

## Introduction to the Special Section on Pedophilia: Concepts and Controversy

Kenneth J. Zucker, Ph.D.<sup>1,2</sup>

In planning for the 1998 meeting of the International Academy of Sex Research in Sirmione, Italy, the Program Committee introduced to the program a Debate in Sexology. It was entitled “Sex Research and the Pharmaceutical Industry: Collaboration or Co-optation?” and the debaters were Raymond C. Rosen and Leonore Tiefer. At the 1999 meeting in Stony Brook, New York, the debate was entitled “How Useful Are Animal Models for the Study of Human Sexuality?” and the debaters were John H. Gagnon and Kim Wallen. At the 2000 meeting in Paris, France, the debate was entitled “The Scientific Study of Sexuality Is Threatened by Social Constructionism and Postmodernism” and the debaters were Ira L. Reiss and John P. De Cecco.

As the Program Committee deliberated for the 2001 meeting in Montreal, the enthusiasm for the debate series had waned and there was agreement that a debate should be convened only if there was perceived to be a legitimate need. The Program Committee could not reach consensus about the merits of a submission by Richard Green pertaining to the psychiatric status of pedophilia and, after a relentless series of e-mail exchanges, it was decided to convert the proposal to a minisymposium, in which Gunter Schmidt had offered his

services. The minisymposium was then followed by a substantial period of discussion time from the floor.

Both Dr. Green and Dr. Schmidt were kind enough to agree to submit their papers to the *Archives*, upon which a call was issued for peer commentary, primarily via three e-mail list serves: that of the International Academy of Sex Research (see [www.iasr.org](http://www.iasr.org)), SEXNET ([sexnet@listserv.acns.nwu.edu](mailto:sexnet@listserv.acns.nwu.edu)), and STARGAZE ([sstargaze-maurice@interchange.ubc.ca](mailto:sstargaze-maurice@interchange.ubc.ca)). Following receipt of the commentaries, Drs. Green and Schmidt were given the opportunity to pen replies.

I hope that this special section of the *Archives* will be of interest to the readership. Additional commentary is welcome in the form of a Letter-to-the-Editor. I personally found it of note that, of the 19 commentaries, only one was authored by a woman (one other commentary was authored by a wife and husband team). Perhaps this means that pedophilia is predominantly a male preoccupation. One day the sociologists and historians of sexology will tell us if this is true.

Prospective authors wishing to propose future target articles, followed by open peer commentary, should contact the Editor.

---

<sup>1</sup>Editor, *Archives of Sexual Behavior*.

<sup>2</sup>Child and Adolescent Gender Identity Clinic, Child Psychiatry Program, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health—Clarke Division, 250 College St., Toronto, Ontario M5T 1R8, Canada; e-mail: [Ken\\_Zucker@camh.net](mailto:Ken_Zucker@camh.net).