it (Morris, 2000, 31 July; Guardian.co.uk), as well as Jack Straw (the then Home Secretary) and Ann Widdecombe (Conservative MP) objecting to it, stating that the News of the World coverage was irrational and harmful (Dodd, 2000, 25 July; Guardian.co.uk.). However, the Payne family were positive about the News of the World campaigns (Day, 2001, 12 December; Guardian.co.uk), and there seemed to be widespread public support (Critcher, 2002), which lead the News of the World to justify their actions (Hodgson, 2001, December 13; Guardian.co.uk.).

The News of the World campaign was the starting point for the moral panic that swept Britain at the start of the current century, and is still in existence today. At the time who could have known that the death of one little girl (Sarah Payne) and the actions of one newspaper editor (Rebecca Wade, News of the World) would have had such an inflammatory effect on the public (Critcher, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2002). The News of the World campaign achieved all of the criteria of its Sarah’s charter bar one, the public disclosure of sex offender information (Critcher, 2002). Even though Sarah’s law has not been introduced in the UK, this does not mean that it will not be; especially because the government’s opinion on the viability of this controversial law is complex, confusing and worryingly inconsistent (Dodd, 2000, July 24: Guardian.co.uk; Morris, 2000, July 31: Guardian.co.uk; ‘No.10 admits Megan’s Law problems’, 2006, June 19: bbc.co.uk; Assinder, 2006, June 20: bbc.co.uk; ‘Sarah’s Law to Start in Months’, 2007, April 9:TheSun.co.uk; Travis, 2007, April 11: Guardian.co.uk; Home Office, 2007).

The development of the ‘name and shame’ campaign shows how the News of the World seized on public concern and reinforced social boundaries, while at the same time promoting a level of unrealistic fear and paranoia over an already sensitive issue (Silverman & Wilson, 2002). The newspaper played on the irrational fear of parents, warning of stranger danger, and the corruption of the nation’s children as a result of the sexual practices of a number of harmful deviants. They did not however, discuss the threats of abuse to children within the home (incest, domestic violence, and
neglect), which are far more prevalent in society than the threats from solitary, sexual predators (Howitt, 1995; Briere & Elliott, 2003). The News of the World’s crusade in turn transformed the social concern surrounding paedophilia into a moral panic, as people started to see indicators of paedophilia everywhere and demanded more be done about it. Also, because of the infusion of other types of media influence into the melting pot (‘Brass Eye Special – Paedophilia’, July 26, 2001: Channel 4; ‘The Hunt for Britain’s Paedophiles’, June, 2002: BBC 2; ‘Exposed: The Bail Hostel Scandal’, November 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2006: Panorama, BBC 1) reinforced the public idea that this is a major social concern. Hence, demonstrating how paedophilia is a social construction which has adapted over time, this has occurred through reflexive modernity, with the media acting as the main catalyst for this change and as a result has helping to create the current social risk and moral panic of paedophilia in modern society.

Combating the current crisis of paedophilia

This chapter has indicated there is a great deal of ambiguity surrounding all aspects of paedophilia and its role in modern society. Hence, the chapter will conclude by discussing possible future directions in regard to paedophilia in modern society, so to reduce the ambiguity surrounding paedophilia, lead to a greater understanding of paedophilia and the negation of the current ‘crisis’.

Current understandings of paedophilia are ambiguous and as such there needs to be greater future research in this area, with in funding from government agencies, charities and funding councils. This need for greater research and funding is exacerbated because paedophilia has become a massive social concern (West, 2000; Cohen, 2002; Silverman & Wilson, 2003) and therefore we need to be able understand how to identify, treat and respond to it; therefore calling for an increase in positive, realistic and open minded research. Future research could address paedophiles understandings and explanations of their offences; professional perspectives on new/alternative treatments, the development of typologies and on the development of best practice. However, as previous research indicates paedophiles are not a heterogeneous group (Van Dam, 2001), therefore it has to be surmised that maybe we will not be fully understand these offenders, especially in general terms, and it may
only be possible to understand them as individuals, with adaptable treatments, policing and legislation.

Paedophilia has become a major social concern, resulting it becoming a high profile political issue set against a background of public protection, risk management and popular punititiveness (Scourfield and Walsh, 2003; Thompson, 2005; McAlinden, 2006A). The high profile and ambiguous nature of paedophilia is exacerbated by the government’s inconsistent approach to understanding and dealing with paedophilia; particularly in relation to public disclosure. Currently in the UK the government operates a policy of informed/evidence based policy making (Gurbin, 1998; Pawson, 2001; Critcher, 2002; Nutley, Davies and Walter, 2002; Pawson, 2002A; Nutley, Walter & Davies, 2003) as such they need to promote more funding, greater research and listen to professional opinion, all of which will allow them to make better informed decisions in regard to paedophilia. Although, the government policies and changes already enacted into law are positive, there is still more to do (Home Office, 2007); including increasing their support and funding of Criminal Justice Agencies, focusing greater emphasis on victim support, funding more research, developing greater social awareness of paedophilia and workable strategies for the re-integrating of sex offenders back into the community.

As the chapter has revealed the media is central to the social construction of issues, the distribution of expert knowledge and their perceived impact upon the public as well as the government; all of which are particularly important in regard to paedophilia. Which raises the question of: would a different media approach result in a different social reaction and comprehension of paedophilia? Hence, suggesting that the media could be engage more in research led approach to the stories that they pursue, as such presenting a more comprehensive and educated portrayal of the issues (‘The Hunt for Britain’s Paedophiles’, BBC 2, June, 2002; ‘Exposed: The Bail Hostel Scandal’, Panorama, November 8th, 2006), especially if they also portrayed the story more realistically and used less sensationalistic language. This adaptation of current media strategy could result in reduction in the current moral panic of paedophilia, leading to a more reasoned debate surrounding paedophilia, as well as the opportunity for a more realistic and workable approach to dealing with these offenders.
Finally there needs to be greater public education in regard to paedophilia. Although research suggests that the public may have a good understanding of paedophilia (McCartan, 2004), this could always be improved on. The public needs to be better informed of salient and original research findings, as well as changes in child protection policy. Public education in regard to paedophilia should be handled both by the government and professionals, being facilitated by the media, using a delicate, non-emotional and realistic approach. The proposed changes to public education on paedophilia could facilitate an open and frank discussion of child sexual abuse in society, leading to a better understanding and a reduction in the contemporary myths, as well as fears surrounding paedophilia.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed current theoretical and research positions surrounding paedophilia, the current public conceptions of paedophilia and the current crisis of paedophilia in modern society. The current chapter suggests that although there is a greater awareness of paedophilia in modern society, a great ambiguity still exists and paedophilia has become a moral panic. Ergo, reinforcing that paedophilia is a social construction and therefore society’s attitude to and understanding of paedophilia has, and will, continue to change over time. In order to reduce the outcry and misconceptions surrounding paedophilia in modern society there needs to be an increase in public education, greater research as well as funding for research, a change in media approaches to paedophilia and increase social discussions of paedophilia.
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