

**THE SCIENTIST AS CONTRIBUTING AGENT TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE AS
PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE ETHICS VIOLATIONS.**

Paper presented to the 5th World Congress of Sexology

Jerusalem, Israel

by

Judith A Reisman, PhD.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Haifa, Israel

June 21-26, 1981

The purpose of this paper is three fold. First, to bring to full scientific and public debate what appears to have been the use of hundreds of infants and children as live sexual guinea pigs in pedophile biased, unmonitored "scientific" experiments which comprise Dr. Alfred Kinsey's experimental data on child sexual development in, *SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN THE HUMAN MALE*. Second, to extend this debate of the scientist as a contributing agent to child sexual abuse, to include an examination of those scholars currently employed as consultants/writers for sex-industry magazines which propagandize children as adult sexual targets.

Such an examination is particularly pertinent for this conference, since many of the academicians so noted are respected sexologists in attendance here. It is argued that public or private affiliation by recognized scientists with pedophile propaganda materials constitutes a violation of scientific ethics - a conflict of interests between scientific objectivity and truth on the one hand and the mis-information of the growing child-sex-abuse lobby on the other hand. Third, such mercantile pseudo-science eventually defames the entire scholarly community, and tends to implicate us all as popularizes of whatever "truth" is paying dividends at the moment.

This paper should be seen then not only as a discourse, but as an advocacy instrument, calling for appropriate investigation and action in defense of children, of science and against spurious sexual information.

Rollo May observed that Kinsey was dehumanizing sex to a *machina ultima*(1). The "ultima" of May's concerns may best be seen in Kinsey's employment of pedophiles to conduct non-replicable child sex experiments for his male and female volumes (2). His experimental results found that adult-child sex was harmless and often beneficial (3). The acid test for the validity of scientific findings, is the ability of the independent scientist to replicate the study.

As adult masturbation of infants and children, in the U.S.A. is still (to my knowledge) viewed as statutory rape - even for scientific studies, and deemed morally reprehensible as well, could we ethically check, much less validate Kinsey's child sexuality findings?¹ It is suggested that Kinsey's probable pedophile bias is best examined via his own words. Well aware of the seriousness of these accusations I argue that Kinsey's claims of child sexuality were accepted without careful scrutiny, due to (a) the climate of the times, (b) misleading language, and (c) the disturbing nature of his reports.

The thousands of articles, and scores of books that reviewed Kinsey pro and con have never really examined critically his child sex design, while his patently invalid and evidently self-serving results have been quoted as factual worldwide. Please assess the following report by Dr. Kinsey of some children's responses to genital stimulation defined by his team with the catch all phrase "stimulus" or not defined at all, and apparently administered by members of an adult male experimental team for the proper chapters(4). Let us fairly state that Kinsey felt that

¹ However, at the time of this writing, the May 12, 1981 New York Court of Appeals decision recognizing infant and child employment in pornographic film, video, magazine etc., was still in effect. So the descriptions of forced masturbation which follow would doubtless be lawful in the areas governed by the New York Court of Appeals.

all scientific experimentation was always valid and moral by definition (5), and that the Kinsey team believed the children derived "definite pleasure" from the following situations - which should tell us something important about the way Kinsey and his team themselves experienced sexual activity and thus about their judgmental prejudices. Some of the 196 children, Kinsey defined as "pre-adolescents" or "individuals" experience:

Extreme tension with violent convulsion: Often involving the sudden heaving and jerking of the whole body....gasping.... hands grasping, mouth distorted, sometimes with tongue protruding; whole body or parts of it; spasmodically twitching,....violent jerking of the penis....groaning, sobbing, or more violent cries, sometimes with an abundance of tears (especially among younger children)....hysterical laughing, talking, sadistic or masochistic reactions.... [E]xtreme trembling, collapse, loss of color, and sometimes fainting of subject. Sometimes happens only in the boy's first experience, occasionally occurs throughout the life of an individual" (9). Pained or frightened at approach of orgasm....some males in the present group [i.e. children, Kinsey says, like many "adult males, "] suffer excruciating pain and may scream if movement is continued or the penis even touched. The males in the present group become similarly hypersensitive before the arrival of orgasm, will fight away from the partner and may make violent attempts to avoid climax. (6)

Kinsey concludes this section with the observation that the children responded positively. Why? These children - he insists- return for more of the same experience. We are obligated to question the evaluation of Kinsey's child experimenters. This male team admit they used children who scream in "excruciating pain" as they fight away from their "partner." The

“partner” is a man who is genitally brutalizing the child. The children are trembling, crying, collapsing and fainting while Kinsey’s “adult males” continued to diligently assault them. The assaults were to attain what Kinsey interpreted as a climax. This was in order to find out if children can be stimulated to what Kinsey, an obvious sadomasochist himself, viewed as an orgasm. Of course these children may also be driven - stimulated - to murder or suicide. Is this what Kinsey alluded to when he spoke of children's "sadistic and masochistic reactions?" Surely most scholars should ask why Kinsey did not identify the kind and number of sadistic and masochistic “reactions” as he did the number of pelvic thrusts he claims to have observed.

His readers are told that 33% of 196 infants and children reacted so, that is masochistically or sadistically. (7). Why a “%”? He was reporting the emotional and physical responses of real children, was he not? While it is true this number represents 64.7 children out of 196, how does .7% of a child faint? The use of % in this case is singularly, sloppily, suspect. Is it easier to accept the idea that 3% of a child "sample" fainted as a result of "stimulation” rather than that 5 young children fainted as a result of forced genital stimulation?

And, on what basis is the adult experimenter qualified, semantically or logically, as a child's "partner" - later, “companion” or even “playmate”? (8) Such double-speak used by recognized scientists demonstrates perhaps best the actual powerlessness of children versus the verbal, social, and physical power of adults. By definition these are not "equal partner" relationships. Perhaps nowhere do we see more clearly than in this Kinsey research the ability of adults to dictate children's behavior~ interpret their responses to fit adult sexual monetary or sexual interest and then to broadcast these interpretations with impunity to the world - never fearing contradiction. For example, Kinsey notes on page 180 that the vital experiments were timed, elsewhere, with a stopwatch or second hand.

While some may consider sadistic, masochistic or hysterical reactions, collapsing, sobbing or such as vital events worthy of focus and concern, Dr. Kinsey limited his interest as noted to his view of a "climax". Growing from the inadequate sample of 196 children just discussed, Kinsey finally secured a proper taxonomist's "homogeneous group" (317 infants and children, 5 months to 14 years, male) - for timing. Here we are introduced to a child of four years, a "typical case" who was quite obviously masturbated, molested, genitally stimulated around the clock for 24 hours. Kinsey observed that this child achieved the maximum number of his climaxes, "26 climaxes in 24 hours" (p. 180). He explains that "more climaxes might have been possible in the same period of time." Indeed one 11 month baby was violated to what Kinsey views as an orgasm every 6 minutes for an hour; another 11 month old every 3 minutes for 38 minutes. While sex experimentation on gall wasps may serve some higher purpose, such genital violations of children as far as we can see, tragically dramatizes the human failure element inherent in what we call "scientific objectivity."

While the Kinsey team proselytized sexual openness and wrote of masturbation often, the actual word appeared only once in describing the child experimenters on pages 160-161. "Children" appeared only once in lieu of less accurate, emotionally charged nouns such as "individuals" (5 times) and "pre-adolescent" (7 times). Although these children were being criminally masturbated arguably by pedophile offenders, neither the word "force" nor "pedophile" nor any simile thereof, was offered to enable the reader to understand the experimental design. Instead, numerous techniques of semantic confusion were employed to effectively mystify the Kinsey team's barbaric experimental activities.

But how does a screaming or a trembling 5 or 11 month old, or even older child “achieve” orgasm, especially when their hands, as Kinsey carefully observed, were often “grasping?” In private correspondence with me, Paul Gebhard as director of the Institute for Sex Research noted that the Kinsey techniques of sexual stimulation of these children included “adult-child contact—chiefly manual or oral” (9). Previously observed children’s reactions of fighting or fainting are hardly examples of voluntary self-stimulation, but Kinsey claimed all his histories were volunteered (except for a bit of pressure here and there) (10).

Who was the “qualified individual” who were the superiors responsible” for these events, officially classified as “criminal”? Who established the criteria for orgasm and how was it *really* measured? Judged? Kinsey tells us orgasm was measured by its similar signs in the boy’s later life, but Gebhard tells us there were no follow-up studies attempted, since these “were impossible or too expensive” (11). Kinsey claims (p. 177) that the pedophile experimenters who had been violating the children via “manual or oral techniques,” were “adult males....able to recognize and/interpret the boys' experiences.” As spurious as this description may be these experimenters received aid in their interpretations and experimental design from Dr. Kinsey - which is only correct procedurally, and practically. Kinsey points out that his team is the first to ever test “by empirical study and statistical procedures....erection, pelvic thrusts, and the several other characteristics of true orgasm in a list of 317 pre-adolescent boys ranging between infants of five months and adolescence in age” (p. 181).

What *scientist* asks a rapist to judge whether his victim "enjoyed" it or not? And, what scientist calls the rapist's opinion "evidence" of sexuality. Most scientists (most people) realize that men with histories of child sexual abuse are not impartial observers of children's sexual responses. So, can Kinsey's observations be seen as any less partial or disordered than those of his trainees? These men had to be properly trained for such research, as Kinsey himself states above, and on several other occasions (12). Kinsey reports that "a fretful babe quiets down under the initial sexual stimulation, is distracted from other activities....(and) thrown into convulsive action, often violent arm and leg movements, sometimes with weeping at....climax. It may be some time before erection can be induced again after such an experience". (p. 177). Surely such cold blooded science is the ultimate in May's prediction of Kinsey's "machine ultima" as utterly dehumanizing. Moreover, such reportage reveals shocking ignorance of elementary biological and emotional facts.

As I have but a moment to touch on contemporary scientists who reflect a similar bent to their research, let us note one positive outcome of Kinsey's work on children. That is, its use as a diagnostic tool for viewing the ways pedophile biased scientists may research, police, mystify, and perceive human sexual behavior. For instance, in contrast to Kinsey's approach to child stimulation, there are pedagogues and pediatricians who argue that even modern mobile colors or mechanical sounds are often too stimulating for a small child and could be emotionally damaging. With Kinsey as a reference tool, we have indeed identified similar language and evidence distortions in other child-sex research (13).

Many children have paid dearly for our current knowledge of the dangers of pedophile-biased research. This knowledge forces us to seriously question the activities of other sexologists involved in any "child sexuality" studies. Bombarded by mass media images of "child-woman" everywhere, parents and educators turn to scientists for help. Unfortunately said scientists are often being retained and supported by the very industry implicated in the growing problem of early sexuality and the child as an arousal object. That is, the sex industry (Playboy, Penthouse, et al) (14).

The sex-industry propagandizes "intergenerational" sex, also promoting incest, which it titles "home sex" or "family sex". Penthouse Forum's board of consultants reads like the Who's Who in Sexology (15). Long supported by Playboy, SEICUS (the Sex Information Council of the United States) now "questions" the incest taboo (16), The Institute for Sex Research, also Playboy funded, blatantly calls incest a "sexual variation" (17). While taking no stand, as far as far as we know, on incest, or child sexuality, Masters, and Johnson have also long been financed by Playboy, and their work reveals a similar conflict of interest (18). It is vitally important to the lifeblood the entire sex industry to popularize children and incest as viable arousal opportunities And this author's original research also documents this pattern in Playboy chronologically.

Thus the mechanizing role of the sexologists in legitimising materials blatantly pedophilic, sadistic, misogynistic, and such becomes a test of scientific ethics. Open and loving humans, secure in their sexuality and their humanity can hardly be expected to survive in a brutalizing exploitive environment. Why do scientists who contribute their expertise, their authoritative, credible names. to such an environment go unscathed by their colleagues? And are they still "scientists", after all?

A natural law: The anti-sex, anti-life roots of sex industry materials can be seen in the sustenance these materials must (and do) inevitably –organically--draw from fear/death themes: sadism, necrophilia, lust/hate for women, infants and children. When permitted integration into mass media and general society, these symbols of sex-hate/death-lust, find expression in commercial, artistic and personal experience. Many scholars argue that the human responses to such widely broadcast pornographic themes include growing narcissism, and violence toward life, seen as lovelessness, alienation, crime, impotence, homosexuality, rape, increased sexual abuse of children, and increased chemical dependency in the general population.

In conclusion, I hereby strongly urge that all work of the Kinsey Group and the Institute for Sex Research be re-examined by an international tribunal, representing children's and scientific bodies, first, to determine formally if the codes of human experimentation have been violated. As part of this statement of concern for child welfare, I urge a similar investigation of ethics violations by scholars who validate patently misogynistic and pedophile sex industry products. Such an investigation would necessitate the exclusion of any scholars with either a pedophile bent, or those whose involvement is with the sex industry, alas under investigation. Action on these issues is seen as urgent and of highest priority lest the entire scientific community be implicated by the sin of silence.

Before we permit this continued retreat backwards to our darkest eras, had we not best ourselves understand that there is a fork in this road for humanity? As scientists, it would seem our task is to help redirect society toward the path of integrated love and human dignity - the path toward life.

REFERENCES

1. May, R., *Love and Will*, Dell, New York (1969); p. 43-47.
2. Kinsey, A., *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, W.B. Saunders, London, (1948), pp. 160~188.
3. Among other comments. p. 161; "They derive definite pleasure from the situation" p. 168 and 170: Kinsey notes the positive value of homosexual pedophile activity, "without help from more experienced persons," children are generally non-orgasmic he writes.
4. -- p. 177: On site control appears to have been in the hands of male child sex offenders. However, several quotes indicate Kinsey's scientific orientation required personal validation. See Pomeroy, *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research*, Harper and Row, New York (1972). Among other comments laced through both Kinsey's and Pomeroy's books, Pomeroy quotes Kinsey, "I need to be able to quote authority until I have a chance to see it myself," p. 184, nothing was too trivial for Kinsey, p. 399; see also pages 19, and criticisms of non-participatory scientists as p. 69. And pages, 58, 63 and 11, in Kinsey for his supervisory role, such as: "It has also been necessary to test the reliability of every other technique, at every point in the program". Space restricts further documentation here.

5. Kinsey, p. 7, 9, 11~13, 32-34, 41-42, 44, 60,157,177,181, etc.
6. p.161.
7. pp. 160-161.
8. pp. 160-182.
9. Personal correspondence, March 11, 1981.
10. Pomeroy: Among other quotes: p. 106, 123, "his wife would never have come forward [filming sexual acts] on her own initiative". p. 180.
11. Gebhard correspondence.
12. Kinsey: no other scientists attempted systematic experimentation p. 34, 181, 158, 12 etc.
13. See 7 out of 8 papers in "Infant and Child Sexuality" and "Pedophile" sections in Cooke, M., and Wilson, G., *Love and Attraction*, Pergamon, New York, (1979): pp. 489-540.
14. Among other publications see *Penthouse Forum Variations*, (1977) pp. 90-92.
15. Wardell Pomeroy, John Money, Albert Ellis, Leah Schaefer, Eric Trimmer, and others.
16. *Playboy* states January 1979, that it awarded "several major grants" to SEICUS beginning July 1967, pp. 84-85, and SEICUS May 1979, Vol. III, Number 5, issued a report many scholars suggest to be slanted toward reversing the incest taboo, "Dealing with the Last Taboo".
- 17 Institute for Sex Research, "Standard Bibliographies" order list places Incest under its column on "Sex Variations". (along with "somasochism" and "Pedophilia").
18. *Playboy*, January 1979, pp. 84-85, began in January 1968 to provide, "several hundred thousand callers" to Masters and Johnson.