

Jeez Louise... as soon as I whisk off a post about the pitfalls of #MeToo disenfranchisement of non-victims who are involuntarily labelled "victims", someone makes a claim that Charlie Sheen "molested" Corey Haim when they filmed the 1980's movie Lucas. Charlie would've been over 20 and Corey would've been ^(14?)13. "Molested"? Isn't that for Corey to tell us?

Here's the thing — Corey Haim has been dead for 7 years. Who is making this accusation? No doubt a quick search would reveal who claimed abuse (and what exactly was claimed), but all I know is that Corey isn't responsible, and neither is his mother. In an interview, Mama Haim clearly rejects the story, saying she "would've known if something was wrong." So; did Charlie and Corey have any sexual contact at all? Maybe. Did Corey Haim have any sexual contact with anyone older when he was 12, 13, 14 years old? Again, I can't know, but it seems likely. Yet, his mom says she'd have known if something was wrong... and I believe she's probably right. Parents often have a sense when their kids are particularly upset by something. Not always, but frequently, and she had no suspicions. No signs, she says. If she tells the truth, then Corey indicated nothing was wrong regardless whether he and Charlie Sheen had any sort of contact a 3rd party now wants to call "abuse" or "molestation". So, what does that mean? It's fairly obvious to anyone not willfully blinded by their articles of faith... it means, among other things, that 13-year-old Corey Haim may well have had some sort of sex with someone older than him, and he may not have been distressed by it. He might be one of those rare birds... call me naïve, but I genuinely believe that some humans — however few — actually enjoy sex. Strange but true; look it up.

I realize that the rage of a thwarted illusion knows no bounds, so I should take some refuge in the strictest possible truth: I readily acknowledge that Corey Haim may have

been a silent victim of sexual abuse... of course he may have, and a lot of people are. That's a fact, and it's what the #MeToo movement rightly aims to end. I just wonder why so ~~many~~^{many} folks are so, so resistant — hostile, really — to the equally clear fact that a lot of young ~~people~~ people really do have sexual contact with others, their age or younger or older, that they actually want and enjoy. For all we know, Corey Haim won an on-set bet and wanted to be paid with a hand job. Is that so far-fetched? Or... who knows, maybe he accepted an invitation to tour Charlie's chocolate factory, a possibility that upends most assumptions about what the nature of any contact between an older and younger male must be. There are countless possibilities; my issue is simply this: Corey Haim is dead, so no one should be conscripting him into their ideological militia without his consent and cooperation. Maybe no one ever touched him sexually before his 18th birthday, in which case dragging his ghost into the fight is just rottenly dishonest. But another possibility, the spectre I raised just last week, is that maybe Corey had some early adolescent sexual experience, with whomever, and that fact just wasn't something he was either upset by or ashamed of. Maybe it was just his private life, and he should be allowed to have one, no? He's gone now and can't defend himself from possibly unwanted allegations of victimhood, but more importantly, could he speak up even if he were alive? How free might Corey Haim feel today to tell his own unpopular truth and face the tidal wave of dismissal and disgust sure to crash over him if he acknowledged ~~young~~^{adolescent} sexual contact with an adult but rejected the victimologist asphyxiation of his "advocates" unsolicited embrace? Is that fair?

We've come, correctly, to recognize people's right to decide for themselves whether they are victims. Might we eventually allow others to decide for themselves that they are not victims, too? #ThemAlso (I know it's not going anywhere, but ~~what~~^{what the hell}.)