

Public Sexual Engagement with Artificial Intelligence by Authority Figures Over Minors: A Policy Recommendation for Institutional Review

Submitted to the Office of Attorney General Andrea Joy Campbell, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

I. Introduction and Context

Attorney General Campbell:

Your office has demonstrated sustained and measurable commitment to the protection of children in the digital environment. In October 2023, you filed suit against Meta and Instagram for unfair and deceptive practices targeting minors. In October 2024, you filed suit against TikTok for similarly harming and addicting young users. In November 2024, you joined a coalition of 31 states urging Congress to pass the Kids Online Safety Act. In August 2025, you co-signed a 44-state coalition letter to AI industry leaders expressing grave concerns regarding the safety of children interacting with AI technologies.

This paper identifies a gap within the framework your office has already established. The gap is narrow, specific, and addressable:

There exists no institutional protocol for reviewing the fitness of a person in a position of authority over minors — including teachers, youth pastors, coaches, counselors, camp counselors, mentors, tutors, and administrators — when that person is found to publicly engage with AI-generated sexual content on platforms accessible to the minors in their care.

Massachusetts already recognizes that adults in positions of authority over minors must meet a verifiable standard of fitness. This is codified in the mandatory Criminal Offender Record Information (CORI) checks required for all adults who come into contact with children in youth programs. It is codified in the strict duties assigned to mandated reporters under Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 119, Section 51A. These statutes reflect a unified legal principle: institutions have an affirmative duty to safeguard children from foreseeable harm caused by the adults entrusted with their care.

The Commonwealth is currently considering Senate Bill S.48 (An Act Relative to AI-Generated Child Sexual Abuse Material), which addresses the production and distribution of AI-generated CSAM. This paper addresses a related but distinct problem: not the production of illegal material, but the public consumption of legal AI-generated sexual content by persons whose

professional role places them in authority over children. The behavior addressed here is not criminal. But it is a safeguarding concern. And it currently has no institutional mechanism for review.

II. The Behavior Defined

For the purposes of this paper, “public sexual engagement with AI-generated content” refers to any visible interaction — including but not limited to liking, commenting on, sharing, or otherwise endorsing — sexually explicit or sexually suggestive content that is generated by artificial intelligence and does not depict a real human being.

This engagement is “public” when it occurs:

- On a platform accessible without meaningful age verification (a self-reported birthdate at sign-up does not constitute verification)
- Under an identifiable legal name
- In a manner visible to other users, including minors

This paper does not address private behavior. It does not address content consumed behind age-restricted barriers. It addresses only what is publicly observable — what a minor could find through standard use of a public platform without special access, hacking, or invasion of privacy.

III. The Reasonableness Standard and First Amendment Considerations

No reasonable person in a position of authority over children arrives at the decision to publicly engage with AI-generated sexual content without understanding that this engagement is visible to others — including the minors in their care. Public platforms are, by definition, public. A “like” is visible. A comment is visible. A pattern of engagement is visible.

Under established First Amendment jurisprudence, including the *Pickering* balancing test (*Pickering v. Board of Education*, 1968), the free speech rights of public employees are weighed against the institution’s interest in the efficient and disruption-free delivery of services — particularly when those services involve the care of children. Federal appellate courts have consistently held that employees who interact with the public on a regular basis, particularly those in positions of trust over minors, are afforded less latitude for disruptive off-duty conduct than other employees. For public-sector authority figures — teachers in public schools, municipal recreation staff, publicly funded program coordinators — this framework applies directly.

For private institutions — youth athletic leagues, religious organizations, private schools, summer camps, scouting organizations, tutoring programs, mentorship organizations, and volunteer coaching programs — the First Amendment presents no barrier whatsoever. The First Amendment constrains only government action. A private institution may set any conduct standard it deems appropriate for the adults it places in authority over children, without constitutional limitation. Private youth-serving organizations have not merely the latitude but the duty to establish and enforce fitness standards for their personnel.

In either context, public sexual engagement with AI-generated content does not constitute speech on a “matter of public concern” as defined under *Connick v. Myers* (1983). It is not political commentary. It is not civic participation. It is private sexual consumption conducted in a public forum. When such conduct becomes known to the community, it foreseeably disrupts the institution’s mission, undermines parental trust, and compromises the authority figure’s effectiveness. Therefore, subjecting this specific behavior to institutional review does not violate the First Amendment protections of the adult; it fulfills the duty of care owed to the child.

IV. Argument One: Compromised Judgment

Safeguarding children is an active cognitive function. It requires continuous, competent assessment by the adults responsible for those children. Specifically, it requires:

- The ability to identify grooming behavior
- The ability to recognize boundary violations, both subtle and overt
- The ability to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate conduct
- The ability to assess whether a child is in danger
- The ability to evaluate what is real, what is fabricated, and what constitutes a threat

Each of these functions requires an intact relationship to reality — specifically, the ability to distinguish between what is real and what is manufactured.

A person who publicly engages sexually with AI-generated content has demonstrated, through observable conduct, that they do not require reality in the domain of their sexuality. They engage with manufactured content as though it were real. They do not distinguish — or do not care to distinguish — between a real person and an artificial image.

This does not prove that their judgment is compromised in a safeguarding context. But it raises a question that is reasonable, relevant, and necessary to ask. When the domain in question is sexuality — the same domain in which child sexual abuse occurs — and the person in question holds authority over children, the question cannot be dismissed. It must be asked formally. By the institution. Through review.

V. Argument Two: Direct Exposure of Minors and Institutional Liability

Children and adolescents routinely research the adults in their lives online. This behavior is well-documented in peer-reviewed research, consistent across demographics, and standard for any media-literate young person. They search for their teachers. Their coaches. Their youth pastors. Their camp counselors. Their tutors. Their principals. They do this on the same platforms where this content exists.

When a minor searches for an authority figure and encounters that person's public sexual engagement with AI-generated content, the minor has been exposed to sexual material through no fault of their own. The exposure pathway is:

1. Child has a relationship with authority figure
2. Child searches for authority figure on a public platform
3. Child encounters authority figure's public sexual engagement with AI content
4. Child is exposed to explicit or sexually suggestive material

This pathway bypasses every safeguard a parent or institution has put in place. Content filters do not block a teacher's Facebook page. Privacy settings do not prevent a child from viewing a youth pastor's visible activity. Parental controls do not flag a coach's public likes. Standard social media platforms rely on self-reported birthdates rather than meaningful age verification — a fact your office has already established in its litigation against Meta and TikTok.

The authority figure has, through their public conduct, created an unmediated pathway between sexual content and the minors in their care. This pathway is foreseeable as a matter of law. In tort law, the doctrine of negligent supervision holds institutions liable when they fail to protect children from foreseeable harm. When an institution becomes aware — or reasonably should become aware — that an authority figure is publicly engaging with sexual content, and fails to review that conduct, the institution assumes liability for the foreseeable exposure of the minors in its care.

VI. Argument Three: Behavioral Modeling and the Double Standard

The foundational premise of placing adults in positions of authority over children is that children learn by example. This is not incidental to the role. It is the role. A teacher models intellectual integrity. A coach models discipline and appropriate conduct. A religious leader models moral boundaries. Modeling is the mechanism through which authority over children operates.

When a minor discovers that their authority figure publicly engages with AI-generated sexual content, the implicit lesson is:

- This behavior is acceptable for adults
- Public sexual engagement with manufactured content is normal
- The boundaries taught in school are performative
- The line between real and artificial does not matter in the domain of sexuality

A child who internalizes these lessons is a child whose understanding of appropriate boundaries has been distorted — not by abuse, but by example.

Furthermore, a critical double standard exists:

If a minor in that authority figure's care engaged with the same content publicly — if a twelve-year-old liked, shared, or commented on AI-generated sexual material — that minor would face immediate disciplinary consequences. Suspension. Expulsion. No second chance. This is standard policy across school districts in this Commonwealth.

The adult who modeled the behavior faces no equivalent scrutiny.

This paper does not argue that the adult should face the same consequence as the child. It argues that the adult should face, at minimum, the same level of institutional review. If the behavior is serious enough to expel a child, it is serious enough to review an adult.

VII. Argument Four: The AI Exploitation Context

This behavior does not exist in a vacuum. It exists within a specific and urgent context that your office has already identified as a priority: the weaponization of AI-generated content against minors.

The current landscape includes:

- AI-generated child sexual abuse material (CSAM) that is increasingly difficult to distinguish from real imagery
- Deepfake technology used to create explicit content of real minors from publicly available photographs
- AI tools used by predators to groom children by normalizing sexual content and eroding boundaries
- A legislative environment in which the Commonwealth is actively considering S.48 to address AI-generated CSAM

Parents are modifying their own behavior — posting fewer photographs of their children — because of the risk that AI will be used to generate explicit material from innocent images. Schools are issuing guidance. Your office has co-signed coalition letters identifying AI as an emerging threat to children.

Massachusetts is currently one of only five states where AI-generated CSAM remains unaddressed by statute. The legislature is working to close that gap. This paper identifies a related gap: while S.48 addresses the production of illegal AI-generated material, no mechanism exists to review the fitness of authority figures who publicly consume legal AI-generated sexual content.

A person in a position of authority over children who publicly engages with AI-generated sexual content is participating in the demand side of an ecosystem that harms children. They are normalizing the technology. They are demonstrating, publicly, that they see no problem with the sexual applications of AI — the same applications being weaponized against minors.

This does not make them a criminal. It makes them compromised. A person who publicly participates in the normalization of AI-generated sexual content cannot simultaneously be entrusted to protect children from the harms of that same content. These positions are irreconcilable. That irreconcilability warrants institutional review.

While the public consumption of any sexually explicit content by authority figures may raise analogous concerns, this paper addresses AI-generated content specifically because it represents the unaddressed gap: it is the category for which no institutional standard currently exists, it is directly connected to the emerging ecosystem of AI-enabled child exploitation that your office has already identified as a priority, and it is the category in which the technology is outpacing institutional response. The broader question may warrant future consideration. This paper addresses the immediate and unaddressed one.

VIII. The “Former” Authority Question

A foreseeable objection is that the person no longer holds authority over a specific child. This does not resolve the safeguarding concern.

A child taught, counseled, coached, mentored, or ministered to at age seven is twelve today. Thirteen. Fourteen. Still a minor. Still on social media. Still capable of searching for their former teacher, youth pastor, coach, or camp counselor. Still one search away from encountering that person’s public sexual engagement with AI-generated content.

“Former” does not mean “no longer a minor.” “Former” does not mean “no longer impressionable.” “Former” does not mean “no longer able to find this content.” The timeline of a child’s minority extends years beyond the end of any single season, school year, or program.

A person who held authority over a child at any point during that child’s minority retains a responsibility — at minimum, the responsibility not to be the source of that child’s exposure to

sexual content. When they fail that responsibility publicly, the institution that placed them in that role has a duty to review — regardless of whether the relationship is current or former.

IX. The Proposed Standard

This paper proposes the following standard for consideration by the Attorney General's Office and for recommendation to youth-serving institutions in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

When a person in a position of authority over minors is found to publicly engage with AI-generated sexual content — on any platform accessible to the minors in their care, under any identifiable name — the institution responsible for those minors shall conduct a formal review.

That review shall assess:

1. Whether the behavior is publicly observable and verifiable
2. Whether the minors in that person's care have been or could foreseeably be exposed
3. Whether the behavior constitutes an isolated instance or a pattern
4. Whether continued placement in that role is appropriate given the totality of circumstances
5. Whether any remedial action — including but not limited to removal — is warranted

This standard is:

- **Objective:** Based on publicly observable behavior, not private conduct or speculation
- **Proportionate:** Does not mandate termination. Mandates review.
- **Consistent:** Applies the same institutional seriousness we already apply to minors who engage in identical behavior
- **Protective:** Prioritizes the safety and developmental wellbeing of minors over the convenience of the adult
- **Legally sound:** Grounded in established principles of institutional duty of care and negligent supervision. It does not criminalize behavior. It does not impose punishment without process. It requires only that institutions ask a question they are currently failing to ask.
- **Compatible with existing frameworks:** Extends the principle already embedded in the CORI system and mandated reporter laws — that adults in positions of authority over minors must meet a verifiable standard of fitness.

X. Anticipated Objections

“There is insufficient evidence that this behavior is widespread enough to warrant guidance.” The absence of documented cases reflects the absence of a reporting mechanism, not the absence of the behavior. No institution currently tracks this conduct. No institution currently reviews it. No institution currently reports it. The standard proposed here would create the mechanism by which such cases are identified, reviewed, and addressed. To require evidence of prevalence before establishing a review mechanism is to require the output of a system that does not yet exist. The mechanism must precede the data.

“This is an internal matter for individual organizations, not the Attorney General’s office.” The Attorney General’s office routinely issues guidance to institutions on matters of child safety, consumer protection, and institutional best practices. Your office has issued guidance to schools on bullying, to businesses on data privacy, and to platforms on the protection of minors. The recommendation proposed here falls squarely within that function. It does not ask your office to adjudicate individual cases. It asks your office to identify a category of conduct as a fitness concern and to recommend that youth-serving institutions establish review protocols accordingly. This is guidance — the ordinary and appropriate function of this office when an emerging risk to children has been identified and institutions have not yet responded.

XI. Conclusion

There is no existing standard for this. There must be. The technology is new. The behavior is not. The only thing that has changed is the medium — and the medium does not change the safeguarding question.

Your office has already established that the protection of children in the digital environment is a priority. You have sued platforms. You have joined coalitions. You have urged federal legislation. This paper asks you to extend that commitment one step further: to the adults who use those platforms in ways that compromise the safety of the children in their care.

The question is simple: should a person whose public sexual behavior — if replicated by a child in their care — would result in that child’s immediate removal from school, continue in a position of authority over children without any institutional review?

The answer is no. It has always been no. The absence of a formal standard does not reflect a deliberate policy decision. It reflects an institutional gap. This paper identifies that gap and proposes a narrow, proportionate, and constitutionally sound mechanism to close it.

I respectfully request that this recommendation be reviewed by the appropriate division within your office. Specifically, I ask that your office consider issuing guidance to youth-serving institutions in the Commonwealth identifying public sexual engagement with AI-generated content by authority figures as a fitness concern warranting formal institutional review —

consistent with the existing framework of CORI checks, mandated reporter obligations, and the duty of care owed to minors in institutional settings.

Submitted by: Alexa Daskalakis Date: July 18, 2026 Contact: alexadaskalakis@outlook.com