

Child Abuse Is Being Normalized by Google's Owners and Their Extremist Media

By Ash Sharpe

Having sex with people who are neither physically nor mentally mature enough to consent to it is rape. This is apparently an increasing controversial hill on which to die, but so be it. If you read the left-wing press, whenever they tackle the issue of pedophilia it is unanimous that pedophiles are just misunderstood.

VICE Canada 

@vicecanada



“The current misconception is that every pedophile is a child molester, and if they’re not, it’s just a matter of time. It’s important to show the world that that’s not the case.” bit.ly/2ErMuRV

1:30 PM - Feb 8, 2018

Social Media Sites Can't Decide How to Handle 'Non-Offending' Pedophiles

Pedophiles have used websites like Twitter to argue they're not evil, forcing social media platforms to decide how they're going to treat them.

[vice.com](https://www.vice.com)

♡ 118 💬 1,492 people are talking about this



When Ender Wiggin was banned from Twitter last December, it wasn't because he was a far-right troll or Nazi sympathizer. In fact, Wiggin had an army of pizzagaters harassing him all hours of the day, insisting he kill himself right up until the moment his account was disabled on December 14.

That's because Ender—aka @enderphile—is the pseudonym of a “non-offending” or “anti-contact” pedophile: someone who is attracted to children but claims to be against adult-child sex and child pornography. Inside that community,

he's known as the unofficial leader, and claims he's been using social media to reduce the stigma associated with pedophilia, showing other pedophiles they can live lives without offending. Jackson Weaver, VICE Magazine

VICE used to be awesome. Even after the McInnes era, some of their reporting, articles and video journalism was top notch. Nowadays the company is riddled with sleazeball liberals who can't treat women with politeness and literal endorsements of pedophilia. Worse, it is not just VICE Canada that is as insane as Justin Trudeau. Salon published another self-described "*Virtuous Pedophile*" in 2015, claiming that he was a poor suffering lamb, who just wants to be loved.

Nice to meet you. My name is Todd Nickerson, and I'm a pedophile. Does that surprise you? Yeah, not many of us are willing to share our story, for good reason. To confess a sexual attraction to children is to lay claim to the most reviled status on the planet, one that effectively ends any chance you have of living a normal life. Yet, I'm not the monster you think me to be.

Such degenerates as Todd and those in the VICE article describe themselves as *non-offending* pedophiles. The natural question then is this- if you are a non-offending pedophile, how would anyone know? The answer is that nobody would know. You would tell nobody. So why are "non-offending pedophiles" identifying themselves?

are *non-offending pedophiles* identifying themselves:

Jackson Weaver of VICE expends a lot of energy gathering quotes and making the case that kicking wannabe child-molesters off social media platforms is counterproductive, citing that peer support- i.e., other pedophiles- is essential to stop non-offending pedophiles abusing children. However, he also writes of one prominent online pedophile that

"He's been using social media to reduce the stigma associated with pedophilia."

The unambiguity of his words should tell you all that you need, but let us spell it out, clear as day. **Pedophilia must be stigmatized in society. It must never lose its stigma.** The very idea that a pedophile should feel without

stain is a very dangerous idea indeed. One may feel a certain level of sympathy for the pedophile- I sincerely doubt that anyone would choose this life- but to empathize with them is a path to ruin. No doubt Weaver and others in the liberal press will deny it, but the agenda here is clear. Leftist activists are using the liberal media to convince people that pedophilia is not immoral.

I had an interesting conversation on Twitter yesterday about the hijab. The hijab, as you know, is not ubiquitous in Islam, nor is it solely Muslims that wear a head covering for modesty. It is almost exclusively Muslims that apply this modesty rule to children, however. The conversation came about in a thread begun by regressive left darling Mike


Stuchbery, an unemployed failed supply-teacher-turned-banal-Twitter-chimp who goes on lengthy rambles about how history disproves conservatism, in search of Patreon dollars. The tweet, -which Mike subsequently deleted- was his standard fare of prostrating himself before Islam and coming out against a school administrator who had suggested that girls under the age of eight had no need to preserve their modesty from sexually active men. The administrator, after talking to *the community*, stepped down.

“Having spoken to our school community we now have a deeper understanding of the matter and have decided to reverse our position with immediate effect.”

Mike supported the people sexualizing kids, in this instance.

So did some of his followers, who stated that no-one should force girls to wear anything they didn't want to, but nor should they be forbidden from wearing things that they did want to wear. I contend that as a culturally mandated practice, the hijab is a forced item- and this brought us to the topic of agency in children. We have rules about what children can and cannot do because they do not possess the experience or ability to comprehend consequences that adults are supposed to exhibit. This is why we have an age of consent, an age at which one can drive a car or fight in wars. You need to be able to understand what you are getting yourself into.

It is therefore curious to me that the case of the hijab is so contentious in the West. It is a garment for a particular purpose- it is not even a religious purpose *per se*. According to the Quran, Muhammad, when encountered with a woman wearing see-through clothing, averted his eyes and told her, "*After a young woman reaches the age of puberty, nothing should be seen of her except this and this,*" motioning to his face and hands. That has been interpreted in many ways.





The modesty of grown women is preserved in most Islamic cultures by some form of veil- burqa, niqab, or hijab, depending on just how barbaric the men of that culture may be. In the more advanced places like Iran, you may only be beaten severely by religious police for not wearing your hijab. In Taliban controlled Afghanistan, to go without your niqab means summary gang-rape and murder by stoning or immolation. If you aren't murdered by your rapist, you may not survive being murdered by your own family in an honor

killling.

It is the woman's fault in both cases of course because the woman is immodest- a man cannot help but rape everything that he is aroused by, so it is essential that a piece of fabric is used to reinforce the generally accepted global social norm that *no raping people in public is allowed*. Some particularly advanced societies have even extended this emancipatory ideal to include not raping people in private, too. In all but the most fundamentalist and stone-age interpretations of this cultural practice, the veil is the reserve of adult women- at least by the standards of Islam, which is 9-years-old for some. Sadly, the fundamentalist and stone age ideals are in the ascendant.



Cute-little-muslim-baby-holing-Holy-Quran-1

Naturally, I oppose the sexualization of children and therefore reject the idea that an eight-year-old-girl (or younger) should be forced by her parents to wear a modesty-protector. She is a child. She is not sexually active, and therefore outside the remit of *modesty*- unless we are to accept the pedophiles delusion- that children are sexy. The intrinsic concept of modesty is to avoid encouraging sexual attraction in others. Modesty only exists when the person being modest understands that they are sexually attractive- the Islamic understanding is that this is a female *power* over men, and therefore the female's responsibility.

I am unsure why I am a better feminist in this regard than most feminists, but the world is a crazy place of late. To cut a long story short- the responsibility for being sexually attracted to children does not lie with the *immodest* child.

Childhood is a sacrosanct garden of learning -at least

Western civilization has tried to make it so- and must be innocent. This means that parents make responsible choices for the child's actions. This means no hijabs, as it infers that adult men cannot prevent themselves from rape without it being worn by all females of all ages. In essence, the hijab forces children into a sexualized state of being.

And so, we are brought back to the topic of the pedophile

acceptance movement. These child molestation acceptance activists will demand that children be given the right to decide for themselves whether they can have sex with adults.

This is the agenda which lies underneath the *non-offending* pedophile movement. If they can normalize attraction to children, goes the rationale, then what next? It is the very spirit of regression to wish Western culture back into the dark ages of marrying old men to prepubescent girls. At least in antiquity, the basis of such unions was for politics or economics, rather than to sate the lusts of mentally ill degenerates.

If you were a secret pedophile who never offended, why would you tell anyone? Perhaps there is the Catholic

confessional route to salvation at play but surely there are few other benefits to proclaiming yourself as a theoretical child molester. The only logical -if logic can hold under such circumstances- is that you realize that the route to satisfying your sex drive and not being murdered or arrested is through public acceptance and ultimately legalization of pedophilia.

So, you out yourself as a public pedophile with the relative safety of an anonymous Twitter handle. Maybe you write for Salon or encourage leftist media muppets to interview you about how misunderstood the whole issue of having sex with children is.

The very definition of pedophilia -or any sexual philia- is

an abnormal appetite or liking for. For example, you might

be a pogonophile and have an abnormal appetite or lust for
beards. As a bearded man, I am abnormally attractive to you-
irresistibly so. While it's funny to think about on the surface,
it is actually utterly superficial. You do not know me. You do
not care about me- all you want is my beard. If I were to
shave it off your attraction would evaporate as rapidly as the
steam on my mirror. In a similarly disordered manner the
pedophile is not interested in children in the romantic way
typical humans fall in love or feel attraction. It is sexual
desire of prepubescent children in the same irrational and
alien way that the pogonophile is drawn towards beards.
Incapable of love, the -philiac is attached only to that which
arouses them; when the object of desire changes -by shaving

a beard off, by a child entering puberty, or whatever other form the abnormality takes- the philia goes unsated and the desire for what once was irresistible is gone. The -philiac must find another locus of arousal.

Pedophiles do not *love* children. One cannot love

children and be a pedophile. The pedophiles use

children to satiate their base desires. This is why pedophilia

is an abnormality rather than a sexual orientation-

A *chronophilic* disorder. A person may well find a much

older person attractive, but when they only find the elderly

attractive, this is beyond merely a sexual preference- it


is gerontophilia. The attraction in this case is still a disorder

but as it affects only adults there is no need to legislate

.....
against it within our society. Not so for the person who is inescapably attracted to children. It is as far from being a sexual preference or orientation as it possible to be; consider those poor souls who find themselves irrevokably attracted to tractors or who marry bridges. It is impossible to normalize even those people who harm no-one with their behavior, let alone those who wish to normalize attraction to children.

This is why the gay movements around the world have struggled so hard to distance themselves from pedophilia, with varying degrees of success. Once more for those in the back- pedophilia is not normal. In a nightmare future, the Western child is forced into the hijab and made to answer questions about whether they are ready to have a sexual

relationship with an adult. How culturally enriched we will be.



June O’Sullivan, chief executive of LEYF, said:

| |

“By providing spaces in which children are able to see people who defy rigid gender restrictions, it allows them to imagine the world in which people can present [themselves] as they wish.”

This is the motivation behind Drag Queen Story Time- The project also seeks to tackle misogyny, homophobia, and racism, so it's just your small-scale neo-Marxist indoctrination of 3 year-olds, who clearly are already so bigoted against blacks and gays that they need to be taught how to think by drag queens.

If pedophilia is normalized also, then it will become acceptable for a man who is sexually attracted to kids to run a similar project. Conservative philosophy is concerned with

the preservation of the pillars of our civilization. The very concept of what makes up a family has been under attack for more than a generation, producing the tragedy today that [in America 40% of children are born to unwed mothers](#) and 25% of all children under the age of 18 — a total of about 17.2 million — are being raised without a father. 35% of these broken families are poor. The story gets even worse once we break that figure down by racial demographics.

The bedrock of our great Western Civilization is the family unit. In 1933 Christopher Dawson wrote “The Patriarchal Family in History,” and drew parallels to [the decline of the Greek and Roman civilizations](#) that preceded our own.

“As in the decline of the ancient world the family is steadily

As in the decline of the ancient world, the family is steadily losing its form and its social significance, and the state absorbs more and more of the life of its members," Dawson wrote. "The functions which were formerly fulfilled by the head of the family are now being taken over by the state, which educates the children and takes the responsibility for their maintenance and health."

Can any deny that 85 years on from Dawson we are even further along this path to destruction? Instead of addressing this matter with concern for the very fundamental building blocks of society itself, the radical intersectionalists of the left have instead pried the pieces apart with the hatchet of *Social Justice*. The family is irrelevant when there are transgender

identities to care about. The environment that children are raised in produces racists and homophobes, so therefore society must take over the raising of children from the inadequate parents. So often unwed and solitary, the single parents of this generation and the last have gladly relinquished responsibility- and who can blame them? As a culture we have produced untold millions of people without an coherent identity of their own to pass on to the next generation.

*" Ender claims that any attempt to make another account—
under any name—was initially blocked following his ban,
but thought they had reconsidered their stance after he was*

able to log back on. Following his most recent ban, he's less optimistic. **Until Twitter directly addresses how they're going to deal with users like Ender, non-offending pedophiles exist in the same state. It's a kind of limbo, where they're able to speak about their attractions to children publicly, but without knowing for how long.**" -

Jackson Weaver, VICE Magazine

This is a progressive magazine with a culture of sexual harassment towards women. This magazine -with a huge readership- is appealing to one of the biggest social media networks on the planet to **stop banning pedophiles**. More than this entire article up until now, this should tell you

everything you need to know about the pedophile normalization movement. *Non-offending pedophiles* want to become pedophiles who are non-offending because the abnormal sex they desire has become socially accepted.

While the majority of people will be repulsed by the behavior, once the normalization of degeneracy has become ratified it is then bigotry to criticize it. It is now normal for an adult man dressed as a woman to teach your three year old son how not to be a homophobe. Don't tell me this is a leap of the imagination.

Still, it is conservatives who are the problem, right? We are the ones holding society back from true progress. Progress towards what exactly? A society of fatherless sons with no

towards what exactly? A society of fatherless sons with no
role-models, no aspirations and the exaltation of self-
centered gratification of the basest desires of the depraved.

No thank you, not on my watch.

No empathy for the devils.