

An Incarnation of Imbalance:
Ancient Greek Pederasty and Its Reprise in the Catholic Church

Sasha Ray

SUNY Purchase

Journalism & Philosophy

It is difficult by nature to say in a few words just what love is, how it looks, or what it means. It is difficult by nature to attempt to claim or define or give attributions to what love itself is. Depending on the context being asked, and what attribution it's looking to be assigned to. Love is said to be a universal thing, and is written about very often in popular culture. Overrated, some might say, in the romantic sense, or the sense that lies outside the realm of friendship, familial love, or the kind of love that is not expressed physically. Love takes many different forms, ideals, and is described as a physical entity in varying ways depending on who is speaking. The universal agreement about love is that it cannot be anything inherently evil about it, there cannot be anything necessarily detractive about love itself in its truest form.

It is easier, therefore, to state what love is not, to say instead what the absence of love is. It is more possible to say instead what the opposite of love is, because there are several opposites of love, none of which are definite or incorrect if not identical to another's idea of the opposite of love.

Much like building a sculpture, it may be easier to define love by first chipping away at what does not apply, cannot be named pertinent, and is not applicable under the definition or true notion of love. This may or may not bring us closer to the definition of love itself, rather than a contradiction, but the notion of love is difficult to define, however it is very easy to understand and recognize a practice that is not love, especially when it is being passed off that way. By dependence on romance in this widely regarded definition, love itself is overlooked and remains unseen in many an applicable situation, maybe because it's not the romantic type, therefore it's not seen or considered love, nor can any act that isn't inherently romantic be considered a "loving" act, and "making love" is purely something physical.

If love cannot be defined one way, and there are many ways to define what love is not, I would like to attempt to do so, by naming one particular institutionalization and situation in which love is not applicable, while it is often said to be.

For the structure of what I denounce as being love, I will use the claim that control has no place in any claim of love, and has been ever-too present in many of the presented situations in which I will argue has too long been called and considered love for all the wrong reasons. I argue that pederasty in the context of Ancient Athenian culture was not a reflection of love due to the power dynamic incorporated in the practice. Within this power dynamic, there included an element of control, which, according to some, is the opposite of love. There cannot be love in any situation where control is being designated for the use of a person, or, in Kantian theory, applying the use of control to gain means, or using someone as a means. The imbalance of power paired with the use of people, and incorporating control to exploit a position that is usually loving, points to a conclusion that in general, no part of the practice of pederasty, nor any imitation that may have been modeled after it, is love. Pederasty acted as a mockery of love due to the acts incorporated in it, and due due to the power imbalance, and therefore inability for equality, sameness, likeness, or matching in this case. In the reprise of pederasty and pederastic relationships, or the imitations of them due to action and the dynamic of participants in modern-day institutions involving males is a far more blatant example of the absence of love. By extension, the claim that pederastic relationships in their original institutionalization set the tone for the remainder of history holds validity, since the reprise of pederasty in its repeated happenings, due to systemic upholdings of relationships rooted in power, using control, and men widely and most often being the instigators of such recurrences. Alternatively, systems with men

in power simply cannot exist without the abuse of their position, used towards other people within their reach (in some cases literally).

Sexual actions, behaviors, and routines, either loving or exploitative acts by nature of the setting, procedure, and occurrence in which they take place, were sorry excuses for the claim of love when used and made use of as often as they had been in the context of pederasty. Even more so, the imitations, similar on the basis of setup, action, and recurrence in the institution of the Catholic Church mirror the proof that love is not present solely based in sexual acts, even when emotions of affection are present, seeing as love comes in many forms, and adding a physical ingredient can cross a line, diminish any kind of connection previously formed, and break the trust and bond built over time.

Tied together by the common factor of men in power, younger boys have been falling victim to sexual objectification, in a similar way to women in the context of rape culture, by male figures towering over them, oftentimes in hoods, robes, or tunics, gaining extremity (danger) following the turn of the century with the presence, incorporation, and reinforcement of law, psychology, and societal acceptance.

Within the realm of grown men seeking, obtaining, and sharing relations with young boys, or boys several years less their age, since the beginning of time, discoveries surrounding the continuum of the occurrence have been uncovered, concluded, and released publicly. The use of control, coercion, the misuse of societal and/or occupational position(s), and most relevantly, the exploitation of child- and adolescent-status boys prove common themes in both the institution of pederastic relationships between mentors and mentees in Ancient Athens and abuse in the Catholic Church. However, the incorporation of danger, fear tactics, manipulation,

trickery, and masked intentions are proven through the means of attaining the similar goal in the case of priests; all factors that had been less evident, if occurring at all, in the case of the Greeks.

Throughout this essay, I inspect the institution of pederasty from its implementation and original establishment. Based on indicative depictions, historical sources, and the discussion of pederasty and love in *The Symposium*, I assert that pederastic relationships [in their original setting] were neither expressions nor demonstrations of love, but were actually exhibitions of an uneven power dynamic existing between its participants. In extension of my initial claim, I argue that modern-day exploitations of young boys, thriving on the same imbalance of power, namely those occurring and recurring between priests and young children, exist on the basis of the same imbalance of power. In my arguments, and with the comparison presented, I intend to nullify the claim that love had ever been included in either aforementioned situation.

In its earliest establishment, the nature of sexual relationships between men and adolescents was considered a norm. The initial implementation of homoeroticism existed as an incorporative part of Ancient Athenian society, and was viewed as, and believed to be, a reflection of genuine, romantic love between its [adult and adolescent] participants. Initiated simultaneously as a romantic and pedagogical venturing, men and boys embarked in relationships incorporating both aforementioned relational aspects for the majority of a younger man's teenage years.

At the time of its inception in Ancient Athens, pedagogy mirrored the model of private lessons, a fitting platform for the integration of sexual acts into the pedagogical setup. With the absence of formal school systems, the utilized structure of education led easily into the type of relationship lending itself to the term “Greek love.”¹ The purpose of sexual integration in a pedagogical setup, however, holds greater pertinence to the nature of the relation between its participants. Teachers and students, also called mentors and mentees, speaking to the nature of intimacy and one-on-one specialized guidance provided by the educators due to these alternative titles, served dual positions as romantic partners to one another, intertwining the setting of education with sexual exchanges and ongoing. This type of [carnal] relation, referenced as pederasty² in the context of Ancient Greece, was a standard practice to the demographic of budding citizens in Ancient Athens. Needless to say, the education instituted in Ancient Athens differed vastly from the setup of modern-day education.

The purpose of sexual integration into pedagogy may very well have served the purpose of sexual pedagogy; or demonstrating to a budding man, who would eventually become a husband, how to engage with a woman in order to procreate or stimulate pleasure. Within this model, however, the inclusion of sexual activity for the purpose of education was, at some points in time, disregarded altogether. By this theory, the integration of sexual behaviors or occurrences was not always incorporated exclusively for education or the benefit of the student’s knowledge, understanding, or skill.

¹ In the context of this essay, the term “Greek love” is used to reference to the euphemism for sexual relationships between men and children [mostly referenced in their Athenian implementation].

² The definition of the word “pederasty” itself refers to a sexual relationship involving a man and a boy. In the context of Ancient Greek history, pederasty refers to the practice of men and boys engaging sexually as a component of education.

A grown man, usually in his early to mid-20s, paired with an adolescent boy, usually only several years younger, were the credited icons of pederastic relationships during their establishment. (The earliest forms of misogyny were displayed in Athens during the 5th Century, BCE, by barring women from citizenship and therefore, education, making education during this era an operation exclusive to males. “Since the segregation of women was a feature of most Greek communities, so that women and girls of citizen family would not very often be seen in public by men, and hetairai who knew their business would tend to imitate this discretion in order to not cheapen themselves (cf. p. 88).”³) The commencement of an adolescent boy’s education, and thereby, romantic and sexual involvement with a man, was initiated by the desire of the older, more well-established half of the relationship’s equation, known as the *erastes*, or lover. This arrangement, and the titles given to its participants, nuanced that one half of the relationship was below the other (the lower half being the *eromenos*, or beloved, the half of the relationship with less power), in the romantic and/or general sense. “The perception that Greek pederasty usually conformed to an age-differential model with the older partner as the active wooer and the younger as the passive object of pursuit has led some scholars to see the active/passive polarity as fundamental to the significance of pederasty as a social institution,”⁴ highlights the point that there was an upper and lower half of the equation. This is a model fitting for the method of teaching, in which there is always one person who holds power above those being educated, taught, or guided. With romantic involvement, however, the dynamic of unbalanced dependency and dominance is displaced, considering a romantically involved pairing is meant to be a partnership.

³ Hubbard, *Greek Homosexuality*, II The Prosecution of Timarkhos, 66

⁴ Hubbard, *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents*, 10

Following the logic of the above statement, it is arguable that the model of education as described in Ancient Greece was far more fitting for the purpose of education, or pedagogy. The implementation of non-educational sexual inclusion in pedagogical relationships was, arguably, an exhibition of the imbalance of power utilized for the wrong reasons.

Titled due to its roots from the original context in which man/child relationships took place, Greek love set the groundwork for the imbalanced continuation of man/child relationships in the centuries that came after the centuries BCE.

The continuation of patterns have gained expansion in the evolution of societal advancement in various components. It is not explicit where and how specifically such relationships have been upheld and continued in varying cultures throughout history and the world since their origination in Athenian culture, but it is unlikely that the continuation of Greek love has, at any point since its implementation, gone on hiatus or stopped occurring at any point in time throughout the history of the world. The term “love” serves an ironic and confusing theme, seeing as nearly all relationships explored are rooted in the basis of control, or power used for the wrong reasons.

In a flash-forward with the continuous theme of Greek love, the most imputed perpetrators of man/child sexual occurrences conduct Mass on Sundays. The recurring theme of child sexual abuse almost directly mirrors the acts originally tagged with the title “Greek love,” but including several glaring modifications, or alternatively calling into question the morality and ideology of its original implementation and occurrence. Moreover, it is possible that the differences, if any, between the two institutions are miniscule, indistinguishable, or otherwise

indeterminable. The framework of both instances is similar in nature, concurrence, and in historical prevalence.

The reasoning behind the occurrences themselves, as well as the outcomes, and purposes of their origination of both happenings, or practices, in the case of pedagogical pederasty, provide a substantial dichotomy in their setup, outcome, and aftereffects.

This type of connection, is problematic and inappropriate in nature, due to the imbalance undeniably incorporated in their recurrence and due to the difference in age of participants, bringing into question legality, morality, and ethical integrity given the context in which they take place.

Due to the absence of all-inclusive public schools and modern-day laws regulating compulsory attendance, education in Ancient Athens was reserved for sons from noble, well-regarded families. Teaching positions, and therefore the responsibility of teaching the younger demographic, or “youths,” as they were referred, were dependent upon men of the upper class, or citizens of Athens. Ancient Athenian education, also called mentorship, held the purpose of teaching a young man the public duties he would soon be held responsible for [as a citizen]. In this pedagogical setup, mentees, or students, were taught the ins and outs of the daily or common tasks expected of citizens, as this was a role they would take on at the commencement of their adulthood.

Within the realm of erastes-eromenos, or mentor-mentee relationships, teenage and recently-turned adolescent boys were awaited, sought after, and harvested at the perceived commencement of their manhood, or the shedding of their childhood, by citizens in Ancient

Athens. According to Hubbard, the demographic of youths outnumbered the demographic of available citizens ready and waiting to mentor younger boys during the time “Simple demographic reckoning tells us that eligible youths in that short-lived, but most desirable, window of efflorescence (from about fourteen to eighteen) were far fewer than the adult lovers who might pursue them (Greek men typically did not marry until their thirties).⁵” A relationship was initiated at the indication that the boy in question was becoming a man; symbolized through early signs of manhood through budding facial hair, indicating that he was ready for an education, and thereby, romantic embarking. When an eromenos’ facial hair grew out fully, the indication was that he had been sufficiently educated, and was now ready to take on a wife, an eromenos of his own, or both, and the cycle was repeated. Eromenoses were chosen and pursued by their lovers, or today’s equivalent of a boyfriend, due to their youth and beauty.

The Athenian curriculum took place in the *symposia*, the setting recognized for the advancement of thought and analytical theory,⁶ or more simply, the shaping of a psyche, and *gymnasia*, physical training⁷ or advancement. “The new mode involved along with the mentor-pupil bond new ways to prepare the youth’s strength of body (gymnasium) and mind (the symposium).”⁸

The symposium, a social gathering in which poetry, music, and affections were exchanged, was a setting which provided ample opportunity for mentees to be both chosen for education [by mentors] and shown love, either through physical affection or art forms utilized.

⁵ *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome*, 11

⁶ “Excluding adolescents from symposia would have prevented the participants from using their discussions to educate the youths, clearly one of its functions.” (*Pederasty and Pedagogy in Ancient Greece*, 117)

⁷ “The term *gymnasia* signifies “exercises in the nude;” and *gymnasion*, “the place of nudity.” The verb *gymnazomai* “to exercise in the nude” *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, 114

⁸ *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, 96

“These gatherings provided an opportunity to court and flirt with the youths. ...Sipping wine with his young friend and while exchanging poetry or ribald songs, a gentleman might flirt with him and even kiss and embrace him. Often the songs praised an eromenos who might be present.”⁹ The advancement of thought stimulated through symposia was also an integral aspect for the youths involved, although this aspect hasn’t been as elaborated upon as the aspect of affections. “Excluding adolescents from symposia would have prevented the participants from using their discussions to educate the youths, clearly one of its functions.”¹⁰ Symposia were more often understood to be and established as settings in which pederasty was practiced, performed, and initiated; it was a setting in which many eromenos were paired or taken up into relationships for the first time.

Gymnasia, unlike symposia, was participated and performed in a one-on-one setting. “Athletics rendered the Greek adolescent more desirable as an eromenos. It was not merely the beauty and flexibility of his body that they improved, but his endurance and self-control. Thus exercise in gymnasia could inspire love as truly as flirtation at symposia.”¹¹

Mentees were taught wrestling and gymnastics with their mentors, an indirect form of training that prepared mentees for war. “The discipline and endurance that prepared a youth for athletics could also prepare him for war, the most essential duty of a citizen.”¹² The emphasis on nudity in the athletic portion of education shortened the jump from education to sexual advancement, or incorporation, into the educations of youths when practicing gymnasia in particular. The incorporation of nudity in gymnasia has been credited to Orsippus of Megara,

⁹ *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, 117

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, 98

¹² *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, 98

“who dropped his loincloth – whether by accident or design is unclear – while running in an early Olympiad, most commonly the fifteenth in 720.”¹³

In both pedagogical settings, the incorporation of physical affection [or physical interaction] was a heavily incorporated aspect and was a seemingly seamless transition from the pedagogical [aspect], since both situations allowed and even anticipated sexual acts based on the scene setup. In the structure of the symposium, “Archaic men’s dining rooms seem to have had seven couches: two along each wall with one missing. The number was sometimes expanded to three benches along each wall.”¹⁴ Symposia was designed almost specially for reclining on couches between lovers; this part of symposia being almost the exact purpose for its existence.

Mentors, taking the role of teachers and [upper-hand] lovers simultaneously, were the sole educators of the one student they took responsibility of teaching. The significance of the word “mentor” points to the specialized and individualized guidance provided to a mentee, or student, by his mentor. Friendship and romantic partnership, [the type of relationship] incorporating acts reserved for romantic relationships, were both integral aspects of the relationship setting between mentors and mentees. In this way, the nature of mentor/mentee relationships are separate in nature from teacher-student relationships, which are centered around the phenomenon of education, or learning in a formal setting (as opposed to fusing romance with learning); education in this day and age is emphasized only for the benefit of its students and, when referred to, is solely academic (rather than physical, in the romantic or pedagogical sense). “The goal of pedagogical mentorship was not to objectify and subordinate [boys from elite

¹³ *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, 114

¹⁴ Percy III, *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Ancient Greece*, 116

families], but to advance their socialization into the elite male world of the symposium and athletics, and eventually politics and the life of the mind.”¹⁵ Although education was incorporated in pederastic relationships, education, meaning the advancement and acquiring of skills utilized in citizenship and societal expectations alone, was not the only component, as it is in the current day.

In the present day, academic teachers serve only the role of educators to their students, and are nothing more, as it has been deemed important for the connection between students and educators to remain just that. The role of a teacher is one that stays in its place: in the classroom.

Unlike the nature and dynamic of a modern-day student-teacher relationship, which places emphasis on its assistance in the cognitive development of a student, mentorships held a significant difference in the integration of physical expressions of education, perceived and referred to as love during its time. In this way, teachers were dually boyfriends, romantic partners, or lovers, as well as educators (due to the nature of what they taught, especially in gymnasias).

Once an eromenos began showing physical signs of adulthood through a thick and full beard, his lessons were ceased. His duties as a citizen were now to commence, and he was furthermore expected to marry off and begin putting to use what he had learned from his mentor throughout the years of his education; among these lessons procreation. “Some [erastes] presumably ejaculated between the thighs of their boys as certain vase paintings may imply.”¹⁶ This type of sexual encounter was one that more than likely took place for the education and

¹⁵ *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome*, page 12

¹⁶ *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, 7

benefit of the latter half, since it may well have come into use for procreation at the time of an eromenos' marriage and time of child conception. Alternatively, the nature and practice of intercrural intercourse may have been due to the perspective that anal intercourse was effeminate, although according to the artwork, it was a position very often engaged.

Concluded due to common depictions of Ancient Athenian culture displaying scenes of Greek love, anal intercourse was a commonly incorporated theme in the relational sexual context of men and boys, or, as they're written, "youths" with boys (youths presumably being an alternative title for the older member of the courtship or relationship). Copulation of this type provided no type of educational benefit nor takeaway to the eromenos, since the nature of this particular sexual relation did not provide any viable possibility for the gateway to procreation. The purpose of intercrural intercourse as a component of education existed for this very reason, and therefore had viability as a component of education. It is difficult to determine how often, or what percentage of the time, the eromenos took pleasure or welcomed such acts, or how often they were made to perform identical acts on their erastes, or teacher, since the commonness of boys penetrating youths anally is far less often depicted.

It is indicated through the artwork of Ancient Greek participants of pederasty that the physical acts were not initially welcomed by those being pursued¹⁷, and by theoretical extension of this depiction, the unrequited desire of advances towards boys may have led to confusion, resistance, or uncooperative behaviors on the part of the boy(s) being pursued. Depictions

¹⁷ "Man courts a youth, who shields his own genitals with his hand," figure B65, *Greek Homosexuality*, "A muscular youth resists a man's attempt to touch his genitals," figure B342, *Greek Homosexuality*, "Youths court boys, whose degree of resistance varies." figure R196a, *Greek Homosexuality*

indicate that the initiation of interest towards a younger male was indicated through physical touch, or the attempt or advancement of physical touch, and sometimes incorporated a “courting gift,” intended to indicate the interest in the boy on the part of the youth.¹⁸ It is a viably defensible claim that a courting “gift” was a bribe, allurance, or down payment. It may have been equivalent to another culture’s custom: giving livestock, horses, cows, goats, sheep, pigs, or some other animal or item of value to a girl’s father in exchange for his daughter’s hand in marriage, as a “gift” of sorts, but imitating the same setup in this case.

In Plato’s *Symposium*, the speeches made by the guests of the party describe love as they believe it to be, taking different forms, in some cases a celestial being, in other ways, it is a virtue of the highest regard in the eyes of the Gods, among other descriptions. In the speech of Aristophanes, the description of physical love is given more a purpose than a form itself.

“Each of us, [then,] is a “matching half” of a human whole, because each was sliced like a flatfish, two out of one, and each of us is always seeking the other half that matches him. People who are split from male are male-oriented.”¹⁹

Aristophanes’ speech assumes the presence of equality and consensus on both sides of relationship, both by the pursued and the pursuant. However, seeing as this was not the case as far as the setup and inner workings of pederasty, due to the power dynamic, actions taken, and depictions revealing that within the frameworks of and Greek education, or love, Aristophanes’ speech cannot be applicable to pederasty in the way it is described. In the context of love itself, when it is equal, balanced, and reciprocated in every sense possible, Aristophanes’ explanation of love is very relevant. Due to the imbalance present between mentors, stemming in their age,

¹⁸ “A man courts a youth. The bird held by the youth is a courting gift.” Figure B16, *Greek Homosexuality*, “Men court youths, and one pair copulates. The stag and cockerel are courting-gifts.” Figure B250, *Greek Homosexuality*

¹⁹ *The Symposium*, The Speech of Aristophanes, 191d-191e, 49

societal position, and the lack of reciprocation in several different occurrences, love in the sense that Aristophanes is attempting to describe it is not applicable.

Another speaker, Pausanias, describes love in such a way that almost directly explains and exemplifies the difference between pederasty and love, accentuating the imbalance in the situation of pederasty, making clear that a man, or youth, and a boy are separate in status, and the dynamic of requited affections, or love, in the case of it happening, is an important, exciting, or noteworthy occurrence.

“In truth, the gods honor virtue most highly when it belongs to Love. They are more impressed and delighted, however, and are more generous with a loved one who cherishes his lover, than with a lover who cherishes the boy he loves.”²⁰

In Pausanias’ speech, the idea of a younger man being reciprocative in the “love” expressed to him by an older man is indicated to be a rare thing, something special, important, exciting, and noteworthy; revealing in this way, that this sort of reciprocation, or reciprocation on the part of the beloved, or boy, is not the norm. Virtue, in such a context, is unidentifiable, since there is little virtue in the depictions of the way courtship and pederasty took place.

In the establishment of pederastic relationships within the educational realm, the institution of education by youths might have been a manipulation tactic in order to gain the trust of the younger half, or used as a disguise to perform sexual acts on the boy. Within this claim, sexual acts, when engaged in, extended beyond the point of educational benefit (this being intercrural sex, easily applicable to a boy’s education in the use of marriage and procreation) or

²⁰ *The Symposium*, The Speech of Pausanias, 36

teaching position being put out of the picture. Alternatively, it may have been seen as a benefit, or a perk, in the general responsibility that came with teaching. While education in general is very important, and while it may have provided benefit in the case of showing a young man the necessary components of citizenship, as well as what would someday come into use during the time of marriage and procreation, there was an exploitation of the position of power, and the use of the teaching of skills for selfish, unbalanced purposes.

The purpose of non-educational sexual acts or behaviors between mentors and mentees is not transparently clear, but there are several different possible purposes or reasons the existence of non-educational sexual acts between mentors and mentees may have taken place. Due to the depictions on vases deriving pederastic scenes and/or occurrences, it becomes more explicit that pederasty in its setup was not an expression of love, since it was not enthusiastically reciprocated on both parts of the relationship, and was initiated by one half of the relationship; fittingly, the one that was in possession of power and status, and had to be bribed, bought, or given incentive, rather than having incentive itself.

It is possible that, as an extension of a mentor's education, which substantiatedly included intercrural sex as a component of education, although it may very well have served a dual purpose, catering to pleasure on the part of the receiver as well as it being a component of education, it wasn't too far a jump from the educational aspect, and may have been viewed by the mentor as something they deserved, or had earned, almost as a return payment for the education provided. It also may have been the case that manipulation tactics were used, perhaps

by telling the mentee that giving sexual pleasure to his mentor was a component of his education, and he would therefore go on to continue the cycle when taking on his own mentee, or eromenos.

The intention of sexual pursuing by the erastes, or mentor is not evident, but it is depicted very openly that love did not take place, and was not stimulated nor reciprocated in many depictions or descriptions incorporating a relationship involving a man, or youth, and a boy.

The occurrence of similar actions in different historical eras have evolved through time due to various factors (explained further below).

Despite the likeness in [explicit sexual] actions by priests to the ancient Athenian practice, further resemblance to pederasty in its original context is limited. The difference in age and status of the upper half of the equation are ever-present themes in both scenarios, leading to the easily-found approximation to both scenarios. While the age gap and actions incorporated in modern-day relationships involving men and children were and are upheld, and therefore sustained similarity to the original practice, the reprise of Greek love [in churches] was not an expected, accepted, or well-established happening for those who were exposed or susceptible to it; those who were involved were considered to have fallen victim to the modern-day replication of pederasty by definition.²¹

Through societal evolution, the nature of man/child or man-boy relationships have manifested varying degrees of importance and relevance, and proven to have an effect on

²¹ The term “pederasty” [by] itself refers solely to the definition of a sexual relationship involving a grown man and a young boy; however, in the context of Ancient Greece, pederasty indicates [a reference to] the nature of such a relationship as a practice [in] itself.

children. Following the commencement of the 20th century, an unbalanced and unreciprocated form of pederasty,²² continued under a different [more informed] title and categorization, one that has, due to the continuation of man-boy relationships, been recognized as exploitative, inappropriate, violatory, and harmful to the latter half of the equation.

Without evidence of any kind regarding psychological detriment as a result of the practice (when it was established and recognized as a practice or institution) in its birthplace, the effect of pederastic relationships on young men living in ancient times is undeterminable. The occurrence of pederastic patterns between its participants was viewed as love, benefit, and overall a positive establishment or institution, and therefore did not stimulate any kind of particular criticism, change, or abolishment during its time. While there may have been negative aspects to the institution of pederasty itself, as it has been depicted, and while the practice may not have been love in fact, the widespread acceptability of the practice, mostly due to its interpreted reciprocation and purpose for institutionalization, did not uphold the same norms as the Catholic Church. Arguably, this may have been due to the lack of developed psychology and an understanding of the effect on boys in a similar setting.

The aforementioned practice during the 5th through 7th centuries held a dual purpose, this being a romantic partnership fused with the institution of education. In this model, students and teachers both held two roles, the first and most relevant role being a romantic partner to the other, the latter a role of a participant in education (teacher or student). Seeing as education was most viable in this way (that is, a one-on-one setting between two men) during its time, there was no fault found in it due to the good it served – young men were taught. In other words, an erastes

²² “Pederasty” in regard to the systemic cycle of misused power/displaced control is based solely on the definition of the word. The term “pederasty” by definition indicates the integration of consent on both sides.

held two roles in the life of a student: a teacher, or mentor, as well as a lover or boyfriend.

Arguably, both roles were relevant to teaching; however, the presence of physical love needn't have been present for such education to have taken place. Regardless, in this setup, education and love became a package deal. One could not consist without the other aspect.

In the case of priests, holding only one very significant position, the happenings are all the worse considering the role a priest has. (Oftentimes, in the stories of victims, a priest took the position of a father or important male figure if one was absent, therefore making the goings on more jarring to those targeted.) Generally speaking, a priest takes on a profession that centers around a lifestyle immersive in the profession; therefore, a priest cannot leave his office at the end of the day and resume status as a regular member of society, due to the role he holds.

Following this argument, a priest holds only one role and only one societal status, both to society at large, and to his parishioners.

The biggest factor(s) generating the dichotomy between the acceptability of the practice [during its occurrence], with emphasis on the time periods, include the development of modern psychology, and therefore, humankind coming to a more sophisticated level of understanding of child and adolescent growth, development, and a deeper understanding of what can damage it; a legal system, and therefore a statutory code criminalizing and outlawing acts that had once [during the 5th century] been considered a norm, an expected part of a young man's early adulthood, and a fundamental piece of a certain era's society, as a result of the psychological findings. The placement of this law is set as the utilization of protection for victims of sexual abuse; should it occur, the appropriate consequences are [to be] taken against the perpetrator.

Following the formation of the aforementioned statutory code and psychological research addressing [the effect(s) of] man-boy relationships [on the minors inducted into the happenings], developed society reached a point in which it could not and cannot return to the custom that Ancient Greece had once established, followed, and engaged in for years.

With attention to the status of young men, an eromenos was only sought after once he had been recognized as a young man, or alternatively, recognized as “no longer a child.” Any young boy was not regarded as a possible mentee before this point. Although an eromenos was indeed younger than his counterpart, he was only inducted into the practice once his childhood had been concluded. Childhood innocence was respected, only to be exchanged for adventure and the embarkings of adulthood once childhood itself had been shed.

Alternatively, and in likeness to the mindset of priests, the innocence of childhood was ripped out of the grasp of budding men, and they were thereby rushed into adulthood in a similar way to children earlier in age than eromenoses, although within the walls of a practice more structured in its setup due to its incorporation of rules and norms followed. Simply put, innocence was maintained through the respect of childhood and the innocence attached to it until physical maturity was reached, indicating that sexual maturity was to be developed next, and was therefore nurtured. The time when the innocence was shed may have been due to adolescents being pulled into sexual scenes, and therefore hastened development due to exposure, at the time of physical maturity.

Young boys targeted by priests manifested the biggest difference through the blatant display of their character, which still existed amid childhood innocence. In the scenario in which they were exposed and introduced to sex, due to sexual abuse by priests, innocence was an unignorable and universal characteristic of the identities of nearly all of its victims, especially with the lessons being taught in Sunday school classes (these being about love, friendship, kindness, good-heartedness, forgiveness, prayer, and giving back). Innocence in this case, while attempted to be protected by parents who see their children for what they are: young, curious, and hopeful, is ripped away from children for all the wrong reasons; innocence became replaced with confusion, shame, guilt, embarrassment, sadness, self-blame, or misunderstanding. Innocence from sexual exposure, especially from Catholic education regarding sex (i.e., chastity, celibacy), is ironic considering the happenings against their bodies and beliefs, and therefore childhood innocence is robbed, ripped away, and replaced with exposure to something that should be learned later in time.

Furthermore, the type of victim targeted by priests was fundamentally different. In the case of the Catholic Church, children from broken homes, poor families, those with divorced or absent parents (e.g. single mothers), or with home-life difficulties were most often victims. The vulnerability, helplessness, and dependency present in children from aforementioned situations made for easier access and lower repercussions, since poor families could not afford to press charges. A worldwide institution that was free, available, and open to the public became a beacon of hope, sanctuary (no pun intended) and community for children in families with few other places to turn.

In the case of Ancient Athens, education, and therefore sexual access to children, was a privilege extended only to children from upper class families; making sexual behaviors a white-collar occurrence. (Had sodomy between mentors and their mentees during the time of its rampant occurrence been considered illegal, as it is now, it would have been considered a white-collar crime due to the social status of its participants.)

In comparison to the case of modern-day schools, educational systems, and the relationships between teachers and students, the idea of love in teaching takes on a whole new meaning. If Greek love is ever introduced to students through occurrence, or demonstration by a teacher, as had so often taken place in Athenian culture, the ethics of the educator are called into play, and, similarly to priests, the purpose of a teacher's presence in the classroom is called into question.

In its original setting and circumstance, the dynamic of relationships between men and boys with particular accentuation upon the sexual [and romantic] aspect was a celebrated aspect of the practice and relationship. The romantic and sexual aspect(s) were regarded as an aspect of education as well as pleasure, paralleling [much of] the relationship itself. While sexual pleasure was an integral aspect of an eromenos's lessons, the incorporated sexual acts [inducing pleasure] were in fact lessons. The type of sexual relation(s) taking place were, a fair amount of the time, intercrural,²³ therefore imitating the type of sexual relation the eromenos would one day participate in with his spouse in order to produce offspring, although this practice has dual

²³ *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, somewhere or another

reasoning for existence (anal sex was viewed as effeminate, embarrassing, or otherwise degrading, and was therefore frowned upon, or excluded from the practice).

The nature of a pederastic relationship was established based in the commitment of both its members to one another, and, with the incorporation of sexual acts and behaviors, held the purpose of practice for what would be necessary during marriage. Because the establishment was viewed as love, or reciprocation of affections (and therefore did not raise controversy), it was respected during its time; or if not respected, it was not questioned, at least not publicly, nor in a manner that caused or raised concern, as the case of the Catholic Church did.

Operating within the walls of one of the world's strictest religious institutions, members of society conducting Mass on Sundays usually were not and are not allowed participation in what students of pederasts in Athens were being taught or prepared to do once their beards grew in and their lessons were to cease (i.e., marry and procreate). There are, of course, exceptions to this rule (e.g. priests who are married,) Unlike their historical predecessors, priests' engagement in comparable actions were more likely out of rebellion, desperation, or, in the case of certain priests, compulsion, otherwise left with an unanswered question as to why it had ever been taking place at all.

On January 6, 2002, a seven-word headline unveiled the truth behind years of secretive cycles involving men in cassocks. Ninety priests in one U.S. city alone were exposed through a newspaper headline for child molestation and rape, gaining public outrage towards the Church's allowing of cycles to be continued for years.

The explanation behind this ongoing crisis remains unknown, [as it may vary,] but its recurrence is relentless. Similarly to their Greek counterparts, priests engaged almost exclusively in forbidden²⁴ sexual acts with boys. With this similarity in place, homosexuality was, surprisingly, not a factor considered. In the case of priests, priests believed their celibacy vow remained uncompromised if they were to, in self-described terms, “fool around” with boys. The same could not be said had girls been made targets,²⁵ due to the nature of Catholicism outlawing fornication.²⁶ In general, priests are not permitted to marry and are to maintain a celibate lifestyle, however, there are often exceptions to this rule [unspecified]. It is unclear when the ongoing and compulsive abuse of boys, both child and adolescent aged, began within the stained-glass walls of the worldwide religious institution. Records indicating that the earliest case of clergy-initiated child sexual abuse took place in 1926, though it may have been taking place earlier, or previously to that.

In the 17 years following the initial story [broken], the system within the Catholic Church became widely viewed as a powerhouse of sexual exploitation of young children. Due to the exposure [of the problem] the Church received after the *Boston Globe*'s initial breaking of the story (and the hundreds of subsequent stories published throughout the year(s) following), the Church had thereby been indelibly stuck with the notion that sexual predators were, and remain to be, most often members of the archdiocese. While there is merit to this claim, it remains unsubstantiated, and therefore unproven.

There was not, and remains not, another institution in power or the public eyes with as

²⁴ This is a multifaceted use of the term “forbidden.”

²⁵ “We thought we were maintaining our celibacy vow if we fooled around with boys but not girls.” *Spotlight* and Its Revelations: *The New Yorker*; Sarah Larson

²⁶ The Catechism of the Catholic Church

many members with as pandemic an interest in prepubescent or adolescent boys in one area or institution since Ancient Greece. Institutions guilty of the same crimes that lie outside of the realm of theology are not as easily identifiable in one [singular] area.

Cases of sex abuse and exploitation [due to the imbalance of power, initiated by educators] are sporadically uncovered in the setting of private schools and pedagogical art institutions, namely music education. Without the same type of exposure that the Church had received, the aforementioned settings of sex abuse in pedagogical settings thrive in the same way the Church has for years. The extent of awareness of the goings on in pedagogical settings, however, are limited to those it affects, namely the victims. In other words, protection is based in secrecy. With the accumulation of centuries allowing for these behaviors to continue in the walls of the Church, though, institutions in which similar happenings occur (i.e. music education, private schools) is incomparable.

Happenings of the same sort are bound to reoccur until exposed [in a manner identical to the system of the Church], and oftentimes, will continue subsequently to exposure.

In itself, teaching is a loving act. To make known one's own insights, pass on the knowledge one has, or show a curious young mind the way to utilize newfound information or methods of thought is a gift that cannot be returned or reciprocated, but, like love, does not expect anything in return. Furthermore, when teaching, control is utilized and incorporated, due to the fact of what's being carried out, but because it's seen as being used for the right reasons, it's not seen as power, control, or misuse of either, but rather as good intention, which is an incorporative and necessary part of love.

The nature of a relationship between a teacher and a student, in an academic setting in particular, is a unique sort of camaraderie. The nature of a relationship between an educator and student in this day and age is one that is unique to its type in that it does not require or integrate physical contact once the student reaches a certain age. When a child's moldable cognitive and psychological development are in the works, the existence and constancy of physical touch from anyone surrounding them, oftentimes including school teachers, are neither considered inappropriate nor a point of concern, but necessary, important, and in some cases, incorporative, however this stage is usually grown out of by the conclusion of elementary school. It is understood by the student, regardless of age, that their teacher's purpose is for their own intellectual benefit, gain, and/or aid.

A teacher-student relationship is inevitable for the person assuming the role of a student, regardless of who their teacher is in an academic setting. (That is, a homeschooled student may have a teacher who is also a relative, therefore changing the dynamic of the "teacher" role; thus, such a relationship is both teacher-to-student and parent-to-child, etc.) The nature of a relationship between an educator and student in this day and age is one that is unique to its type in that it does not require or integrate physical contact once the student reaches a certain age. Following the conclusion of early childhood development, a student-teacher relationship is one that, unlike nearly any other, does not require or incorporate any sort of [extensive] physical contact. During early childhood years, constructed of ages 3-6, physical contact or touch is a vital aspect of child development and is therefore an incorporative part of early childhood education, especially in the case of special needs children. When a child's moldable cognitive and psychological development are in progress, normally [for] the duration of ages 3-6, the

presence and constancy of physical touch from anyone surrounding them, oftentimes including school teachers, are neither considered inappropriate nor a point of concern, but necessary, important, and in some cases incorporative, especially at younger ages; however this stage is usually grown out of by the conclusion of early elementary education. It is understood by the student, regardless of age, that their teacher's purpose [in their everyday lives and interactions] is for their own intellectual development. Following the conclusion of independence from such a need, educator-student relations are established and mutually understood as being hands-off and coexisting in the context of words, books, and content of knowledge.

The model of an older, more experienced person and a younger, less knowledgeable person is an appropriate and fitting model for the method, setup, and power dynamic of both teaching and being taught, [regardless of what constituted lessons], as well as the power dynamic of a teacher-student relationship.

In the general pedagogical model, there is always one person who holds power above those being educated, taught, or guided; this being the teacher, due to their elevated knowledge, ability, and awareness of the material, or lessons, being shown or passed on. In short, knowledge is power, or lends itself to those in positions of power; those looking to gain knowledge from those in possession of knowledge give attention, respect, regard, responsibility, and trust to the one in possession of it. Generally speaking, knowledge is gained through experience, something that can only be accumulated through years lived, and therefore, age; this being the reason that educators are, generally speaking, older than their students in essentially every formal case or example.

The power dynamic shared between a teacher and student is one that does not highlight heavily upon the imbalance between those involved in it when being practiced, carried out, or engaged in. The view of a teacher-student relationship is, when done properly, not seen as an imbalance of power at all, but instead a loving act, due to the benefit it provides, and the selflessness incorporated in teaching as an act or profession. (By extension, this is why mothers are said to be loving, since mothers and parents in general are teachers by default when deciding to have children.)

In other words, the nature of a teacher-student relationship does not include any sort of constant reminder or implication that one side of the relationship is above the other; it is generally understood and accepted due to the universal pedagogical setup. For the above reasons, the setting of pedagogy in Ancient Athens, an introduction of the model of education in general, was highly suitable for the non-physical portion of education especially. It was not viewed as imbalance.

With romantic involvement, however, the presence of improper imbalance due to dominance is ensued, considering a romantically- or sexually-involved pairing is meant to be a partnership. In the aforementioned description [of pedagogy], there is an undertone of dependency of a different sort, and therefore inequality within the theme of sexual or romantic engagement. This is relevant to any kind of romantic relationship stemming from the foundation of meeting as a teacher and a student. In the nature of relationships that are originally pedagogical and later made romantic, sexual, or otherwise skewed, the power dynamic becomes skewed, uneven, and highlights more heavily upon the difference in age, experience, and status of the two participants.

At an established age and level of education, a teacher-student relationship is unique to its own type; consisting of a nature dependent solely on a cognitive connection; maintained and built upon by verbal discussions, manifestations of one's ideas, opinions, and aspirations, and fostered through the admiration and common opinions of both parties.

In the platform of higher education, relationships between professors and [their] students have greater potential to become imitative of close platonic friendships. Cultivation of connections of this type are increased in possibility, probability, viability, and outcome in a university setting due to students having the option to spend more time, or time utilized differently than in a public or grade school setting (e.g. office hours, smaller classes, a schedule tailored to a student's interests and preferences, which in some cases can be based on the person teaching the class) with educators and therefore gain trust, trade insights, explore thoughts, share news, create opinions, and reveal certain thoughts, ideas, stories, or secrets. The nature of this kind of cultivated relationship can be imitative of the relationship one has with a best friend, or simply be constructed of a nature that takes the form of non-physical closeness based in cognitive intimacy, revelation of deep insights, and the opportunity to spend time with one another very often, either individually or in a group or lecture setting. By extension of the previous statement, a relationship with a best friend is essentially the kind of relationship that every other kind of relationship is built upon, and is stronger than any other kind, because romantic relationships are only considered "romantic" when they're physical (sexual) as well as romantic, and incorporative of many platonic elements, including admiration, friendship, and affection – all components that are present in a strong bond shared with a teacher, or professor.

Love can, and often does, exist in relationships between educators and their students; however, it is manifested, and therefore demonstrated and expressed, differently than in relationships of dynamics between friends, sibling, parents to children, etc. In the setting of a classroom, or academic setting, students express their love and appreciation by showing up to class, or choosing to partake in classes with the same professor, proving that they like, appreciate, and want to gain more insight from this particular educator, strengthening the bond they have. In another way, the student shows eagerness, gratitude, and desire for more by spending one on one time with their professor, going to office hours, asking them questions, etc., and looking to them for advice, help, support, encouragement, or positivity in a certain situation or due to a certain thing happening. This imitates the nature of a relationship between best friends, since they plan to spend a lot of time together, and usually much talking and communication is involved in the time spent together. A student-teacher relationship, because it is based in teaching, guidance, showing a student the way, and exposing them to new things, also takes the form of another kind of platonic relationship, one between parents and children, in some cases, albeit in a different setting, and moreover, with different lessons, while some may not be solely academic. Similarly to mentor/mentee relationships in Ancient Greece, teachers and students, like children with their parents, spend a much time together. Time spent together allows for the foundation of trust, bonding, appreciation, the gaining of insight of one another's good attributes to be built, added to, and therefore cherished, especially when done in a way that students are able to privately make known their concerns, misunderstandings, or shortcomings in the context of a classroom or academic setting.

In association to the relationship itself, the sort of love felt and shared between a teacher and a student exists in a different form than the kind of love that is manifested in any other kind of relationship, which may include physical contact, words of affirmation, or pet names, all things that do not occur in the case of a student-teacher-relationship. The type of love occurring in the teacher-student relationship includes affection, as is an integral part of love itself, but the form(s) of affection displayed differs generally from any other kind of relationship incorporating love.

Affection is an integral part of love of any kind, and is a component of teacher-student love and relationships [when they are loving, because not all teacher-student relationships are loving], but are different than the type of affections between friends, partners, relatives, etc. (A professor's showing of affection is a more subtle form, such as sharing humor, making their students laugh, revealing a part of themselves or their lives, discussing an event or recent happening that may impact or interest students in a certain way, having an informal classwide discussion about it, making a funny comment about something, allowing students to do something that gives them the opportunity to share something about themselves, calling them "my friend," "my dear," giving them affirmations like "you're more important than writing an email, I'll do this later so we can talk now," allowing students to know they can talk about non-academic topics, providing a comfortable setting for students, etc.)

Affection and love both include trust, respect, politeness, genuineness, generosity, and/or kindness, all of which are present in student-teacher relationships. All of the above aspects are incorporated into a relationship between a teacher and a student. Contextually, for example, a greeting of a friend, partner, sibling, cousin, or roommate is methodically universal. Actions to

greet the above are usually expressed through physical touch, context of casual conversation, and prompts of certain words when appropriate (e.g. I love you, pet names, etc). Affection of this kind is universal among platonic, interpersonal, romantic, erotic, and [physically or situationally, in the case of roommate or sibling, that's more circumstantially, since in general, one does not have control over who their siblings or roommates are, they're very close to someone because they spend a lot of time with together] intimate relationships; somewhat defining the type of relationship through such actions and words. Simultaneously and alternatively, affection of this sort is unspokenly reserved for those made by choice or coincidence; the type of action incorporated in affection for another person in an intimate or interpersonal relationship is not appropriately imitated in the nature of a teacher to a student.

A teacher to student form of affection or love, when reciprocated, is rooted in mutual admiration, respect, honesty, and trust, like other kinds of love. But, this kind of love, instead of physical contact, casual conversation, and use of certain words, is instead manifested often invisibly to the educator themselves; expressed and/or shown through recommendations of the educator to others, verbal expressions of appreciation, thankfulness, happiness, satisfaction, or gladness and joy at being able to be a part of the educator's livelihood (i.e. their student), mentioning their admirable, enviable, positive attributes, and continually or repeatedly taking part in their classes, workshops, or seeking their guidances. On the part of the educator, the desire for what is best for their counterpart creates the presence of love towards them. This aspect of love, desiring what is best for the other, is a defining trait of love [as a virtue]. With the absence of this such desire, love is not present, even if all other aspects remain and hold strong. The feeling of love or affection towards an educator by the student is foremost a mental and

cognitive awakening, connection, and/or appreciation; a sense of admiration, gratefulness, satisfaction, and happiness in being able to exist alongside the educator; gain knowledge, intelligence, and collectible wisdom from the instructor, especially in the case of a student with the cognitive capacity to appreciate the teaching style, approach, mannerisms, dedication, or educational or personal attributes of an educator in particular. On the part of the professor, love is necessarily similar; the behavior on the part of an educator that imitates one of an interpersonal relationship has been deemed inappropriate given their role in a student's life, and in their career choice. It is unclear whether this unspoken, accepted societal declaration is a dictation of the nature of a teacher's typical behaviors, or an educator's behavior has over time shaped the expectation of a hands-off approach to passing knowledge down, but nonetheless, this approach is generally a well-respected custom on the side of both parties.

The methods of definition in an interpersonal relationship, including nature and amount of time spent, conversations held, and activities participated in mutually, differ vastly from that of a teacher to a student, depending on the nature of the relationship. Above aspects (those usually and most often present in interactions between friends, siblings, or partners) can, in some cases, be incorporated into relationships between teachers and students, therefore imitating that of a relationship between friends, roommates, or one with interpersonal connections. Conversations, for example, may take the form of a friend complaining to another, updating them on life happenings lying outside of the academic realm, providing emotional or moral support, offering advice, and/or sharing news, and ideas or thoughts on a recent happening. Sharing interests, in another example, may be an imitation of mutual likes leading to a strong bond between two people, usually attributed to a personal relationship of any kind. Incorporating any

or all of these doings between a teacher and student imitates the behaviors of people in an interpersonal relationship, and therefore incorporates intimacy, affection, and a mutual interpersonal connection; however, the nature or dynamic of the relationship remains unchanged. Incorporations or additions of this kind to a teacher-student relationship makes it stronger, more comfortable, and easier to be a part of. Intimacy, companionship, camaraderie, comfortability, and connection can be and sometimes is achieved in this way. It remains unique to its own kind because this type of intimacy does not incorporate, necessitate, or revolve around physical contact, yet a higher level of companionship can be achieved between two people. The connection present is purely emotional, cognitive, or of the mind, unique to the relationship it is present in. Physical touch, as aforementioned, is excluded in this type of relationship particularly; arguably, the type of connection between two people is stronger when physicality is subtracted. There is, quite literally, no other aspect of the relationship to lean on or be held up by.

Certain teacher-student relationships existing outside of an academic classroom or setting require, incorporate, and include physical contact, such as that of a sports coach (swimming, gymnastics, figure skating, martial arts) or dance teacher. Physical touch in this case is an integral and therefore necessary aspect of training, learning, teaching, and instruction of the craft itself. Proper positioning and placement, for example, is a necessary incorporation of physical contact in this kind of teaching; it is something that cannot be verbally expressed or carried out. This kind of physical contact is present and active solely and necessarily in the teaching aspect, because it is a physical lesson and activity, and is therefore expected on the receiving end, and therefore the same mental, emotional, or cognitive connection to a coach (than a professor) is less present, if at all.

Bridging the gap between the physical and emotional or intellectual connection between a teacher and a student is very often left undone, or not executed, as the hands-off factor is what allows the interpersonal nature to exist between both parties. In fact, a student to teacher relationship may be severed, diminished, or tensioned if the line of physical contact or intimacy is crossed; similarly to that of a platonic relationship becoming romantic and driving a wedge between two people who had once been very close to each other platonically. The boundary crossed, despite the smallness of the gesture, can instantly diminish or undo past intimacy or connection. In nearly all relationships [outside of a teacher-student relationship], the first physical connection [made] creates a stronger bond, and is usually made quickly after the initiation of a relationship, no matter the kind. Advances initiated by one side, when misunderstood, misconstrued, unwanted, unreciprocated, or misled, can create discomfort, and lead to feelings of being disrespected, violated, uncared for, or selfishness. Arguably, the incorporation of a physical relation between a teacher and student is a manifestation or expression of the desire for power or control, a violation, or an expression of selfishness, and is easily the subtraction of love that is and has been built and grown.

Therefore, I argue that relationships between teachers and students turned erotic, physical, or otherwise more than exclusively cognitive or emotional are not and were not expressions of love, but rather the diminishing of them. The practice in Ancient Greece of pederasty in an educational setting, therefore, was not an expression of love, but an expression of selfishness, greed, an imbalance of power, and the creation of hostility in situations in which the disguise of love existed under false pretenses. Lessons taught that incorporated or were centered around sexual contact (i.e. the first sexual encounter of a young man being shared with his

teacher, being “taught a lesson in manhood,” or “taught” what they would have to do once they were married off and expected to procreate, as was at the time considered the norm) blocked the possibility and short-circuited the progress formerly made in cognitive connection after physical touch was brought about, or introduced.

In today’s classrooms, schools, lecture halls, and offices, the emotional connection between two people is one built off of respect, admiration, trust, anticipation, and the desire for a better tomorrow through the guidance of an educator. This kind of relationship exists exclusively between two people who do not have a need for physical contact, and are able to coexist platonically in such a connection that no other relationship incorporates or includes, or is expected to.

For priests in particular, the early decision of a life dedicated to God is almost always synonymous with a life dedicated to celibacy, because preliminary embarkings on the career path of a priest entail practices to be put into play almost at once. Fourteen-year-old boys with their minds made up, for example, upon taking the first and earliest steps to reaching priesthood, enter a world in which they are symbolically, and in some sense technically, evirated. Whether the decision to abstain and remain with one’s hands above the blanket is voluntary or imposed is unclear, but it is very clearly connected to the decision of dedication to priesthood. A “normal” teenage life is traded in and therefore compromised, or forgone. An integral part of developmental maturing, and one of the most personal components of teenage years are put to sleep, never to be aroused (no pun intended) intentionally, voluntarily, or at all. Evidence of a link between the celibacy requirement and psychosexual stunting in priests is largely unknown,

and remains widely unproven, since only 50% of priests are celibate, although the result is the same for a fair few members of the clergy alike [celibate or not].

With this particular norm in place, and without any kind of safe or healthy outlet for regular urges deemed “sinful” in the eyes of the Church, it is conclusively sensible to claim that psychosexual stunting is generated from the forgoing of sexual activities such as masturbation, experimentation, indulgences (pornography, sex toys), or admittance to having sexual feelings, all of which aid in sexual development and regularity. This claim has not been substantiated, however; therefore the factors linking behaviors to reasoning remains an inconclusive question.

Within the frameworks of this unnatural mental freeze, the “stop” button is pressed indefinitely on [teenage] sexual development (which usually begins during the time an adolescent devotes himself to a celibacy vow; boys usually begin puberty between ages 9 and 14, reaching sexual maturity around the latter half of these years), creating figures in robes trapped in a phase of their curbed sexual development that they cannot outgrow. While psychosexual stunting is not a widespread explanation for the occurrence of child molestation within the Church, it does hold relevance in several instances of its perpetrators.

Similarly to the pederastic model in Ancient Greece based on starting age; boys were unwillingly led into adulthood too early by men years above them in age. Opposing the Ancient Athenian practice, initiated at the basis of “readiness” due to the indication that youth was being shed, the initiation of seemingly innocent relationships [later turned sexual] were based in the attraction to the youth and lack of development, or childhood status, of victims. This detail was a common finding among misconduct in priests.

The priests themselves did not use the same tactics, hold the same beliefs, or fall into the pattern of sexual misappropriation for the same reasons. Many of the priests whose stories stood out differed in nature in going after boys; the one similarity had to do with the fact of the matter that they were guilty of the same crime. Another likeness in the pattern, following discovery of the fact, conviction, and intermittently, laicization of priests, was the relapse and recurrence of the attacks on children; sometimes subsequently to imprisonment or attempted treatment for their misconductuous behaviors, oftentimes to no avail of favorable outcome.

In the earliest case exposed in the media, Father James Porter, ordained in 1960, molested more than 200 children throughout his constant reassignments, starting almost immediately when he was ordained. After being convicted of the crimes he was guilty of, he served a prison sentence and then got out and had children and molested them too. ← Maybe that's not important.

Father Ronald Paquin, a priest active [non-continuously] from the years 1973-2000 in Haverhill, Massachusetts, is perhaps the best example of psychosexual stunting occurring in priests. "Ordained in 1973, he began abusing young boys almost immediately."

"His own psychiatrist, he said, told him he 'had the sexuality of a thirteen-year-old. I was stuck as a thirteen-year-old. Whenever I felt pressure, I would hang around with thirteen-year-old kids.'"²⁷ Medical evidence [through diagnosis of a medical professional] of Paquin's stunting in developmental growth was further proven by his behaviors with boys of this age.

²⁷ *Betrayal, The Predators*, 66

Albeit coincidentally, unknowingly, and unintentionally, Paquin led many boys²⁸ into their adulthood years in a manner nearly identical to the sexual induction of mentees in Athens during the 5th century. One victim, who spoke on the condition of anonymity,²⁹ described his relationship with the now-defrocked priest, which exposed the recognizable resemblance between Paquin's tactics to an Ancient Athenian mentor's. The age of this victim closely matched the age of an eromenos when the abuse was initiated, and stopped at roughly the same time an Ancient Athenian mentorship ceased. The setup of the happening occurred in a private setting including only the priest and the altar boy-turned-victim, or an older man with a younger man, mirroring the setting of the [sexual] happenings between an erastes and eromenos, and followed same time frame of a pederastic educational relationship, ceasing at the time of the younger half (in this case the victim)'s legalized manhood. The acts performed on the younger half of the equation were nearly identical and initiated by the older half of the relationship in both situations.

The aforementioned victim, now married, claimed that Paquin began to sexually abuse him soon after he became an altar boy at age eleven or twelve. [The abuse] continued until he was seventeen or eighteen, he said.³⁰ The nature of Paquin's relationship with this victim also closely imitated Ancient Greek pederastic relationships due to the incorporation of friendship, affections, fondness, and generosity towards the lower half of the equation, in this case, his victim, all of which were factors in the teacher-student aspect of a pederastic relationship, and

²⁸ "Ordained in 1973, he began abusing young boys almost immediately." *Betrayal*, The Predators, 65-66. Paquin is guilty of abusing xxx boys. (Source.)

²⁹ Appearing in *Betrayal*, 66

³⁰ *Betrayal*, The Predators, 66-67

were incorporated into the initial Greek conceptualization of the non-physical expressions of love, aside from emotion.

The glaring difference between the actions of priests and Ancient Greek lovers lies in the intent and purpose for the evinced behaviors and regards. The interests, attitudes, behaviors, and regards [Paquin] exhibited towards the altar boy-turned-victim were neither stemmed solely in good intention nor appreciation of the boy's friendship, companionship, or presence and involvement with the Church.

"He immediately wanted to start being my friend," the man said of Paquin, who often took him shopping, bought him gifts, gave him money, and invited him to visit the church, where they would talk about religion. A friendship blossomed, and the man came to regard Paquin as a father figure. Before long, their conversations took a sexual turn, as Paquin steered the topics to psychology, then Freud, then sex.

"He just started making this a part of our normal conversation," the victim said.³¹ This conversational tactic, a gateway to the abuse patterns, was an integral component of the setup.

"During a one-on-one outing, one of several [outings] the pair had taken together, Paquin began talking about massage therapy, and then began massaging the boy's back and legs.

"Next thing you know he's fondling me," the man said, "then physically bringing me to ejaculation. That's how he pitched it: it's good to have an ejaculation, it's good to be comfortable with him." It was the man's first sexual experience. Eventually, Paquin was regularly performing oral sex on him, often in a car in the Haverhill cemetery. The sexual activity continued when Paquin was sent to Our Lady's Hall, a well-maintained sprawling brick mansion in Milton used

³¹ *Betrayal*, The Predators, 66-67

by Boston archdiocese to house the depressed, alcoholic, and abusive priests. While claiming to offer treatment and rehabilitation, the facility provided Paquin with additional opportunities to continue his abuse, giving him a private, unsupervised place to spend time with the young man.”

32

Along with the tactics pursued in order to gain access to the victim’s body, the recurrence and retention of the relationship between Paquin and his victim aligned in an unsettlingly similar timeline measurement to that of Athenian pederastic relationships.

The pattern initiated by Paquin, and incorporating an adolescent male, continued until the victim turned 18 and had obtained a girlfriend, and subsequently, a wife. “Finally, after the meeting the woman who would eventually become his wife, “That’s when I told him, ‘I can’t do this anymore,’” he said.³³”

At the time pederasty had been rampant in Athens, the ceasing of a mentorship came once an eromenos was married [off], or seen as old enough to have learned what he had been shown throughout the years and make use of it in its intended area (that being marriage and procreation).

The nature of Paquin’s relationship closely mirrors the setup of a relationship between a mentor and mentee during the time of its original institutionalization, and may very well be identical in tactic of bringing about sexual activity during that time. “Paquin, the victim said, steered the relationship in a sexual direction gradually and carefully, cultivating an emotional relationship with him along the way. The boy was a sexual neophyte when he met the priest, and he believed the older man’s assurances that sex was a natural evolution of their relationship.

³² *Betrayal*, The Predators, 67-68

³³ *Betrayal*, The Predators, 68

And, he explained simply, Paquin had become a close and trusted companion. “He was my best adult friend. I can safely say that I loved this guy — I really did. I said to myself, ‘You know, he did teach me a lot about patience and kindness and religion and faith.’ But you’ve got to weigh his good and his bad, and the bad is just too heavy. He’s got this issue, this pathological problem.”³⁴

Arguably, this pathological problem may have been one that was first demonstrated by Ancient Athenians, the historical initiators of man-boy relationships, albeit for a different reason. It is highly unlikely, and therefore a rather far-fetched claim that the Ancient Greeks suffered from the same mental complication that Paquin, or priests who had been psychosexually stunted, and may have operated in similar ways to Paquin himself, had been afflicted by. The setup of Athenian relationships between teachers and students, or lovers and their beloveds, operated in a similar way but existed not as a rebellion, or against the expected behaviors of their societal roles, but instead as a custom. Instead of abusing positions of power in a way that is unexpected, unthinkable, and creates an unspeakable occurrence, as priests had done, erastes, or educators, used their societal roles to mold their view of the public to become what it was.

With an uneven power dynamic seemingly present in the situation of Greek love, the evident power of the educator, or erastes, was used for the wrong reasons, leading to the practice of exploitation of the younger member involved in the relationship, and possibly crafted to come about in a similar way Paquin had planned for it to happen. While the actions themselves did provide benefit and were viewed as an integral part of a mentee’s education, the initiation of the practice was rooted in the same imbalance, inequality, and use of power for the wrong reasons

³⁴ *Betrayal, The Predators*, 69

over the younger and unknowing side of the relationship, therefore more moldable and easy to convince the actions were not wrong (applicable in both situations aforementioned).

Unlike Paquin's underground ploys, Father Paul Shanley took a more unconventional approach, both in his priesthood and his illicit behaviors with children and adolescents. In the parishes and counseling rooms where desperate and troubled young people sought his help, Shanley was a sexual predator, a skilled manipulator who used his power and authority to prey on those who came to him for guidance and support. Therapy sessions became the settings for molestation and rape.³⁵ Practicing his priestly duties mainly in the streets and catering to children widely unaccepted by the Church, their families, and society in general, the gateway to sexual manipulation stemmed from the allure of having something in common with those not accepted or recognized as valid.

The indication of Shanley's sexual misbehavior with children may have been recognized, or could have been more easily identified than other priests, through his advocacy for man-boy relationships in the modern world as they had once been in Ancient history; originally brought to public attention in the 1960s when the mention of homosexuality was brought up and regarded as a topic of controversy. The topic of homosexuality had been denounced from the very beginning by the Catholic Church.³⁶ "In the midst of the tumult of the decade in which he was ordained, Shanley frequently challenged Church teachings, particularly its condemnation of

³⁵ *Betrayal, The Predators*, 70

³⁶ "Homosexual acts are morally wrong because they violate God's purpose for human sexual activity." *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2357, glossary

homosexuality,³⁷ and clashed vocally and publicly with his superiors, including Cardinal Medeiros. At a talk in Rochester, New York, in 1977, Shanley publicly asserted that he could think of no sexual act that caused “psychic” damage to children, and argued that the child is often the seducer in man-boy sexual relationships. In 1985, a woman alerted the chancery that Shanley gave another talk in which he once again endorsed sexual relations between men and boys.”³⁸ Shanley’s outspoken approach to the topic of man/child relationships was set apart from other priests. He spoke in favor of the type of relationship many priests like himself were (and continue to be) guilty of, although “it was also what Shanley said in private that set him apart, and it was what he did behind closed doors that, four decades after his ordination, brought him far more notoriety than did his rebellious dress and preaching style.”³⁹ It has been revealed that Shanley had been guilty of preying upon children prior to his ordination.⁴⁰

Unique in tactic, Shanley took advantage of his position as a priest to allure children of both sexes due to their vulnerability. “Shanley openly embraced ostracized minorities such as gays, lesbians, and transsexuals, and in the 1970s created his “ministry to alienated youth” for runaways, drug abusers, drifters, and teenagers struggling with their sexual identity.”⁴¹ Within this tactic, power was gained, and subsequently highlighted upon, due to the vulnerability, and therefore lack of power, in the lives and situations of the children-turned-victims. It is evident in this case that love was not present, but perhaps the most striking point exists in the fact, or argument, that love could very well have been expressed to those lacking it the very most.

³⁷ “Sexual attraction or orientation towards persons of the same sex and/or sexual acts between persons of the same sex. Homosexual acts are morally wrong because they violate God’s purpose for human sexual activity.” *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2357, glossary

³⁸ *Betrayal, The Predators*, 70-72

³⁹ *Betrayal, The Predators*, 70

⁴⁰ *Betrayal, The Predators*, 73

⁴¹ *Betrayal, The Predators*, 70

Instead, a derivative extraction of an act that is meant to stem from love (i.e., sex), was forcibly brought upon many victims, therefore making the lack of love itself all the more evident, and therefore, with power used in a more underhanded and less evident manner, thriving off of common vulnerability, making the betrayal all the worse.

Operating in a manner that aligned very closely with the beliefs, practices, and teachings of the North American Man-Boy Love Association, or NAMBLA, which advocates for pederastic and pedophilic relationships involving men and boys, as the title would imply, Shanley's advocacy for pederastic, or more appropriately put, pedophilic, relationships relates similarly to Greek love itself due to the intended replication, or revamping, of such a kind of relationship.

In advocacy for man/child relationships, Shanley was, in short, an advocate for the reinstitution of pederasty as it had once been in Ancient Greece, despite its rampant reprisal in all the forms taken, albeit socially unacceptable. With the beliefs aligning with NAMBLA's agenda, Shanley more than likely was an advocate for the abolition of the stigma attached to it (for legal, psychological, and recognizably just and legal purposes).

As in my previous claim that pederasty was not a reflection of love, the same applies in this case for a variant purpose. NAMBLA, with what it stands for, advocates for, and hopes to achieve, operates in a way similar to the alt-right, the KKK, the Nazi Party, Confederates, and ISIS. The purposes and intentions in all of the above organizations are based in giving positions of power on an elevated level to people with intentions to use the projected positions to uphold oppression, promote violence, and perpetuate systems in which there is a level of unbalanced power. Furthermore, in all of the above systems, organizations, associations and groups, victims

are integral components within with the goal of every group, many of them victims of oppression to begin with.

In accordance to the above claim in regard to psychosexual stunting and “man-boy love,” there are several points in which both situations can be disproven, and in this section, I will attempt to apply the concept of imbalance on a philosophical level.

According to *The Symposium*, pederasty was a highly-debated topic in the many forms it took, claimed to be synonymous with love, or a form of love itself. In one approach, Aristophanes claims that the physical act of love, while it was present in pederasty, was an attempt to reconnect with the “half” or “other half” of oneself that had been lost once humans had been cut in half as punishment for their bad behaviors.

With similarity to the custom(s) present in original pederastic relationships, it is close to an attempt in the case of Paquin to claim that with the alignment of mental development in a sexual sense, a younger man, or pre-adolescent boy, in the case of priests generally speaking, is aligned with someone psychosexually stunted. In this approach, it’s a tentative justification for the inexcusable behaviors on the behalf of priests.

Aristophanes’s theory of all pairs finding their other halves is, in some approach, viable and semi-applicable to this theory. “Each of us, [then,] is a “matching half” of a human whole, because each was sliced like a flatfish, two out of one, and each of us is always seeking the other half that matches him. People who are split from male are male-oriented.”⁴²

⁴² *The Symposium*, The Speech of Aristophanes, 191d-191e, 49

The occurrence, and ongoing system of priests preying upon youths, during their adolescence or childhood, holds potentially applicability to Aristophanes' claim and belief.

Paquin and priests similar to him were, albeit uncertifiable, similar in age mentally, emotionally, and developmentally. Depending on whether Aristophanes' speech was in reference only to those who physically matched, or were the same size [presumably due to their age], alignment between people of developmental (or underdeveloped) similarity might have aligned in just the same way. If Aristophanes' theory pertained to the mental age, and therefore alignment of a man's missing half, the "other side" in the case of priests could have viably been boys of the age they were frozen in mentally.

However, Aristophanes' belief of finding one's "other half" through sexual encounters was held in regard only to the physical act of love; seeing as the two "halves" were looking to become one again. The bond between two halves of what had previously been "one" necessitates similarity in size, and therefore, similarity in age, as well, seeing as the development on both "halves" would have to be at the same stages, or otherwise stages that were similar, and would have to be to some extent equal [or close to equal] in order to reconnect with one another. By this argument, those seeking their other half must have been relatively or measurably similar in size. With the lack of physical alignment between men and the boys they preyed upon, most of them not-yet developed or introduced to the idea of sexuality, any sort of possible connection under the rationale of one's "other half" in this case is diminished in possibility. Viability in this case is skewed, and logically unrealistic and therefore nullified, because, in its clearest essence, the controversy surrounding pedophilic priests, and "matching" was the lack of a physically symmetrical match, regardless of how far back the mental development had been frozen on the

part of the older man. With the absence of alignment in age, maturity, and readiness, a match cannot be made between the participants in the case of priests.

In the context of the Greeks, pederasty was not and should not have been neither viewed as an example of discovering nor seeking one's "other half," because, in its barest form (no pun intended), it upheld and integrated imbalance between its participants. With the difference in age, and therefore physical stature, bodies did not align; and by extension of this theory, the idea that one's "other half" was someone of a younger status cannot be applied in any sense.

However, with the budding development in the body of an eromenos, an erastes' promise included to grow with his eromenos, or mentee, while he was still young and becoming a man. By this model, the "other half" of an erastes (this being his eromenos) would be equal in size [to an erastes] once he was developed; and by extension, the growth of an eromenos' body may have been helped along due to the sexual or physical incorporation of an erastes.

According to several sources, the scandal involving priests attacking boys of lesser age is not a "pedophile problem" due to the technicality that many victims were pubescent at the time of the abuse taking place. This loophole does not excuse priests from their criminal behaviors, nor does it equate to love nor erase the dominance present due to the existing power dynamic. Regardless of the absence of prepubescent status, physical bodies did not align, therefore they did not match. The attempted excuse of "ephebophilia" was attempted by some in legal cases, pointing to the idea that, because the victims were not explicitly children, there was some level of equality, or a step closer to equality.

The term “pederasty” was swapped out for a more legally appropriate term, accentuating the one-sided sexual attraction to, and pursuit of, young children. As they were now called, pedophiles were viewed [by outsiders] as being most often found in church offices, basements, rectories, or in some cases, the homes of parishioners. Today’s perceivably most notorious instigators of imbalanced same-sex relations use the prefix “Father.” ← find somewhere for this

According to psychological research, pedophiles, or those who act on their urges with children due to sexual attraction, comprise less than five percent of the general population. While the exact number of priests in the United States, let alone worldwide, is undeterminable, it has been found that between six and seven percent of priests act out sexually with minors. Due to the inconclusivity of the percentage of the population comprising clergy members, there is no way to tell the percentage of pedophiles in general who double as religious guides to children. Similarly, the percentage of predators stemmed in music education, private school settings, or institutions in which sexual predators are rampant (e.g., Boy Scout leaders, found guilty on many accounts as of April 2019, as well as years prior).

In the case of other priests, violently graphic details plague the lives of victims and taint the institution of the Catholic Church. In general, the biggest theme is pertinent to the theme of imbalanced power by men, and power turned to control by men, both in robes and working for higher-ups allowing for the patterns to continue.

Generally speaking, when power is used with good intention, or for the right reasons, it is not considered nor viewed as power, but a just that – good intention, or the utilization of skills

for general good, or good for the most amount of people. There is power necessarily present in any kind of intention, Foucault might say, making power inextricable from intention or any kind of action because power is present in varying levels. When used in the wrong ways, or for the wrong reasons, power becomes, or is velocitized to become control, which incorporates and/or can be used for manipulation, attainment, possession, or the use or abuse of other people, namely those of lesser power or status. According to Foucault, “The pleasure that comes of exercising a power that questions, monitors, watches, spies, searches out, palpates, brings to light, and on the other hand, the pleasure that kindles at having to evade this power, flee from it, fool it, or travesty it. The power that lets itself be invaded by the pleasure it is pursuing; and opposite it, power asserting itself in the pleasure of showing off, scandalizing, and resisting. Capture and seduction, confrontation and mutual reinforcement: parents and children, adults and adolescents, educator and students, doctors and patients...”⁴³

In nearly all of the above situations in which there is power from one to the other, there is nearly always good intention, therefore power is not seen as power, but as guidance, assistance, or overall good.

In the case of teachers, power is pertinent to rules, regulations, requests, and the general setup of an educational setting. A professor, for example, who does not allow technology in a classroom does so out of the position he has, and therefore uses the power from the position he is given. The power used from the position, however, is not for the purpose of feeling powerful or assuming power itself for that sole reason, but rather for the good of the students that will more

⁴³ Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, The Repressive Hypothesis, 45

than likely come about if the power is used with good intention and meant for the best outcome. In this theory, power used for the right reasons and with good intention is not seen as power, which in general is used unjustly, in a manner than highlights upon imbalance, or the abuse of power.

With this theory, Foucault would say that to use the power given to a person for a particular position, such as a teacher, or a priest, as I have been discussing here, their purpose of power has more to do with the way it's used, the regard given to them, and what goes into having power.

In the aforementioned uses of power, both in pederastic and priest-parishioner relationships, the implementation of intention, and thereby, usage of power was not a good or well-intending one, nor is it a reflection on power dynamics that provide benefit to those who engage in them willingly for their own benefit or the cultivation of a relationship involving a power dynamic in order to reach this kind of relationship, based in good intention (e.g. a doctor-patient relationship, teacher-student, parent-child, etc).

In possession of a similar view to Foucault, Kant's categorical imperative reflects a view of good, as well, however, it represents the latter half of my argument, this being that good intention can only be good when used selflessly, in short, or for the reasons that include *willful* good, or necessary good, due to their inherent being or occurrence of good, regardless of intention.

“All *imperatives* command either *hypothetically*, or *categorically*. The former represent the practical necessity of a possible action as a means to achieving something else that one wants (or that, at least, is possible for one to want). The categorical imperative would be the one that

represented an action as objectively necessary by itself, without being reference to another end. Because every practical law represents a possible action as good and hence, for a subject practically determinable by reason, as necessary, all imperatives are formulae for the determination of an action necessary according to the principle of a will that is good in some way. Now, if the action would be good merely as a means to *something else*, the imperative is *hypothetical*; if the action is represented as a good *in itself*, hence as necessary in a will that itself conforms to reason, as its principle, then it is *categorical*.”⁴⁴

The application of the above theory, or the hypothetical imperative, is relevant in the case of priests. The work of a priest, when the position is taken seriously, used for the right reasons (these being, for example, a dedication to a higher power, the belief that the higher power is a worthy cause to dedicate his life to, and the desire to mentor students in a healthy, generous, and kind manner due to the position taken requiring such characteristics), is a categorical imperative. The desire to teach, lead, guide, and mentor children, as well as other people in general, in the personal, intimate, and curiosity-inducing field of religion, spirituality, and the connection to all of the above in the right ways (subjectively speaking, however it is fairly simple to carry out this task lovingly, properly, and with good intentions). To wish to fulfill the purpose of teaching children for the purpose of their own good, their own benefit, and to help them to gain their own insights on religion, a higher power, or their life’s purpose is a categorical imperative. The purpose and intention of the action is done for its own good, and for the good of others.

Very often, however, the hypothetical imperative is instead applied to the situation of priesthood. The question of intention to teach children is not brought into the picture, and the

⁴⁴ Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, Second Section, revised edition

overall intention does not lie in the realm of wanting to do good, but rather only *wanting*, and wanting enough to use the position of power in order to gain what is deeply desired. Wanting to attain sexual gratification, pleasure, or fulfillment, and using the position of power attained in order to do so, is an example of the hypothetical imperative, since the good is done only for the fulfillment of the desire, and the means it can attain. There is, arguably, no kind of good in the hypothetical imperative, especially in the case of priests, especially seeing as the level of prominence the hypothetical imperative this pertains to.

In the same way, the attainment of desire, or pleasure of desire, may have been present in the applicability of the hypothetical imperative. Mentors in Ancient Greece were more likely to suffer through the less desired components of their responsibilities in order to gain pleasures. In the case of modern-day education, it can be argued that the intention of a teacher pertains more to the categorical imperative, since there is little incentive otherwise to enter into the profession of teaching at an elementary school level, one of the more easily attainable positions to reach, seeing as it does not necessitate the highest level of education, the way becoming a professor does. The income of a teacher is hardly livable, and the only true outcome is in the result of teaching reflected in the behaviors, uptake, and expanding of the mindset, or personal growth, of the one being shown the way.

In general, the nature of pederasty, as well as any relationships mirroring pederasty, was not, could not have been, and are not love, due to the undeniably present imbalance of power between its participants. This power imbalance, both in the case of present-day and in its original implementation and practice, nullifies the presence of romantic love or partnership, due to the

lack of inequality. In this way, relationships between men and children in their earliest establishment were most appropriate had they been education-exclusive.

In the structure and norm of Ancient Athenian culture, which incorporated pederastic components as a compulsory part of the curriculum, in comparison to the modern-day replications, there was benefit present in the comparison, because in the original institution of pederasty, education was a component. In the case of pederasty's most notorious replication, there was only obvious detriment, a factor made clear following the development of modern psychology, and subsequently, legal systems that caused the acts present in pederasty be deemed criminal.

In the present-day, teacher-student relationships are unique to their own type in the fact that they share a form of love, however, this form of love is unique to its own type because it is one that, unlike nearly any other kind of relationship, does not incorporate physical contact in any manner, and arguably holds a certain level of importance irreplaceable by any other relationship (namely a relationship that does incorporate physical acts in some way or another) and therefore does not hold a similar context.

With the application of the categorical vs. hypothetical imperatives, teaching positions as priests, erastes, or teachers in this day and age, are good in themselves due to the benefit provided to the students, or those dependent on those with power. When power is used for the right reasons, it is not seen as power, but as good intention. When used for selfish fulfillments, power becomes control, namely when incorporating the use of people, as Ancient Greek mentors, like modern-day priests, had.

The epidemic of child sexual abuse, dating back to the beginning of history, may continue until the end of time due to the cycles upheld, even with the implementation of laws looking to change the ongoings allowing men access to children. To this day, there has not been a place on earth where children are safe from men in the highest positions of power, finding affirmation, maybe, in the fact that their predecessors did the same, and the extent of the crisis has never been fully addressed in a way that can be overturned. Every day of the year, new stories regarding the sexual abuse of children due to the imbalance of power given to men are uncovered, revealed, and reiterated. The same stories repeat daily, due to the shoulder-shrug response of this ongoing epidemic. News outlets from all corners of the globe reveal that in the case of men in power, there is nowhere to hide.

“A Lafayette Diocese priest was accused of molesting minors during a monthslong State Police investigation in 2015 and 2016. Two alleged victims told authorities that former Rev. Albert Nunez had either sexually abused or attempted to abuse them in the 1970s, but the investigation was closed because the alleged victims did not press charges, according to a State Police report.” (May 10, 2019)⁴⁵

“The essential problem that gave rise to decades of clergy sex abuse in the Roman Catholic Church was that bishops, whose authority over their domains is all but absolute, were too often complicit in enabling pedophile priests, covering up their crimes, and looking the other way as countless young victims were raped, molested, harassed and left scarred for life.”⁴⁶ (May 11, 2019)

“When Theresa Engelhardt became pregnant with their son 15 years later, she ended her relationship with the Rev. Robert Dreisbach for the seventh — or was it the eighth? — and final time.” (Washington, DC, May 12, 2019)⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Ben Myers, *The Acadiana Advocate*

⁴⁶ *The Washington Post*

⁴⁷ Marisa Iati, *The Washington Post*

“The Diocese of Wheeling-Charleston has filed a motion to dismiss a sexual harassment suit against former Bishop Michael Bransfield.” (West Virginia, May 13, 2019)⁴⁸

“Becky Ianni is still haunted by years of sexual abuse that happened at the hands of her priest when she was a young child.” (Louisiana, May 13, 2019)⁴⁹

“Prince Charles was “deceived” into supporting a paedophile bishop, it is claimed.” (United Kingdom, May 13, 2019)⁵⁰

“Father Franciszek Cybula, the former chaplain of president Lech Wałęsa, and Father Eugeniuś M, the custodian of the Shrine of our Lady of Sorrows and of the Basilica of Our Lady of Licheń, are among a number of priests who molested children, according to Just Don’t Tell Anyone, a documentary by Tomasz Sekielski.” (Poland, *Emerging Europe*, May 13, 2019)

“A Catholic priest, previously accused of sexually abusing a child at a parish in Atco, now is alleged to have molested an altar boy at a Ventnor church, according to a lawsuit filed Monday against the Diocese of Camden.” (New Jersey, May 14, 2019)⁵¹

⁴⁸ Joselyn King, *The Intelligencer*, *Weirton Daily Times*

⁴⁹ Corey Rangel, WCPO, Cincinnati, Ohio

⁵⁰ Phil Hill, *County Gazette*, United Kingdom

⁵¹ Jim Walsh, *Cherry Hill Courier-Post*, Cherry Hill, New Jersey