

This is the supplemental document to my paper that will hopefully explain certain aspects more informally for ease of understanding and to clarify things.

I'll start with lolicons liking lols, a lolicon can like a loli without liking any of the traits that make up said loli. For this analogy, I'll use cake as an example. The loli itself is a cake and the traits are the ingredients. You can enjoy a cake without liking all the raw ingredients that make it up. Look at it this way: there's no prerequisite saying you have to go Tony Montana on a fat stack of cake flour to have a slice of Devil's food cake. The same goes with loli.

Secondly, humans can be lolis, but only specific types of people. Generally, it's going to be partite Asian women. This is due to Asian women having the clearest skin and the softest faces. I'm not saying it's racially exclusive in any way shape or form. It's just that most people who can successfully adopt the loli aesthetic are Asians.

It should go without saying that there is not an age minimum to be a lolicon, just the prerequisites to not be a pedophile, and fully understand what loli is.

In the traditional form the loli aesthetic is focused on cuteness and freedom, this does not mean it is the only style of loli. To best explain this look at Lolita fashion specifically the Classic Lolita. This is their equivalent to a traditional loli. Most all of the other styles of Lolita are based off of this traditional style's elegance. It's the same with loli all styles are based on the youthfulness of the traditional loli.

As for the thing about people being art. I didn't just make it up, I came to that conclusion after having many discussions with people I know. They all said things to the degree of "I understand why someone would think that" or "Yes, I think people are art". The people I talked to weren't all religious, in fact, the one religious person cited "muscles" as the reason people could be considered art. He showed me a very high def up-close video of some dancers moving. After watching I understand what he means, I just don't think I could accurately describe it. Another person who I talked with said that people can be art because for something to be art it must be observed and because humans are both the observer and the observed they can be considered art.

Finally, I understand RikaFag has been the foremost authority on lolicon for the past few years, but he's wrong when he says that pedophiles can be lolicons. Science proves him wrong. Although there isn't a definitive paper stating that pedophiles perceive certain interpretations of loli as something analogous to children. The studies I provided give strong evidence to my theory being correct