

ELITE AMERICAN EUGENICISTS

*Kinsey concentrated on negative eugenics, calling for a program of sterilization that was at once sweeping and terrifying. "The reduction of the birth rate of the lowest classes must depend upon the sterilization of perhaps a tenth of our population."*¹

James H. Jones, *Alfred C. Kinsey: A Private/Public Life*, 1997

In 1954, the 83rd U.S. Congress became concerned about the influence of the large tax-exempt foundations on the nation's social, economic, and political well-being. Following the infamous 1914 scandal known as "The Ludlow Massacre" of women and children in Rockefeller's Colorado coal mines, the Democrat-chaired Walsh Committee held hearings on the industrial practices of Big Business. In 1952 the Cox Committee continued the line of inquiry, but further examined certain "non-profit" foundations created by Big Business. The 1954 investigation was chaired by Republican B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee, a decorated veteran and World War I hero. The Reece Committee inquiry confirmed what Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis had once said about the extent to which foundation funds were being used to achieve political objectives, while the foundations themselves had become "a state within a state." The Reece Committee reported that a mix of the Old World aristocracy and heirs to the American "Robber Barons" had emerged to control extensive resources while "operating outside of our democratic processes."²




U.S. Congressman and World War I hero B. Carroll Reece (R-Tennessee) chaired the Reece Committee during the 83rd Congress (1953-1954).

Dr. Carroll Quigley, professor of history at Georgetown University's Foreign Service School, wrote his important and revealing book *Tragedy and Hope* in 1966. Quigley had been one of Bill Clinton's college mentors, and the President-to-be paid tribute to him by name during his acceptance speech at the 1992 Democratic National Convention. In *Tragedy and Hope*, Quigley candidly stated,

I know of the operations of this network [of foundations] because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted... to examine its papers and secret records. I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and many of its instruments.³

Regarding the foundations, Quigley recalled:

It soon became clear that people of



Cartoons in the first half of the 20th Century often depicted big business as a threat to American interests.



Professor Carroll Quigley

immense wealth would be unhappy if the [Reece] investigation went too far and that the “most respected” newspapers in the country, closely allied with these men of wealth, would not get excited enough about any revelations to make the publicity worthwhile, in terms of votes or campaign contributions. An interesting report showing the Left-wing associations of the interlocking nexus of tax-exempt foundations was issued in 1954 rather quietly. Four years later, the Reece committee’s general counsel, Rene A. Wormser, wrote a shocked, but not shocking, book on the subject called *Foundations: Their Power and Influence*.⁴

In the introduction to *Foundations*, Wormser summarized the Reece Committee’s findings:

It is not easy to investigate foundations, not even for Congress to attempt it: the giant foundations are powerful and have powerful friends. A special committee was created by the House of Representatives of the 83rd Congress to investigate tax-exempt organizations. It is generally referred to as the “Reece Committee” after its chairman, Congressman B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee. It was successor, in a way, to the “Cox Committee,” created by the previous Congress. The Reece Committee had perhaps the most hazardous career of any committee in the history of Congress. It survived its many perils, however, to bring to the attention of Congress and the people grave dangers to our society.

These dangers relate chiefly to the use of foundation funds for political ends; they arise out of the accumulation of substantial economic power and of cultural influence in the hands of a class of administrators of tax-exempt funds established in perpetuity. An “elite” has thus emerged, in control of gigantic financial resources operating outside of our democratic processes.⁵

As described by the Congressional Committee, the network of philanthropic foundations was quite “willing and able to shape the future of this nation and of mankind in the image of its own value concepts,” creating injustice due to undemocratic, “interlocking and self-perpetuating” groups. The Reece Committee concluded that, unlike corporate structures, foundations are “unchecked by stockholders”; unlike government they are “unchecked by the people”; and unlike churches they are “unchecked by any firmly established canons of value.”⁶ Indeed, these “Old World” American elite interests operate like the European aristocracies America’s founders sought to escape. They chafed under the American democratic process, believing it left the world without a unified hand and mind to guide it safely through the global shoals of food production to feed the teeming masses (workers for their business interests in peace and war) and population control (too many of the “wrong” types of people).⁷



Rockefellers, father and son. The Reece Committee investigation of the Rockefeller Foundation was triggered by the Foundation’s inclination to fund causes promoting population control and alteration of the American way of life.

The Rockefeller Foundation had primarily targeted its efforts and largess at controlling populations and manipulating mass communication. And one focus of the Congressional Committee investigation which differed from the earlier Walsh and Cox inquiries was Rockefeller Foundation support for Alfred Kinsey's Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University. Reece Committee legal counsel Wormser writes,

The Rockefeller Foundation's statement filed with the Committee explained its connection with the Kinsey studies in this way. In 1931 it "became interested in systematic support for studies in sexual physiology and behavior" ...Its work in these areas was chiefly in connection with the "committee for research in problems of sex of The National Research Council," to which, by 1954, the Foundation had granted \$1,755,000 in annual grants running from \$75,000 to \$240,000. Beginning about 1941, a considerable portion of these funds was supplied to Dr. Kinsey's studies, and one grant was made direct to Dr. Kinsey.... The work of the NRC produced some results of truly noteworthy importance.... [However] the much-publicized "best-seller" Kinsey studies base an advocacy of criminal and social reform on the very *unscientific* material which Dr. Kinsey had collected and permitted to be widely disseminated.⁸

During the Reece Committee hearings, Dr. Albert Hobbs, a widely published University of Pennsylvania sociologist, critiqued the "skewed" Kinsey data in scathing terms. Kinsey biographer James Jones attacked Professor Hobbs as a "right-wing sociologist"⁹ for his testimony that,

[S]ocial scientists should exercise the greatest care in informing the public when their work is not truly "scientific." The very term "social science" implies that their conclusions are unassailable because they are "scientifically" arrived at. There is the constant danger, then, that laymen will take these conclusions as axiomatic bases for social action. [Note for example]...the remarkable number of writings which appeared after the Rockefeller Foundation-supported Kinsey studies. With the assumedly "scientific" character of Dr. Kinsey's work behind us, we had such things offered to the public as this by one Anne G. Freegood, in the September 1953 issue of *Harper's*:

The desert in this case is our current code of laws governing sexual activities and the background of Puritan tradition regarding sex under which this country still to some extent operates.¹⁰

Later, Ann Freegood wrote that the first Kinsey report "has already been cited in court decisions and quoted in textbooks as well as blazoned from one end of the country to the other." Wormser quotes from Professor Hobbs' book, *Social Problems and Scientism*, regarding the widespread use by the professions of Dr. Kinsey's first report:

Despite the patent limitations of the study and its persistent bias, its conclusions regarding sexual behavior were widely believed. They were presented to college classes; medical



University of Pennsylvania sociologist Dr. Albert Hobbs warned the Reece Committee about Kinsey's "scientism" (pseudo-science).

doctors cited them in lectures; psychiatrists applauded them; a radio program indicated that the findings were serving as a basis for revision of moral codes relating to sex; and an editorial in a college student newspaper admonished the college administration to make provision for sexual outlets for the students in accordance with the “scientific realities” as established by the book.

Some of these Kinseyites have said that our laws are wrong because they do not follow the biological “facts.” Published reports such as those of Kinsey can do immeasurable harm when they falsely pretend to disclose biological “facts.” A great part of the Kinsey product is without basis in true “fact” and is mere propaganda for some personally intriguing concepts.

Wormser continues,

Professor Hobbs pointed out that Dr. Kinsey ridiculed “socially approved patterns of sexual behavior,” calling them “rationalizations,” while conversely referring to socially condemned forms of sexual behavior as “normal” or “normal in the human animal.” This presentation, said Professor Hobbs, “could give the impression, and it gave the impression to a number of reviewers, that things which conform to the socially approved codes of sexual conduct are rationalizations, not quite right, while things which deviate from it, such as homosexuality, are normal, in a sense right.” ...Professor Hobbs stressed the fact that such pseudoscientific presentations could seriously affect public morality. Here is more of his testimony:¹¹

For an illustration, in connection with the question of heterosexuality compared with homosexuality, Kinsey, in the first volume, has this statement: “It is only because society demands that there be a particular choice in the matter (of heterosexuality or homosexuality) and does not so often dictate one’s choice of food or clothing.

In the second volume it is stressed, for example, that we object to adult molesters of children primarily because we have become conditioned against such adult molesters of children, and that the children who are molested become emotionally upset, primarily because of the old-fashioned attitudes of their parents about such practices, and the parents (the implication is) are the ones who do the real damage by making a fuss about it if a child is molested. Because the molester and here I quote from Kinsey, “may have contributed favorably to their later sociosexual development.” That is, a molester of children may have actually, Kinsey contends, not only not harmed them, but may have [helped]. Especially emphasized in the second volume, the volume on females, is the supposed beneficial effects of premarital sexual experiences. Such experiences, Kinsey states: “provide an opportunity for the females to learn to adjust emotionally to various types of males.”¹²

* * * *

In addition on page 327, he contends that premarital sexual experience may well contribute to the effectiveness of one’s other nonsexual social relationships, and that many females—this is on page 115—will thus learn how to respond to sociosexual contacts.... On page 328, that it should contribute to the development of emotional capacities in a

more effective way than if sexual experiences are acquired after marriage.¹³

The avoidance of premarital sexual experience by females, according to Professor Kinsey, may lead to inhibitions which damage the capacity to respond, so much that these inhibitions may persist after years of marriage, “if, indeed, they are ever dissipated.” That is from page 330. So you get a continued emphasis on the desirability of females engaging in premarital sexual behavior. In both these volumes there is a persistent emphasis, a persistent questioning of the traditional codes, and the laws relating to sexual behavior. Professor Kinsey may be correct or he may be incorrect, but when he gives the impression that the findings are scientific in the same sense as the findings in physical science, then the issue becomes not a matter of whether he as a person is correct or incorrect, but of the impression which is given to the public, which can be quite unfortunate. (*Hearings*, pp. 129, 130.)¹⁴

As discussed in Chapter 8, Hobbs was correct in fearing that the Kinsey data were being used in law and public policy and taught to college students nationwide. The results were indeed “unfortunate.”

POWERFUL POLITICAL INTERVENTION AND THE KINSEY FILE “NEVER SAW THE LIGHT OF DAY”

During a conversation just prior to his death, Dr. Hobbs told this author that he could not understand how he had missed the clear evidence of child sexual abuse in Kinsey’s data. Dr. Hobbs’ daughter, Pamela Hobbs Hoffecker, stated during a 1996 interview: “My father told me that if the Reece Committee had had the benefit of Judith’s Reisman’s discovery that children were abused for Kinsey’s data, that would have changed the course of American, even world, history.”¹⁵


Certain Rockefeller business activities had supplied war-making materials to Hitler’s war effort, causing then-Senator Harry Truman (D-Missouri) to use the word “treason” when describing Rockefeller (Standard Oil), during a Senate speech on March 27, 1942. Now the Rockefeller Foundation (and other foundations as well) were found to be funding questionable programs and research during the post-war era that were having a harmful impact in critical areas of America’s social, educational, and political life. The Reece Committee investigation of Kinsey’s sex research as it served the conspirator’s special revolutionary interests, had to be stopped—and it was. Wormser writes,

Most mysterious and disturbing was how the investigation of the Kinsey data was thwarted by a combined effort of the Republicans and the Democrats in that administration.... [Congressman Wayne] Hays [D.-Ohio]



The Rockefellers’ international business dealings with Nazi Germany were labeled “treason” by U.S. Senator (later President) Harry Truman (D-Missouri) on March 27, 1942.

particularly [would not allow] a proposed study of the Kinsey reports... Dr. Ettinger had dug up some significant material about foundation support of the Kinsey projects. This brought Mr. Hays to a steaming rage, and he asked to see our entire Kinsey file. It was produced for him, and he angrily declared to Mr. [Norman] Dodd [the committee's research director] that we were to go no further with this particular investigation, contending that every member of Congress would be against our doing so. Neither Mr. Dodd nor I could see any reason why Dr. Kinsey's foundation supported projects should not bear as much scrutiny as any other foundation operation. But Mr. Hays then introduced another element into the situation. Our appropriation for 1954 had, at the time, not yet been approved, and Mr. Hays stated emphatically to Mr. Dodd that he would oppose any further appropriation to our Committee unless the Kinsey investigation was dropped. His unreasoning opposition to any study of these projects was so great that he threatened to fight against the appropriation on the floor of the House. [Fearful,] Mr. Dodd concluded that Mr. Hays must be appeased. He suggested, therefore, that Mr. Hays take the entire Kinsey file and lock it in his personal safe so that he would know the



This May, 1954, Congressional Committee chart tracks the flow of money, men, and ideas from the tax-exempt foundations into critical sectors of American life.

material could not be used without the express consent of the Committee. This Mr. Hays did. The file remained in his safe throughout the hearings... he may still have it.

The Kinsey reports were included as a small part of the committee's evidence in open hearings, thanks to the testimony of Professor Hobbs. But Wormser laments that the valuable material in the Kinsey file never saw the light of day.¹⁶ Committee chief counsel Wormser and research director Dodd were first-hand witnesses to the intense and powerful opposition to any investigation of the tax-exempt foundations,¹⁷ including the successful effort to prevent further public hearings. The censorship was reinforced by the major media's refusal to provide meaningful news coverage of the committee's hearings and findings or to expose the behind-the-scenes war to keep the public in the dark.

Due to massive pressure coming from the highest levels, the Reece Committee was shut down by the end of 1954.¹⁸ Its final report was delivered on December 16, 1954. Kinsey's powerful friends in high places had again protected him and his cadre from public scrutiny.



Norman Dodd, director of research for the Congressional Committee.

STATISTICAL STUFF, NONSENSE, AND CONTROL

Kinsey's preposterous statistical data served the Rockefeller Foundation's larger purposes. You will recall that six years prior to the Reece Committee hearings the Foundation had been informed of the bad data by Warren Weaver, the head of its Natural Sciences Division. In 1948, Weaver had discussed Kinsey's lack of scientific methodology with Allen Wallis of the University of Chicago,¹⁹ and later wrote that although monies for "the National Research Council Committee for Research in Problems of Sex were, from 1934 through 1941, recommended to the Trustees by me,"²⁰ the Kinsey research was a scientific farce. He had bluntly asserted, "I know of no evidence that Dr. Kinsey understands the underlying statistical character of his work," and had charged that neither Kinsey nor his assistant, Clyde Martin, had "the competence... [or] interest" in correcting this shocking fault. Weaver was, for example, appalled to discover that "Kinsey quotes an 'average,' which on examination, turns out to be an average of just one case!"²¹

Despite the exposure of Kinsey's worthless research by Weaver, Wallis, Hobbs, and other credible critics, Rockefeller Foundation trustees continued to fund the Kinsey sex studies until 1954, when the Reece Committee planned to publicly examine both Kinsey and his data.

Cultural trends author and Kinsey analyst Dr. E. Michael Jones comments on some of the ways in which Kinsey exercised control over his benefactors. He refers to Yerkes, Corner and Gregg as "the Three Wise Men." Reviewing the James Jones biography of Kinsey, Jones asserts,

What is clearer in the book is how Kinsey used sex to control the people around him. In this regard the controllers at the Rockefeller Foundation—Yerkes, Corner and Gregg—got more than they bargained for. The method was fairly simple. To begin with all of the above mentioned men had jettisoned religion in favor of science as a better guide to how to live life. That naturally led them to see sex as just one more field of study, which led them to ignore its power over them. Hence when Kinsey jerked their chains they were unaware of what was going on until it was too late. In this Kinsey played Dionysos to their Pentheus. All the while they thought he was in their power, when all he had to do

was ask if they wanted to see the women dancing naked on the mountainside to turn the tables on them.

Which is precisely what Kinsey refined into the standard treatment of those who came to visit at the Institute in

Bloomington. “I want you to see our library and our collections of erotic materials in sufficient detail to understand what bearing they have on the research project as a whole,” Kinsey wrote to Alan Gregg, director of the Medical Science Division of the Rockefeller Foundation and the man who held the purse strings, and on February 6, 1947, Gregg arrived in Bloomington, like Pentheus arriving on the mountain to watch the women dancing naked. Kinsey, [Jones tells us] took obvious delight in showing his visitor various books, photographs and drawings,” which is not hard to understand because he understood that this was the simplest way to draw Gregg under his control as a supporter of his research.

The culmination of every trip to Bloomington was, of course, the moment when Kinsey took his victim’s sexual history. (Actually, some of Kinsey’s willing victims then went on to allow themselves to be photographed while engaged in sexual activity, but this was the exception and not the rule.) Yerkes had done this before Gregg arrived in Bloomington and afterward no matter how shabbily Kinsey treated him, Yerkes felt obliged to support him. The word blackmail springs most immediately to mind. Kinsey took sexual histories as a way of gaining power over people, and scientists, those who felt that sexual morality was an outdated remnant of a bygone era were his easiest picking in many ways. The threat of blackmail was never far from the practice of taking sexual histories, which is probably why, in addition to his prurient interest in the subject matter, Kinsey was so avid to take them.

His use of sex as a way of controlling people was not limited to foundation executives. He did the same thing to the press in preparation for the release of the *Male* volume. Reporters were invited to Bloomington, softened up by being shown pornography, then asked to sign a “contract” which would allow Kinsey to read any article they wrote before it was published, in the interest, of course, of scientific accuracy. To insure final control over this willing group of Enlightened thinkers, Kinsey persuaded them to give their sexual histories. Then in the event that one of the journalists would somehow come to his senses and write something unfavorable, Kinsey had a wealth of information on the most intimate details of his life that could be used against him.²²



Robert M. Yerkes



George Corner



Dr. Alan Gregg

THE VICTORY TOUR: KINSEY TO THE LAND OF GUYON, HIRSCHFELD AND CROWLEY

By 1955, Kinsey was at the height of his renown. Homosexual author Gore Vidal described him as the “most famous man in America, the world, for about a decade.”²³

In the wake of the Reece Investigation, Dean Rusk, then president of the Rockefeller Foundation (and later Secretary of State) terminated the Foundation's financial support of Kinsey's sex research.²⁴ Kinsey had served his purpose. The Foundation had shifted its funds to the American Law Institute. There, Kinsey's research would be put to use to erode existing laws protecting marriage and the family and to craft more lenient sex-offender laws via the American Law Institute's (ALI) Model Penal Code. On April 25, 1955, the ALI released its first Model Penal Code draft (#4), modeled in large part on Kinsey's recommendations, which helped to alter and liberally revise American sex offender laws and penalties.

Kinsey had lectured nationwide to standing ovations in America's finest universities and colleges, traveling an "anything-goes" campaign trail to weaken sex-offender laws. He had escaped close scrutiny by a congressional committee that could have resulted in ruin, even prison. He and wife Clara now embarked on a trip to Europe.

In his 1972 biography, Pomeroy claims that beyond Mexico and Peru, Kinsey "had never been any farther from the continental United States than Cuba before 1955."²⁵ Kinsey did not speak a foreign language, yet Pomeroy suggests that during his three-week worldwide tour he was able to comprehend and authoritatively evaluate the socio-sexual intricacies of scores of exotic foreign cultures. "Somewhat to his own amazement, Kinsey found that he was a celebrity abroad."²⁶ A conquering hero in Scandinavia, the eugenicist began training professional groups, from law enforcement to psychiatry, about "scientific" sex by portraying his defective methodology and sham findings as authoritative and scientific.

In Denmark, Kinsey "tracked down a scholar"²⁷ who insisted that the entire corpus of Hans Christian Andersen's famous fairy tales were "straight-out homosexual stories." Kinsey agreed, but said the sexually permissive Danes "would have been outraged" to know what this anonymous "scholar" had discovered. Kinsey called Anderson's *The Little Mermaid* a "mute nymph" who "cannot tell the world how she feels about anything," just as "Andersen could not tell the world of his homosexual love for the people of the world."²⁸ His literary argument says little about Andersen, but it reveals a great deal about Kinsey, who would not tell the world of his secret life. Kinsey's notions about Andersen follow:

Andersen is an excellent illustration of the fact that the world simply must learn that persons with homosexual histories and exclusively homosexual histories have been among the persons who were



Kinsey was popularized in the theater and was the subject of numerous mainstream cartoons.

the most important.... [Homosexuals] certainly have done some of the outstanding things in the world.²⁹

Kinsey, who knew he also had done some of the “outstanding things in the world,” was pleased by the “socialized approach to sex” in Denmark and by their tolerant police force. As a sexologist, filmmaker, and promiscuous collector himself, Kinsey was elated that the Danish sex industry had “recently been greatly [liberated] by the repeal of the laws against pornography.” A reduction of the age of consent made sex for unmarried girls over 16 and boys over 18 legal, permitting vulnerable youngsters to enter and enrich the legalized sex “industry.” Expanding opportunity for exploiting ever younger “sex workers,” with government approval, is something for which Denmark has earned a worldwide reputation.

Kinsey, undisturbed by prostitution, was pleased to have the chance to “talk to the boys and girls who were actually prostituting.” They accepted money in an “indirect fashion.” Kinsey was touched that the police did not interfere when an older man sexually solicited “a twenty-year-old boy.”³⁰ He was gratified that “transvestitism was permitted,” although disappointed that a police permit was required. Kinsey “shocked” Danish students with lectures describing restrictive American sex laws. Kinsey’s great disappointment in the Danes was that, while legalizing homosexual conduct, they still largely disapproved of it. He wrote in his notebook,

I found there was very considerable public opinion against such behavior, and it was the judgment of most of the persons with whom I talked—and I had the opportunity to talk to scores in the short time I was there—that it would do considerable damage to the social or political position of an individual if it was discovered that he had a homosexual history, even though no legal action was taken.³¹

Next on the tour was Sweden, a country where Kinsey also found himself quite at home. Shortly before he arrived, according to Pomeroy, a cabinet minister was “found to have had sexual relations with a teen-age boy. Kinsey was assured that people would be shocked at any suggestion that he be removed from his office.”³² As other Scandinavian countries, Sweden (a monarchy-based plutocracy) had no jury system, so it was easier to implement lenient sex-offender laws there than in jury-based America.



Publicity photo of Dr. and Mrs. Kinsey during their trip to Europe.

Neither Kinsey nor Pomeroy comment on the impact of politically powerful pedophiles on Swedish laws that opened the nation to adult and child pornography, thereby largely abandoning both women and children to sexual predators. (It was apparently a result also of the influence of such Swedish sex revolutionaries as Gunnar and Alva Myrdal.)³³ Premarital sex for children was condoned by the Swedes, and Kinsey reassured critics that children had sex only with those they held in “esteem.” A Cabinet minister, for example, would presumably qualify.

Neither Kinsey nor Pomeroy comment on the impact of politically powerful pedophiles on Swedish laws that opened the nation to adult and child pornography, thereby largely abandoning both women and children to sexual predators. (It was apparently a result also of the influence of such Swedish sex revolutionaries as Gunnar and Alva Myrdal.)³³ Premarital sex for children was condoned by the Swedes, and Kinsey reassured critics that children had sex only with those they held in “esteem.” A Cabinet minister, for example, would presumably qualify.

For Kinsey, Sweden was more progressive than was Denmark, though he admired all of Scandinavia due to its open sexual license. In Norway, he enjoyed the sculptor Adolph

Gustav Vigeland, whose “vital nude figures... [are] spread through a beautiful park.” While heroic and cherubic nude statuary has been common in Europe for centuries, Kinsey was especially pleased with Vigeland’s nudes. Why? “Kinsey observed a high percentage of the figures were male... often depicted... wrestling against females, or animals devouring females with apparent male approval.” Although Vigeland had been married, Kinsey noted a score of his letters “to a single male in a one-year period... the [homosexual] inference was clear.”



Kinsey commands attention as he lectures to an academic audience in Denmark.

From the Scandinavian countries, Kinsey traveled to England, where he helped craft the controversial 1957 Wolfenden Report. The report recommended the legalization and licensing of obscenity, homosexuality, and other activities previously understood to be perversions. After Kinsey’s visit, the Wolfenden Report became a cited authority in the United States; Wolfenden cited the Model Penal Code of the United States, while revolutionary American attorneys and judges cited Wolfenden. In England,

[Kinsey attended] conferences with professional groups. The latter included prison and hospital staff as well as the British commission that was then working on the revision of the English sex law. This was the group that crafted the Wolfenden Report for Parliament in 1957. Lectures in London at the Institute of Psychiatry and at the Maudsley Hospital were high points.³⁴

ROMAN HOLIDAY

France disappointed Kinsey. He had expected the French to be far more sexually liberated. In England, writes Pomeroy, Kinsey had hoped to acquire Aleister Crowley’s diaries for the Institute.³⁵ Crowley, an “occultist” drug addict and sadist also known as “The Beast,” was accomplished in homosexual magic. He conducted ritual Satanic sacrifices of such heartless cruelty that he was driven out of Italy following the revelation of fatal bloody orgies with children and their mothers in his squalid Sicilian “abbey.”³⁶ He had died in December 1947.³⁷

Kinsey was reportedly unsuccessful in obtaining the diaries, after which he made a pilgrimage to Thelema Abbey, the temple where Crowley had ministered. Crowley’s first book, the pornographic *White Stains*, advocated sexual magic and was much favored by Kinsey. In fact, Kinsey was photographed in Crowley’s “Chamber of Horrors,” while he and Clara appear together in a photo following Kinsey’s return from the Abbey. The latter appears (without identification) in Pomeroy’s biography, and also in *Anger* (1995), by William Landis, a biography of Crowley disciple Kenneth Anger. The caption reads, “Dr. Kinsey with his wife in Italy, 1955. He had just visited Crowley’s Thelema Abbey in Sicily and would soon die.”³⁹

At Thelema, Kenneth Anger restored the occult and pornographic murals that adorned Crowley's temple for tantric sex (they had been white-washed by order of the Italian government). Landis focuses on Anger's homosexual filmmaking and his relationship with Crowley, and also describes in some detail Anger's relationship with Kinsey. He confirms Kinsey's attempt to obtain Crowley's diaries in England.



"Dr. Kinsey with his wife in Italy, 1955. He had just visited Crowley's Thelema Abbey in Sicily and would soon die." (Cutline from *Anger* by William Landis)

Were Kinsey and Crowley correspondents? Indeed, was Crowley one of Kinsey's "technically trained observers"? We know from Pomeroy that Kinsey had carried out extensive, secretive, "confidential" correspondence with diarists in Europe and Middle Eastern countries. Kinsey and Crowley could have corresponded in English. They shared similar sexual obsessions, friends, and acquaintances, such as Kenneth Anger, the American Nazi George Sylvester Viereck, and the French pedophile Rene Guyon, to name a few. According to Anger,

Kinsey was obsessed with obtaining the Great Beast's day-to-day sex diaries.⁴⁰ ...To obtain grant monies and maintain the support of the university, Kinsey needed the excuse of research to validate his twenty-four-hours-a-day obsession with sex. However, Prok's battle cry of "Do your best and let other people react as they will" seemed a variation on Crowley's "Do what thou wilt" maxim.⁴¹

The shorthand code in which Kinsey recorded his subjects' histories also is "highly reminiscent," said Anger, of Crowley's own "sex ritual" records. American Nazi traitor George Sylvester Viereck may have been Kinsey's initial contact man for Crowley during the war.⁴² Pomeroy remarks only that Viereck's "admiration for Hitler had him in frequent political trouble," and that Kinsey had a "high opinion of Viereck's erotic writings," as well as those of Crowley's *White Stains*. Kinsey's judgment of Crowley as "a brilliant writer,"⁴³ is downplayed by the Kinsey Institute's erotic bibliographer, Greshon Legman, but one wonders about Kinsey's obsessive desire to secure Crowley's diaries. During his visit to the Sicilian temple, Kinsey registered no ethical, moral, or humane objection to the practices and paintings of satanic sex magic evident at Crowley's "Unnatural Abbey."⁴⁴ The images covering the walls garishly depict children and adults in real-life, ritual sado-sexual ceremonies.⁴⁵

Kinsey constantly condemned those who espoused sexual self-discipline and restraint, or American founding moral principles, but he found Crowley's savage child pornography, his homosexual magic, and his human sacrifice records to be "most open."⁴⁶



Kinsey with Kenneth Anger, a friend of Kinsey and Aleister Crowley. The photo, taken at Crowley's Sicilian temple, does not appear to be a candid photograph. Rather it seems to make a shadowy statement about Kinsey, Anger, and Crowley.

ITALY

Pomeroy devotes six pages to Kinsey's visits to France, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, but ten pages to his trip to Italy alone. He quotes Kinsey as saying that Italian males took great pride in the size of their genitalia, and giving assurance that "on the average they were large." Pomeroy writes,

Italian tailors, Kinsey discovered, made a practice of making extra room for [genitalia] in the pants they cut, so that it came near to being a pocket. Italian men told Kinsey they did not like American-style jockey shorts because they brought the genitalia up into the crotch.⁴⁷ ... This difference in male attitudes toward the genitals Kinsey had first observed in Cuba, where he saw boys openly touching their sexual parts, in contrast to America where male children are taught from an early age not to do such a thing.⁴⁸



Aleister Crowley kept extensive sex diaries of great interest to Kinsey.



A Cyclops figure adorns that wall of Aleister Crowley's Sicilian temple Thelema. It is representative of the satanic and pornographic murals restored by Kenneth Anger after these murals were whitewashed by the Italian government.

As a sexologist in the field, Kinsey wrote that groin touching was even more common in Southern Italy, where he said men unzip their pants in public, reach in and adjust their genitals, then zip up again. Even well-dressed businessmen did this in the middle of the day, Kinsey said, and he was sure that no one paid attention. Pomeroy states that Kinsey wrote that he saw businessmen stroking their penises through their clothing when they had a sudden erection.⁴⁹ Both Kinsey and Pomeroy were quite certain that such zipping, unzipping, and related activities were excellent telltale signs of Italian health and sexual freedom.

A highly promiscuous heterosexual and homosexual environment inevitably produces a corresponding rate of venereal disease. With Kinsey himself apparently suffering from one or more sexually transmitted diseases related to his orchitis, he and Pomeroy neglected to note that venereal disease commonly locates on the groin. Regular manipulation, shifting, scratching, and rubbing is common among those infected by disease in the groin. As poverty limits good hygiene and interest in cures, disease could easily account for obsessive genital touching which tourist Kinsey attributed to “sexual freedom.” In 1955, a decade after the war, Italy remained largely destitute. The poor Italian male, whom Kinsey grumbled had to pay 25 cents for sex, could not easily pay for venereal-disease medication as well. He would just scratch and pass it on to others, including any children he fathered.

Kinsey uses the word “girl” interchangeably with “woman.” Italian “men” had sex with “girls,” not women. Apparently many of these “girls” were indeed juveniles. Kinsey, like jurist Rene Guyon, viewed women as “parasites.” Only once does Pomeroy mention a girl’s age. Kinsey’s European translator and colleague, cryptically known as “R.J.,” took Kinsey through many houses of prostitution. In one such facility, described as bare, dirty, and crowded with “girls” exhibiting themselves for inspection by potential customers, R.J. requested that he and Kinsey have sex with a thirteen-year-old child.⁵⁰

Their order was processed by the madam, whom Kinsey viewed approvingly as bringing no moral values into her business affairs. He claims, however, that he did not use the girl. “The madam did not even seem surprised; she let it be known that girls of almost any age were available.”⁵¹ Kinsey, it appeared, was charmed.

THE TURIN GIRL

Kinsey saw the child-sex traffic in Italy as simply sex for pleasure. He thought male prostitutes were “handsome young Italian boys,” while female prostitutes were “rather sloppy, fattish Southern Italians.” At the regulated brothels, girls were paid,

twenty-five cents, on a scale going up to seventy-five cents—about as cheap as [Kinsey] had ever recorded. The men who went upstairs, came down, stopped at the desk and paid the madam as they went out.... In Naples one night Kinsey talked to a girl from Turin [who] complained that she had had only nine men that night and could not live on this kind of trade.⁵²

In an observation that rivals Guyon’s “parasite” comment about women, Kinsey wrote of the Turin girl: “I have never seen any sex machine who had less emotion for the Southern Italian male, than she did.”⁵³

Was this the “sensitive” interviewer who found out everything about 10,000 to 18,000 males and females for his reports? Or was he a Grand Inquisitor who took delight in extracting the most intimate experiences from intimidated subjects? What could Kinsey learn from questioning a “sex machine” who had little “emotion for the Southern Italian male?”

The Turin girl had serviced *only* nine men in one evening. Kinsey said she was unhappy with the slow traffic and “complained she... could not live on this kind of trade.” He viewed her “kind of trade” and her life—past, present, and future—in terms of her failure as a “sex machine.” There are other pertinent questions. Did the girl support others financially—her parents, siblings, or perhaps one or more of her own children? What does her apparent lack of emotion say about her life, her feelings, and any hope for the future? Were Kinsey and Pomeroy so lacking in feeling that neither questioned how she could find *pleasure* in being copulated and sodomized by parades of dirty, scratching, strange, lonely, and commonly diseased men? Such matters apparently did not trouble Kinsey or friendly biographers, all of whom had access to his travel files and letters.⁵⁴

Kinsey and Pomeroy clearly believed that prostitution, including child prostitution, was neither wrong nor exploitive. Indeed, Pomeroy’s Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality has advocated the legalization of prostitution—with no age restrictions—as an “ethic” in their formal graduate training brochures. Pomeroy quotes Kinsey’s summary of the quality of Italian sexuality:

It is a man’s country... and interestingly enough, I talked to a good many women who said they do not resent it.... I have never seen males who were less interested where females were concerned... even those who went off with the girls....⁵⁵

According to Kinsey, the reason Italian boys and men demand pay for sodomy is that while they *want* to engage in sodomy gratis, they “could not offer free sex; it would have lowered their status.” “Kinsey surmised this might be a cultural holdover from their Greek and Phoenician backgrounds.”⁵⁶ Pomeroy continues,

It was perfectly apparent to him, Kinsey noted later, that most of the males he saw looking for sex would have accepted it from either males or females; the only difference was that they would be paid for it if they were brought to climax by the males, and would pay for it themselves if females accomplished it. Consequently, a man might look for males first, then go out and have sex with a girl, since the girl would cost less than he had been paid by the male, and he would make a slight profit.⁵⁷

Reading this, some might fairly conclude that Kinsey was so blinded by his own sexual appetites that he had no ability to see reality. Italian men paid for sex with women because, despite the larger female supply, women were more naturally desired and in demand. Kinsey’s opinions about the sexual status of children, and sex throughout Italy generally, were revealing. The following excerpt from one of his letters reveals his perverse delusions as the father of the sexual revolution and sex education in the United States⁵⁸:

I don’t suppose that we spoke to any person of any age, male or female, in the city who didn’t promptly offer to find sexual relations for us. Several girls came out of a house in a back alley and hung on to our hands, begging for money, and when we, came to a cross-alley, a woman came out and got rid of the girls, then we had her for two or three blocks. It was the same way with boys, who offered to find anything for us. Any child could tell you where the nearest house of prostitution was, and it was never very far away.⁵⁹

Pomeroy further notes:

Another prime area of sexual activity in Naples was its famous Galleria, where Kinsey found it was possible to observe any number of people out hunting for sex at any hour of the day or night. Young boys masturbated and no one paid any attention, which proved once more, Kinsey wrote, “what a hysterical fear we have acquired of male genitals.” There were both male and female prostitutes in the Galleria. One girl was completely nude to the waist; she had on a gauzy, thin shawl which kept slipping off. Kinsey saw a young, slender boy of twenty or so who was doing a big business with GIs, sailors and older Italian men. There were roving smaller children who would begin by offering to take the visitor to girls, and if that did not work, they would offer boys, their younger or older brothers, and finally themselves. Gangs of young adolescent boys swarmed on American sailors.⁶⁰

The implied meaning here, as in all of Kinsey’s work, is that the United States should imitate Italian homosexuals and let sexual freedom ring here as there. On the other hand, many of those living in Italy at the same time insist that Kinsey’s accounts are untrue.⁶¹ Yet the need to portray post-World War II Italian sexual disorders as a reflection of sexual health and vigor was crucial to the Kinsey thesis. Pomeroy writes,

Kinsey saw men from thirteen to fifty [a thirteen-year-old man?] exhibiting and indicating they were ready for sexual contact [and] a boy with an erection who followed them for several blocks until they made it clear that they were not interested.... [One man insisting] “But I have to come to orgasm, and if you are too tired now, I can see you at 2 a.m.”⁶²

Kinsey’s foreign travels read like *The Ugly American* as a “free-sex” missionary.⁶³ Pomeroy continues,

It was noteworthy, he [Kinsey] said, that boys in Rome who brought letters up to the hotel rooms were satisfied with a tip, but in Naples they might sit down and make it clear they would be glad to stay longer for other purposes.... One handsome thirteen-year-old looked at their guide, smiled and instantly came to erection.... He followed Kinsey’s little party around for several hours.... The town of Taormina was filled with older men who had been photographed as boys [in sexual activities] by the baron [a local pederast].⁶⁴

Kinsey and Pomeroy were fully comfortable with young boys allegedly following them around with erections, and suggested that the elderly baron’s young victims were unharmed by his criminal obsessions. Kinsey claimed, however, that there “were no purveyors of erotica in Sicily,” since when “sex is so free, you don’t have this sort of thing.”⁶⁵ The comment gives one pause. Elsewhere, Kinsey had claimed that the absence of “erotica” was a sign of sexual repression. But as Pomeroy once noted, Kinsey could change his position or beliefs swiftly, and then change them back again at whim.

We are not told if Kinsey toured Europe’s numerous historical and cultural sites during the trip. Based on the available accounts, apparently not. He preferred lower anatomy to lofty monuments testifying to centuries of human achievement.

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

Kinsey's enthusiasm about sexual license in Scandinavia and Italy was balanced by his aversion for Spain, where he witnessed little public sex. He wrote of the Spaniards, "Their buttocks are a totally different shape and, obviously, genitalia were being held up by inner clothing to prevent anyone noticing them."⁶⁶ He was also most disturbed by the absence of male street prostitutes: "If I had been there longer and had people to guide me, I could have found all the hypocrisy that goes with the suppression." He bought a "tremendous lot of sex books in Barcelona," apparently for his Rockefeller-funded "nature library."⁶⁷ Pomeroy observes that Kinsey would have been pleased with post-Franco Spain: "He was a few years too early. Today many of the big hotels, even the most luxurious, have prostitutes openly inhabiting their lobbies and cocktail lounges."⁶⁸

Kinsey also found Portugal to be rather dull. When he asked a cab driver about homosexual activities, the driver replied there were none. "Men are men in Portugal," said the cabbie. Kinsey described the response in his notebook as "A grand piece of nonsense," and dubbed Portugal "a priest-ridden country." Portuguese men, he snidely added, had "low buttocks."⁶⁹

LAST DAYS

Kinsey died in August 1956, shortly after his return from Europe. The official cause was given as pneumonia brought on by overwork and an enlarged heart. Jones writes:

He was suffering from pneumonia, which aggravated a long-standing heart condition....

The immediate cause of death was not pneumonia or a failing heart but an embolism caused by a bruise on one of his legs, which he had sustained in a fall while working in his garden.⁷⁰

Despite the official medical diagnosis, there is reason to believe that Kinsey's bizarre array of sexual activities may have done him in. Despite the reality of common STDs, he had often denied the dangers of the sexual perversions he advocated. Jones, acknowledging what those at the Kinsey Institute knew but kept hidden, asserts that for Kinsey:

Sexual activities in themselves rarely do physical damage, but disagreements over the significance of sexual behavior may result in personality conflicts, a loss of social standing, imprisonment, disgrace, and the loss of life itself.⁷¹

Throughout his life, his sexual behavior became more and more disordered. Jones, as noted in an earlier chapter, recalled:

William Dallenback, the institute's photographer [said] Kinsey was becoming overtly exhibitionistic... having himself filmed, always from the chest down... in masochistic masturbation. The world's foremost expert on sexual behavior would insert an object



Kinsey with Institute photographer Bill Dellenback in a barnyard.

such as a pipe cleaner or swizzle stick into his urethra, tie a rope around his scrotum, and then tug hard on the rope....⁷²

On one occasion... Kinsey climbed into a bathtub, unfolded the blade of his pocketknife, and circumcised himself without benefit of

anesthesia... Recalled Dellenback, "God it must have been damn painful. It must have bled a hell of lot."⁷³



Wylie Hall at Indiana University, was the site of Kinsey's sado-sexual hanging.

Kinsey was not only an obsessive masturbator, but impotent as well. According to Jones in *The New Yorker* book summary (September, 1997), Kinsey required extensive and labored private sexual activity to attain a degree of sexual arousal. By 1954, as his fame peaked, he sank into depression:

Sales of the *Female* volume were not as great as he had hoped, his research was investigated by a congressional committee amid charges that it aided subversion.... One evening in August 1954, dejected and bitter, stood in his offices in the basement of Wylie Hall... threw a rope over the pipe, tied a knot around his scrotum, and wrapped the other end around his hand. Then he climbed onto a chair and jumped off.

Medical professionals explained to this author that this sado-masochistic act likely represented a long-standing pattern of behavior for Kinsey (confirmed by Gathorne-Hardy in his 1998 biography). This act of self-mutilation occurred as the Reece Committee prepared to call him to testify. He fled committee, citing health problems as an excuse. Jones continues,

Shortly after this episode, Kinsey... Gebhard and Dellenback traveled to Peru.... There, Kinsey took to his bed, suffering from an infection in his pelvic region. He attributed his illness to a throat infection he had contracted earlier in Los Angeles, explaining that the infection had spread to his pelvis. A physician friend, however, labeled Kinsey's illness *orchitis*, pinpointing the testicles as the site of the infection.

According to *Dorland's Medical Dictionary*, orchitis is,

...marked by pain, swelling... usually due to gonorrhea, syphilis, filarial disease, or tuberculosis.... Traumatic orchitis [is] orchitis following trauma, vas ligation, or surgical manipulation, without evidence of previous disease, believed to be due to an infectious process resulting from lowered resistance of the injured tissues to bacteria.⁷⁴

Kinsey's orchitis followed the "trauma" of Kinsey's compulsive genital self-mutilation, causing "injured tissues," lowering Kinsey's resistance to "bacteria," a compromised immune system and his death from orchitis. In the same way, Kinsey's reported pneumonia and heart condition could have logically resulted from advanced syphilis or other venereal diseases.

Indiana University's biographical publicity about Kinsey says nothing about his "orchitis," or any other medical condition that could have resulted from sexual disorder or venereal disease.

The *Indianapolis Star*, whose editorial page masthead carries Abraham Lincoln's dictum, "Let the people know the facts and the country will be saved," commented on James Jones lengthy article about Kinsey in *The New Yorker* magazine for September 1, 1997:

Kinsey gave the world a distorted—some would say sick—view of human sexuality. And what ought to enrage Hoosier taxpayers is that their money helped him do it. For years, the institute received about \$500,000.00 annually from Indiana University. The funding was cut in half in 1993, largely at the behest of some university trustees. Political commentator Patrick Buchanan, never one to mince words, once called Kinsey "America's original dirty old man." The *New Yorker* article suggests Buchanan may be uncomfortably close to the truth.⁷⁵

The press was devastated with news of his illness. The "sexual revolution" faced a potentially serious setback were it widely known that the theoretical father of the movement had died from an advanced stage of sadosexual autoerotic (masturbatory) activity. *The National Review* commented on Kinsey's untimely demise:

As for Kinsey's own quest for personal liberation, it ended in pain and squalor: he developed a massive pelvic infection as the result of his masochistic practices, almost certainly hastening his death at the age of 62. Growing up at the turn of the century, he had been exposed to countless tracts warning that masturbation led to insanity and death. In his case, they may have been onto something.⁷⁶

What has taken place at the Kinsey Institute in recent years? One reproductive "expert" announced plans to create a human clone under the guise of "Gender and Reproductive Technology,"⁷⁷ an especially worrisome development since the Kinsey Institute is now named "The Kinsey Institute for the Study of Sex, Gender and Reproduction." Its past director, June Reinisch, has been implicated in research that entails giving pregnant women male hormones, without their knowledge, so that gender-specific behavioral effects on the babies can be observed.⁷⁸ And, the Kinsey Institute, without apology, reprinted Kinsey's two volumes for libraries, universities, students, teachers and the public.



Kinsey's two books were republished by Indiana University in celebration of Kinsey's 50th jubilee in 1998.



"Mr. Tilby is in the Kinsey Report."

This cartoon suggested that Kinsey and his data were appropriate for discussion in polite, mixed company.

THE COLD, DEADLY HANDS OF KINSEY

No other report of a scientific investigation has ever been launched with such carefully planned publicity as was this volume. Newspapers and magazines were given release dates for articles about the study to be printed in advance of the book's publication, and Dr. Kinsey and his associates stipulated that manuscripts of the articles must be submitted to them for checking.⁷⁹

The New Yorker magazine

January 3, 1948

AFTER WORLD WAR II

Kinsey's two reports ushered in the era of sexual license that he espoused. The available evidence indicates that mainstream America did not initially believe Kinsey's "findings."

It was in the face of a relentless, one-sided media assault that attitudes began to change, as Americans were pushed and prodded into the sexual revolution. The country gradually became Kinseyfied. "Science" supposedly confirmed that sex was no more than a pleasurable pastime; that masturbation was harmless; that "wife-swapping" and "swinging" could solve silly jealousies; that "no-fault" divorce could end friction and blaming—better for the children—that early premarital sex could strengthen marriages without increasing rates of out-of-wedlock births and venereal disease; that exposure to obscenity was sexually healthy; that religious strictures were either outmoded or overstated; that reducing or abolishing penalties for sex crimes, and providing parole for sex offenders, would reduce rape and other types of sex abuse; and that 10 percent of American men were homosexual, and virtually all others bisexual, so anti-sodomy laws should be repealed.

No longer restrained by "Victorian" and "Puritanical" strictures, America could at last be the "Land of the Free" in every sense of that word—free from traditional morality and free from self-restraint.



Cartoon depicting the marital suspicion engendered by Kinsey's data—perhaps especially that 50 percent of American men were secret adulterers.

Were Kinsey, Hirschfeld, Crowley, and Guyon alive today, (or for that matter, those of the Marxist “Frankfort school” including the USA college guru, Herbert Marcuse) they would no doubt be delighted to find their model of sex education dominating the media, the arts, and permeating most of our schools.

They would find their sexual model, “The Kinsey Model,” imbedded in laws and government policies. These sexual liberators and libertines would be pleased to see obscenity in corner drugstores, on the Internet, in public libraries, private and public schoolrooms and on roadside billboards.


Kinsey would be thrilled by the extent to which “The Kinsey Model” was entrenched everywhere, the way non-marital sex, adultery, sodomy, and bi/homosexuality are glamorized in film and on TV. He would delight in watching teachers instruct grade-school children on how to place condoms on bananas, cucumbers, and wooden penises, and how to make models of their sex organs in Play-Doh. And he would thrill at the sight of schoolrooms plastered with sexual and patently pornographic AIDS posters, while the Ten Commandments are prohibited by judge-made “law.”

It is doubtful that any other 20th century figure can equal Alfred C. Kinsey for achieving widespread public acceptance of the disordered and destructive elements of his own troubled imagination, or in wreaking havoc on our culture in the name of “science.”

However, as it turns out, Kinsey was only one of many so called “geniuses,” eugencists, who sought to remake humankind in their own images. Our final chapter, good reader, introduces others of Kinsey’s elitist 1930s-1950s international network. We will go back in time to Cabaret Berlin, Hitler, Germany, and Stalinist Russia, raising further questions and some answers, about Kinsey’s crimes and consequences.

CHAPTER 9 NOTES

1. James H. Jones, *Alfred C. Kinsey: A Public/Private Life*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1997, p. 809 footnote 78.
2. Rene Wormser, *Foundations*, The Devin-Adair Company, New York, 1958, pp. vii-viii.
3. Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*, Macmillan, New York, 1966, pp. 954-955.
4. Quigley, p. 950.
5. Wormser, pp. vii-viii.
6. Wormser, pp. vii-viii.
7. Gregory Ahlgren and Stephen Monier, *Crime of the Century, The Lindbergh Kidnapping Hoax*, Boston, Massachusetts: Braden Books, 1993. Dr. Carrell was the scientist with whom Lindbergh had maintained a relationship since their work at the Rockefeller Institute in New York. Carrell argued for the preservation of the strong. “Only the elite makes the progress of the masses possible,” he wrote. There should be no interest in “encouraging the survival of the unfit and the defective....” These, he concluded, should be gassed.
8. Wormser, pp. 100-101, footnote.
9. Jones, p. 734.
10. Wormser, p. 100-101.
11. Wormser, p. 102.
12. Wormser, p. 103.
13. Wormser, pp. 102-103.
14. Wormer, pp. 102-103.



This 1990 Kinsey Institute book launched the current “sexual literacy” campaign in American classrooms. The Institute urged that teachers become “trained” to supplant parents who are alleged to be “sexually illiterate.”

15. Author's interview with Pamela Hobbs Hoffecker, January 12, 1996.
16. Wormser, p. 351. See also William H. McIlhany, II, *The Tax-Exempt Foundations*, Arlington House Publishers, Westport, Connecticut, 1980.
17. Wormser, pp. 345-346.
18. While Jones suggests that the Reece Committee continued its investigation well into 1955 (p. 737), this does not appear to be what finally happened. (Personal interview with Robert Goldsbough, The American Research Foundation, Inc., Baltimore Maryland, January 5, 1998. Goldsbough's Foundation houses the Norman Dodd papers).
19. Author's interview, May 6, 1997, Washington, DC.
20. Warren Weaver memo to CIB, May 7, 1951, Rockefeller Archive Center, p. 1.
21. Weaver, footnote, p.3.
22. E. Michael Jones, *Culture Wars*, "The Gay Science" February, 1997.
23. Kinsey, on "Reputations," *Biography*, BBC-TV, rebroadcast on Arts & Entertainment, 1996.
24. Plutocracy is defined as government by a wealthy class, Encarta, 1997.
25. Wardell Pomeroy, *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research*, Harper & Row, New York, 1972, p. 401.
26. Pomeroy, p. 405.
27. Pomeroy, p. 409.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Pomeroy, p. 406.
31. Pomeroy, p. 410.
32. Ibid.
33. See discussion on Mr. and Mrs. Myrdal in Claire Chambers, *The SIECUS Circle*, Western Islands, Belmont, Mass., 1977.
34. Cornelia V. Christenson, *Kinsey, A Biography*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, 1971, p. 195.
35. Sandy Robertson, *The Aleister Crowley Scrapbook*, Samuel Weiser, York Beach, Maine, 1994, p. 83.
36. See Robertson, Landis, Cavendish, et al.
37. John Symonds, *The Confessions of Aleister Crowley*, Arcana, England, 1979.
38. Bill Landis, *Anger, The Unauthorized Biography of Kenneth Anger*, Harper Collins, New York, 1995.
39. Landis, pp. 87-89, p. 148.
40. Landis, p. 87.
41. Landis, p. 88.
42. David Brinkley in *Washington Goes to War*, Ballantine Books, New York, 1988, reported that Viereck was convicted of treason in World War II, as a paid Nazi agent. This author verified the conviction with the extant public records.
43. Pomeroy, pp. 197, 414.
44. Robertson, Ibid, p. 83.
45. Landis, Ibid. See also, Richard Cavendish, Editor, *Man, Myth and Magic: An Illustrated Encyclopedia of the Supernatural*, Marshal Cavendish, New York, 1970. Crowley's *The Book of The Law*, which he claimed came from a spirit of one of the Secret Chiefs of Madame Blavatsky, was to spawn a new world with Crowley as prophet.
46. Landis, Ibid.
47. Pomeroy, p. 425.
48. Pomeroy, p. 425.
49. Pomeroy, p. 425.
50. Pomeroy, p. 424.
51. Pomeroy, p. 424.
52. Pomeroy, p. 422.
53. Pomeroy, p. 422.
54. Within the total pages devoted to children, neither Kinsey nor Pomeroy express any concern for the critical issues of child venereal disease, pregnancy, from kin or non-kin, emotional vulnerability and blackmail, resulting patterns of prostitution, drug and alcohol abuse, self-inflicted harm (cutting, burning of the body) or suicide, and the like, all of which is well and completely documented as the common result of children's early sexual abuse. All the more so in Kinsey's day, the "data" on the harm to children from sexual relations with adults was understood in the medical and psychological literature. Indeed, that was one of the key reasons for the unified efforts of "Puritans" and feminists at the turn of the century. It would have been impossible, however, for men on the Kinsey team, men who viewed "convulsions" in an infant being raped by a man as "definite pleasure," to hear, much less accept, much less print, the facts, about the trauma of child rape. Moreover, having interviewed the rapists and the incestuous rapists, Kinsey and his team had nothing to say about the interviews with their victims.
55. Pomeroy, p. 421.
56. Pomeroy, p. 426.

57. Pomeroy, pp. 425-6.
58. Pomeroy, p. 423.
59. Pomeroy, p. 425.
60. Pomeroy, p. 426.
61. Pomeroy, p. 425.
62. Pomeroy, p. 26.
63. While Pomeroy offers a disclaimer, there is no real evidence that Kinsey knew or cared about the true plight and economic conditions of Italian men, women, or children. "I should make it clear, I think, that Kinsey was not insensitive to the other aspects of life in Italian cities. His journal speaks often of the poverty in Naples and in other parts of Italy. He was well aware that part of the abundant sexuality directed toward him and any other obvious American was motivated by the desperate need for money" (p. 426).
64. Pomeroy, p. 427.
65. Pomeroy, p. 428.
66. Pomeroy, pp. 428-429.
67. Pomeroy, p. 428.
68. Pomeroy, p. 428.
69. Pomeroy, p. 429.
70. James Jones, "Dr. Yes," *New Yorker*, September 1, 1997, p. 113.
71. Jones, *Ibid*, p. 108.
72. Jones, *Ibid*, p. 113.
73. James H. Jones, *Alfred C. Kinsey: A Public/Private Life*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1997.
74. *Dorland's Medical Dictionary*, W.B. Saunders, Philadelphia, 1981, page 933.
75. Editorial Board, "The Kinsey Legacy," *The Indianapolis Star*, August 26, 1997.
76. Terry Teachout, "What the Doctor Saw," *National Review*, October 13, 1997, p. 69.
77. *The Washington Post*, January 1, 1997
78. Elizabeth Hall, *Psychology Today*, "Profile: June Reinisch, New Directions for the Kinsey Institute," June 1986, pp. 33-39.
79. "The Kinsey Report," *The New Yorker*, January 3, 1948, p. 60.
80. Edward Everett Hale, "Lend a Hand," in James Dalton Morrison, Ed., *Masterpieces of Religious Verse* (1948); also, John Bartlett, *Familiar Quotations*, Emily Morison Beck, Ed., 14th Edition, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1968 [1855], p. 717.