

Kinsey Consequences: It's Rotten Research-ers

There is of course always the possibility that if someone in public life can persuade enough people to act on the assumption that his interpretation is valid, he can so influence the character of the future as to make it consistent with his predictions.

Michael Balfour, *Propaganda in War, 1939-1945*¹

The great conflict of the 21st century ... will be between modern civilization and anti-modernists; between...those who believe in science, reason, and logic and those who believe that truth is revealed through Scripture and religious dogma.

Robert Reich, Clinton's Secretary of Labor oracle,
prophesized in [*American Prospect*](#) on "Bush's God:"

Having worked for the US Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency under the Reagan administration as Principal Investigator for an \$800,000 grant to examine, *Images of Children, Crime and Violence in Playboy, Penthouse and Hustler*, I was in a unique position to uncover the problem of rotten research and rotten researchers. Another book about that experience is worth writing. For now, notice that no less an authority than US Supreme Court Justice, Stephen Breyer recognizes that, "Law cases can turn almost entirely on an understanding of the underlying technical or scientific subject matter."²

Quite so.

Legally, Federal and State Government agencies cannot knowingly finance or use fraudulent scientific data. (We learned a little at least from the American "intellectual" eugenic mania that preceded the scientific horrors of the Nazis in W.W.II. Most Americans are, I think, aware that the belief in a "superior" Aryan race dominated western academic circles until the barbaric scenes of Buchenwald were un-escapable.)

Our nation prohibits the use of data gotten from experiments on people who did not provide informed consent. We also outlawed even non injurious experiments on minors without parental consent. Scholars and institutions producing such data may have their funds terminated and in some

cases may even face criminal charges. The research produced by our tax-funded universities can actually be a matter of life and death.

In fact, in 1989 medical researcher Stephen Bruening received a felony conviction for publishing “50 articles based on fraudulent data on the use of psychoactive drugs in mentally retarded patients.” Breuning's data impacted public health policy nationally. But Kinsey's data have impacted public sexual conduct and public health—and law-- *internationally*. Kinsey’s lies have globally infected courtrooms, classrooms, bedrooms, church rooms, examining rooms and more recently, boardrooms.

Daniel Koshland, editor of *Science* claimed that, "You may falsify an important finding, but then it will surely form the basis for subsequent experiments and become exposed" (*Science* 235:141, 1987). However, Koshland and subsequent editors of *Science* have made it difficult to do that regarding Kinsey’s fraud and sex abuse findings. Despite my correspondence with *Science*, they have censored from their readers even the existence of books on Kinsey’s crimes that are available for review and criticism.

Clearly, the scientists involved in the creation of the Kinsey research findings have become and have trained influential scholars, writers, lecturers, experts on national and international panels and commissions, courtroom witnesses, and academic luminaries in the sexology and sex education fields. That means that all “sexuality” research is under the cloud of deception, of inadvertent or purposeful and ideologically driven fraud. This is especially so when all of the “science” oversight publications censor criticisms of the Kinsey Institute and of its founders criminality.

Rotten Research Yields Rotten Results

Kinsey’s research was based on fraud. Yet, this "Patron Saint of Sex," (*Esquire*) who launched "the first wave of the sexual revolution" is, said sexologist Morton Hunt (and more recently, Dr. Ruth), the giant on whose shoulders all sex researchers since his time have stood. WebMD reports that “Ruth Westheimer, PhD” regularly pays “some type of homage to famed 1950s sex researcher Alfred C. Kinsey, PhD.” saying “we are taught that if you stand on the shoulders of giants, you can see farther.”³

Homosexual researchers John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman, in their book *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*, also give proper credit to Kinseyan research for changing society. "[T]he strongest assault on sexual reticence in the public realm emerged not from the pornographic fringe, nor from the popular culture, but from the respectable domain of science," with the publication of Kinsey's Male and Female reports. By allegedly proving that Americans were sexual buccaneers pretending to be sexually chaste, meant "cultural values surrounding sex needed revision."⁴

D'Emilio and Freedman said that Kinsey's "scientific credentials ... gave legitimacy" to the media publicity and the public had to believe his claims were somewhat true. The authors also credited "*The Kinsey studies*, as much as pornography, [for shaping] the context in which the Supreme Court responded to the obscenity issue."⁵

And, in 2003 D'Emilio and Freedman's rotten research in *Intimate Matters*—as it relied largely on Kinsey and other rotten research relying on Kinsey—became a key authority cited by US Supreme Court Justice, Anthony M. Kennedy for the Court's majority decision to legalize sodomy. Yes, Yes, rotten research yields rotten results.


Kinseyfying Medical/Academia For Now and Tomorrow



Rotten Research tentacles reach out to infect us all. Kinsey lectured to medical groups nationwide, and by the hundreds of thousands to overwhelming crowds, like that at left, university youth who came to worship at the feet of the new sexuality guru. These were our future leaders, writers, entertainers, doctors, lawyers, politicians, prosecutors, and the like. Christie Hefner reported that in the 1960s the *Playboy* Foundation became the major research sponsor of the Masters and Johnson Institute and made the initial grant to establish an Office of Research Services of the Sex Information and Education

Council of the U.S. (SIECUS).⁶ The latter organization is heavily involved in the incorporation of Kinsey's basic sexual philosophy into school sex education programs, explained elsewhere in this book.

In 1971, *Playboy*, according to Hefner junior, "awarded a grant to establish a pilot program at the University of Minnesota" with the aim of "changing the attitudes of men and women medical students."⁷ Why bring rotten research into the medical community? Because, said Hefner, "today's medical students and practicing physicians perpetuate arbitrary judgments about normal and abnormal sexuality... [and] are ignorant of the variety of possible human sexual expression." This was corrected by the infusion of pornography money into the medical community.



Following in Kinsey's footsteps, "sexologists" invaded the medical schools with Kinsey's infamous scale (left) claiming to "prove" that 10% to 37% of men are sometime homosexual and that all humans are naturally bisexual.

This opened the door to *Playboy* in the wings, laying down track for its future medical consumers.

In the early 1970s young, naïve medical residents in most of the major medical schools were doused with Kinsey's "science" followed up by Hefner's "pamphleteering" via allegedly scientific pornographic shows. The Sexual Attitude Restructuring was allegedly to "desensitize" students so they could more easily accept and treat their patient's sexual problems. No, these were not slides of venereal disease, such unpleasant images were carefully avoided. The medical SAR included "obscene" or "erotic" or "pornographic"

films and slides of sex between women and men, same sex, animals and sometimes children, as were all of the SAR presentations.

A Few Sample Case Studies

The following briefly are a spectrum of contemporary federal reports and/or findings that use fraudulent and criminal Kinseyan data and disciples as authorities for the nation's legal and public policy decisions. Chapters 8 and 9 document the effects of these fraud in more detail.

1. 1969 U.S. *INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH (NIMH) "TASK FORCE ON HOMOSEXUALITY"* Kinsey's co-author and Institute Director, Dr. Paul Gebhard as well as Dr. John Money (a contributor to *The Journal Of Paedophilia*) typified the "fourteen experts" on human sexuality whose formal report cited Kinsey's data as authority to urge nationwide legalization of homosexuality.⁸
2. 1969 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (DOE) and the U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (PHS) Almost all DoE and PHS reports post 1969 which address human sexuality cite to Kinsey and/or his disciples as their key authorities
3. 1974 U.S. CONGRESS CREATES "STATUS OFFENDER" LEGISLATION. This well intentioned legislation made it illegal to place minors in protective custody unless they were committing "adult" crimes, hence opening the floodgates to child prostitution and child pornography. The view of children as wholly autonomous and as not requiring some kind of protective intervention by the state reflects a dramatic shift from the evolution to traditional American views of child care to the Kinseyan view of the child as unharmed by broad freedom and license.
4. 1977-1985 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (DO J) "THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF CRIME SEVERITY" (SET PRECEDENT FOR FEDERAL SENTENCING GUIDELINES, CIRCA 1990's): In his academic scholarship, Principal Investigator, Marvin Wolfgang, former member of the President's Commission on Pornography and Obscenity (1970) cites Kinsey and his colleagues for sexual authority, the Commissioners having been trained at the Kinsey Institute during a "sexuality" site visit. The Kinsey model is reflected above in the NSCS sentencing guidelines. By excluding child rape or other forms of serious child abuse as crimes, the authors mischievously directed judges and juries nationwide into dismissals of child sex crimes, and into leniency and paroles for violent crimes against children, inevitably also trivializing violent sex crimes against women and legitimizing sundry other Kinseyan pansexual standards.
5. 1986 NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, (NRC) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES on 'TEENAGE SEX.' When he was Secretary of Education, William Bennett pointed out that the report of the NRC (apparently chartered by Congress,

hence an authoritative arm of the federal government) called for condoms in schools despite the data that disproved this as a solution to early sexual activity. A review of this NRC report finds Kinsey's pansexual philosophy and disciples extensively cited as authority.

6. 1989 NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, (NRC) NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES: "AIDS; SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND INTRAVENOUS DRUG USE." Kinsey's former chief researcher, John Gagnon is part of the research team. The report fully cites to Kinsey and his disciples as sexual authority, suggesting that while Kinsey did outstanding work, these data are not too useable since they were derived largely from white, college males. This false claim about *the nature* of the fraud serves many purposes, among which, a) it intimates that the deviancy data are understated rather than overstated, hence b) it allows continued, even fuller use of the data. Were the NRC to admit that the data reflect prisoners, sex offenders, homosexual males, boy prostitutes, thieves, hold-up men and feeble-minded subjects, Kinsey's data would be used to define abnormal males, by definition. After claiming it's flaws, the authors deify and continue to cite Kinsey as authority, finding homosexuality and other nontraditional sex to be normal
7. 1989 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, JUVENILE JUSTICE (Do J) "REPORT TO THE NATION ON CRIME AND JUSTICE." This DoJ report on crime purges the 1986 Attorney General's Commission report on Pornography that found massive crimes of child abuse and child pornography. Hence, the crime report "to the nation" does not list child pornography as a crime. Moreover, the AG's Pornography Commission testimony from the former director of SIECUS and Planned Parenthood, as well as Kinsey colleagues C.A. Tripp, John Money and others would have significantly impacted the Commission's findings.
8. 1989 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION (OJJDP) "THE SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF MISSING CHILDREN." Three months prior to the following HHS Youth Suicide Report, among other unsubstantiated Kinseyan claims, the OJJDP researchers said the "data" found religious and parental "harassment" of biologically homosexual children to be responsible for child runaways, prostitutes and suicides. Finkehor et. al., have long cited Kinsey and his disciples as scientific authority and this OJJDP report reflects the author's continued reliance on the Kinsey "model" of homosexuality, prostitution, pornography and the like.
9. **1989 ADAMHA: ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE, MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION IN ADAMHA NEWS** "The Most Forgotten Teens" builds on the Kinseyan authority, blaming children's emotional problems 'not on the many causal factors which often lead youths into homosexual conduct, but on social hostility to homosexuality. The article ignores the extant data on adult or older juvenile sex abuse, etc., as precipitating many harmful responses, including homosexual acting-out.

10. **1989 U.S. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES (HHS)" THE SECRETARY'S TASK FORCE ON YOUTH SUICIDE."** This report cites Dr Kinsey and his disciples as sexual authorities to disregard any environmental factors triggering homosexual conduct, claiming a biological imperative and blaming parents, churches and traditional American values as causing the suicides of "gay youth"

11. **1991 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) "HOMOSEXUALITY AND PERSONNEL SECURITY."** The author, Theodore Sarbin cites as his human sexuality authorities, Kinsey and his disciples, including Dr John Money and Verne Bullough, self-identified pedophile editor of *The Journal of Paedophilia* Hence, Sarbin disingenuously concludes that "no empirical data have been developed to support any connection between homosexuality and security" (p 31)

The above eleven are a few of similar reports that sway or direct current laws and public policies on human sexuality. Now, just briefly let's look at several other recent research gems on children: First, the cyberporn data on parental assault, next the alleged "decline" in child sex abuse and the harmlessness of pornography for children and finally a "well being" report that says children are safer today than in the days of Ozzie and Harriet.

12) Cyberporn Abuse 2004

Table 1: Are These Birth "Parent" Predators or No?




Table 1 at left says that 49% of all recent cyberporn abusers were "parents" of the child. Certainly pornography in the home means that those adults in the home have a higher probability of sexual assault of children under their care. Therefore this 2004, National Center for Missing and Exploited Children chart pointing


to parental abusers seems quite reasonable.

However, when looking at “rotten research” we need to always ask if an ideological vision is slanting what the researchers say. So, what is a “parent” in our justice department statistics? Knowing full well the bias against biological parents as caretakers of their children, I queried John Rabun, NCMEC COO to find out if that bias held in the “parental” abusers cited above. I am reprinting Mr. Rabun’s December 18, 2004 email to me:

Judith,

Parent is a term of law that has to do with who has legal rights and responsibilities to/for a minor. Most times that is the biological parent but more and more it's the person who has been awarded care of the minor by a Family/Juvenile Court. The other legal term for this person is "legal guardian" which is not necessarily the step-father/mother as that person may be more simply living with their mate and may have NO rights/obligations to the minor in that home per se.

Table 2: NCMEC 2,222% Increase in Sex Years



If by living arrangement or "common law," the step-parent is fulfilling the parent role, then he/she would also be included in our term "parent" but wouldn't be the short term, live-in boyfriend

(otherwise we would use "close friend").”

So, on the evidence, cyberporn is a domestic terrorism priority as reports of cyberporn child sexual exposure and/or harassment soared 2,222%

from 4,573 to 106,201 cases between 1998 and 2004. Some of these cases resulted in direct physical harm to the child, others in coarsening and shock, but all cause emotional damage along with brain structural changes of unknown and unknowable magnitude.

Biological Versus “Other” Parental Abuse Rates

Misleading “family” definitions take on an ideological cast in the context of the massive research produced by the OJJDP and DOJ premier child abuse expert, David Finkelhor. In 1979, Professor Finkelhor warned in *Sexually Victimized Children* of the increased sexual risk to children in a non-biological family environment, warning especially of stepparent family hazards. Why then, having stated in 1979 that stepfathers were “almost 150 percent” more responsible for “family” sexual abuse, does Finkelhor neither note that fact or distinguish between step fathers and birth fathers in his many research papers on child abuse in the family?

[T]he addition of a stepfather to a girl's family causes her vulnerability to skyrocket. *Girls who are merely without fathers were about 50 percent more vulnerable than the average girl, but girls with stepfathers were almost 150 percent more vulnerable*Clinicians have noted that *in many cases of father-daughter incest the offender was really a stepfather.... Indeed our data give support to this picture.* The rate of father-daughter incest is much higher in the families with stepfathers than in any other subgroup in the whole survey--almost five times higher....[G]irls in these families are more vulnerable to stepbrothers, stepsisters, step cousins...[and possibly] a coterie of friends and acquaintances who are not so protective toward a stepdaughter. (Emphasis added).⁹

However, after stating in 1979 that the evidence was clear regarding the danger to children from *non biological* fathers, Finkelhor deliberately adds the number of predators who are step fathers with those who are birth fathers together and calls this group “parent” and “family.” Why do that? Whose interests are served by such a false classification? Is this flawed redefinition based on a personal or an ideological decision? And, why has no one protested? Why do neither DOJ or OJJDP investigate these repeatedly

misleading definitions? Why do neither DOJ nor OJJDP investigate what else of this nature may be falsely disseminated via their “child abuse” reports?
“Report on the Nation’s Youth” (June 2000).

In June 2000 Finkelhor et al produced a “Report on the Nation’s Youth” in which the authors explained that there were “several thousand” child abuse incidents that year due to online solicitations, and “almost all of these would go unreported.”

Based on the results of this study, it appears that several million young people ages 10 through 17 get propositioned on the Internet every year.... If even some small percentage of these encounters results in offline sexual assault or illegal sexual contact -- a percentage smaller than we could detect in this survey -- it would amount to several thousand incidents. Youth and parents do not report these experiences and do not know where to report them.... Even the most serious episodes were rarely reported.¹⁰

Bear this report of thousands of unreported cyberporn abducted children as we proceed. Let’s briefly look at four more US Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention reports:

- 13 “Child Abuse Reported to the Police” by Finkelhor et al.,
14. “Explanations for the Decline in Child Sexual Abuse Cases” by Finkelhor et al. and
15. “Pornography Crimes Involving Juveniles,” by Finkelhor et al.
16. “America’s Children: Key National Indicators Of Well-Being,” a 20 Agency report.


CONTEXT: in 1990 the National Incidence Study of “Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Throwaway Children in America” (NISMART) was conducted by Finkehor, Hotaling and Sedlak. These were undertaken in response to the mandate of the 1984 Missing Children’s Assistance Act that requires the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to conduct periodic studies to determine the actual number of children reported missing and the number of missing children who are recovered for a given year.

Finkelhor said a “family member” was “*anyone with a romantic or sexual involvement with at parent*” (p. ix). With that definition, sexual abuse by “family members” would go sky-high.

13) FINKELHOR (CACRC) ON “Child Abuse Reported to the Police” 2001

In their report, “Child Abuse Reported to the Police” in 2001, Finkelhor and Ormrod quietly abandoned the above “family” definition that specifically included those with a “sexual” involvement with a parent” and adopted a less graphic definition of “Parents and other Caretakers.” Here, the DOJ/OJJDP researchers casually lumped “*boyfriends or girlfriends*” in their definitions of “caretakers.” Such a definition, of course, just like the “romantic or sexual” one, allows a wide range of heterosexual, bisexual or homosexually promiscuous “relationships,” up to and including prostitutes and their pimps as “parents and other caretakers.”¹¹ In “Child Abuse Reported to Police,” CACRC say,

Figure 6: Offenses Against Female Juveniles by Parents and Other Caretakers, by Type of Crime and Victim Age



Source: Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1997.

Although for child welfare purposes the definition of caretakers can vary ...the term typically includes parents.... Unfortunately, NIBRS *does not have a specific caretaker category*, but it does specify *parent and stepparent* perpetrators, who constitute the vast majority of child

maltreatment offenders (Sedlak and Broadhurst, 1996). *To these two groups, the authors added grandparents, other adult family members (but not inlaws), babysitters, and parents’ boyfriends or girlfriends...*¹² [Emphasis added].

What kind of child sexual abuse reporting methodology is this? Boyfriends or girlfriends and babysitters are now lumped into a “caretaker” category—shooting up the data on what the public sees in Figure 6 as parental sexual abuse? That NIBRS (the FBI DOJ National Incidence Based Reporting System) *did not* lump “parents” and their lovers, etc, together as generic “caretakers” and that CACRC pretend such commonly exploitive associations are family like “parents” is seen in the text and reflected in several tables in their report.

14) Explanations for the Decline in Child Sexual Abuse Cases

In this January 2004 OJJDP paper Finkelhor and Jones confirm a significant reduction in child sexual abuse. Yet, to get this happy “finding” Finkehor and Jones have regularly given the wrong impression by a) ignoring clear areas where child sexual abuse has increased (e.g.: cyberporn, kidnapping, prostitution, foster care and the like) while b) misinforming the public by claiming a the higher risk for children from biological than non biological parents. This is accomplished by redefining “parents” and “family” to include non biological relations.

Now, while there are many step-dads who are clearly better and and safer and more fatherly than biological fathers, still statistically the opposite is true. We just saw that in 1979 Finklehor clearly identified stepfathers as significantly more dangerous to children than dads or even single motherhood.

Now, between their 2000 report on Cyberporn child solicitations and their 2004 report on “Decline in Child Sexual Abuse,” the online solicitation rate increased over 4,800%. Yet, although this suggests a similar rate of increase over the “several thousand” crimes the authors warned of, this area of growing assault was ignored by Finklehor et al in their claim for decreased rates of child sexual abuse.

We would certainly expect that an organization calling itself the “Crimes Against Children Research Center” would be highly sympathetic and aware of the childhood ‘State of the Child Union’ as it were. Certainly such an agency name inspires confidence. So, let us proceed—again briefly.

A Real Decline in Child Sexual Abuse Cases?

Even as the nation is flooded with pornography as never before, the 2004 report provides additional government “science” to support the economically and politically powerful Sex Industrial Complex’s claim that its products are socially benign.

How could this be? Well, not only did the CACRC report ignore the cyberporn child victims, Finkelhor also ignores brazenly conflicting data that would document *increases* in child sexual abuse. The CACRC study ignored abducted children, prostituted children, runaways and throwaways, foster children or as part of child homicides. Additionally CACRC does not even address the exposes of Child Protective Services for covering up child rape and murder under their watch since the 1990’s. They do mention that mothers (and some fathers) hide spousal or child sexual abuse fearing the loss of child custody in the courts.

Finkelhor CACRC ignore data that document the dramatic reduction of children’s free movement since roughly 1990 as, following the publicity given to child kidnapping cases, parents began chaperoning their children everywhere as a national pastime.

Bad, Misleading Definitions

- In 1990 the CACRC defined a child’s “**Family**” as those having “a romantic or sexual relationship with a parent.”
- In 2000 CACRC defined “Parent” as open-ended, easily including stepparents, adoptive parents or those appointed by the court to serve in the legal capacity of parents.
- In 2001 the CACRC eliminated parents as a category and equalized them as children’s “**Caretakers**” as “parents’ boyfriends or girlfriends.”
- In 2004 CACRC defined a child’s “**Parent**” to include adoptive parents, stepparents and “parent substitute.”

Some Ignored CCRS Categories of Annual Child Sex Abuse

- CCRS ignores juvenile murders; these increased substantially in 1997 above the mid-1980’s levels.
- CCRS ignores abuse of increased numbers of child runaways, child prostitutes and boys—from 350,000 to one million victims.
- CCRS ignores high rates of sex assault of foster children; foster children increase from 250,000 in 1995 to 550,000 in 2000.
- CCRS ignores the 58,200 children abducted from streets, playgrounds by non-

- family members in 1999—where are the data for 2003?
- CCRS ignores victims under age-12; yet these youngsters constitute “about half” (NIBRS) of all sex abuse victims.
 - CCRS cites 314,400 victims. Prevent Child Abuse America cites “844,320 new” child sex abuse cases circa 97-98. The discrepancy of roughly 529,920 child sex abuse victims in one *year* requires clarification.
 - CCRS ignores lowered Cyberporn and sexual killings due to the “Hierarchy Rule” (in homicide, rape of the victim is not “counted” in rape data)
 - CACRC ignores online sex solicitation of minors, arguably growing at over 1000% per month.
 - CCRS ignores the fact that sex crime *reports* decrease as a function of increased disinhibition. That is, as a culture is more erotically charged, sex crimes are *increased* reclassified as “sex,” and complaints *decrease*.
 - CCRS ignores new parental controls; carpooling children everywhere, restricting freedom of movement enjoyed by children in the past.
 - CCRS ignores Parental Alienation Syndrome [PAS] Backlash Against Reporting Child Sexual Abuse. Parents, especially mothers, are counseled by their lawyers to hide incestuous abuse, fearing PAS charges in the courtroom and loss of their children to offender’s custody.
 - CCRS ignores growing pattern of habituation and Trivialization of ‘Lower Level’ Child Sexual Abuse.
 - CCRS does not reveal that Child Protective Services data of “*Sexually Exploited Children,*” will only document predators defined as child Caretakers

Based on the hard (cultural) data, why would CACRC conclude that *Real* Child Sexual Abuse had declined?

15) “Pornography Crimes Involving Juveniles: The National Incident Based Reporting System” 2004

Right out of the gate the CACRC report *title* “Pornography Crimes Involving Juveniles: The National Incident Based Reporting System” ” by Finkelhor and Ormrod is false. CACRC cites “pornography” 134. However, the actual “data” they are discussing covers just a very narrow band of illegal “*obscenity.*” All *legal* pornography involved in *grooming* young victims is given a pass in this report.

This way, the CACRC again provides flawed “data” which the Sex Industrial Complex can use to proclaim its benign effect upon juveniles and society. A recent Internet check does not find this paper on line. As I had the

opportunity to review the report prior to its publication I will address a few “Rotten Research” issues here.

This review of the DRAFT Finkelhor/Ormrod paper, written in 2004, addresses only a few key methodological flaws. Although these authors identify public concerns about “pornography” and child sexual abuse below, I viewed the report as a whitewash of pornography’s role in child sexual abuse. The authors say:

Concerns about pornography and child exploitation have widened in recent years, as new electronic and imaging technology appear to have facilitated its production and dissemination. Such concerns have led to legislation, as well as additional initiatives involving federal and local law enforcement, aimed at inhibiting the production, sale and dissemination of *pornography* depicting juveniles. These are also directed at the dissemination and sale of *pornography* to minors.¹³ (Emphasis added)

Public concerns over “pornography” have “widened” recently mainly due to the direct public experience of its harm—to marriages, public safety and child welfare. The job of the “expert” who reviews data on any critical public issue is not just to *report* “survey” data but to suggest what may be *missing* from these surveys so as to reach below the surface information to arrive at causes and solutions.

Now, back in 1979 while Finkelhor referenced “pornography” (not obscenity) only twice in his *Sexually Victimized Children* book, one book reviewer quotes Finkelhor as warning that child sexual abuse:

may have been aided and abetted by the availability of *popular* pornography. The world of pornography always needs new frontiers to conquer...exploit[ing] the theme of sex with children.”¹⁴

In fact, in this early book Finkelhor writes,
More evidence of this counterculture *is available at any drugstore*. In the last five years, the *pornography trade* has

begun to cater heavily to fantasies of incest....Sexually oriented magazines often carry stories, ostensibly from readers, about experiences of incest described in graphic detail...the convention of the genre clearly is intended to allow readers to participate in fantasies without having to feel guilty about them.¹⁵ (Emphasis added)

Strange then that this pornography report (which is NOT a pornography report but a report on obscenity cases) ignores the systemic role of *pornography* in sex crimes against prostituted and abducted children. In summarizing their findings, the authors may be said to disclaim their own data by saying “caution” should be observed in viewing the stated “200%” increase in “juvenile victim/child exploitation pornography [sic] offenses” as a real increase in such offenses.

CACRC opine that a 27% “association of pornography [sic] crimes with child victimization” is “modest” and provide two more warnings to exhibit “caution” should the reader conclude that there is a significant association between pornography (misabeled here as the authors are really only addressing illegal “obscenity” for this database) and crimes against children.

The report falsely implies that adult *pornography* is not associated with child abuse, thus facilitating acceptance of the Sex Industrial Complex at large. Finally, after ignoring the mainstream pornography that is most common in “family” abuse, a CACRC solution is to have intrusive, government- run “residential searches for child pornography.”


It is then all the more confusing to find Finkelhor’s research concerns and “cautions” do not clearly identify the need for law enforcement to collect the data on mainstream pornography harms “*available at any drugstore,*” and now on the internet, in grocery stores, libraries, schools, malls, billboards, etc.

To any reasonable person, because family is badly defined *and mainstream pornography in the home ignored*, CACRC’s recommendation of “residential searches for child pornography” appears imprudent and a distraction from root causes.

16) America's Children: Key National Indicators Of Well-Being, 2003

Months before Hollywood and the liberal media launched their return-to-Woodstock love-fest for *Kinsey*, the movie, your federal tax dollars were at work promoting another annual report that would have made Kinsey extremely proud. Each year since 1997, the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics (FIFCFS) has published a report entitled *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being*.

The researchers who wrote this 20-federal agency report marshaled data that appear to support some very incredible claims. The researchers would have us believe, for example, that while more children today have less exposure to religion and while fewer children live with both parents, they are *less* likely to be “victims of violence” than were mom and dad when they were children.



Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics

Children today are more likely to live in single-parent households than their parents were. On the other hand, their parents had a higher risk when they were children of being victims of violence....Teenage children are less likely to be regular churchgoers than previous generations of children. Today's children are less likely to say that religion is important.” (Medical News Today, March 25, 2004, pressrelease@medicalnewstoday.com)

Correct. According to the FIFCFS, families were much more dangerous for children back in the violent days of *Ozzie and Harriet* than in today's idyllic family life à la *Ozzie and Sharon Osbourne*. Even if common sense and experience tell us this is preposterous, nevertheless, it *must be* true,

since it's supported by the requisite authoritative looking tables and seemingly irrefutable statistics.

Abstract:

This report provides information on children's health in America. It presents age, gender, and ethnic demographics related to child and adolescent Well-Being. It includes data on surveys conducted on children's health, and maps of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. The next full report is scheduled to be published in 2005, and the next abbreviated version in 2006."

<http://www.ask.hrsa.gov/detail.cfm?id=MCH00088>

. After all, illiberals would claim, *America's Children* bears the imprimatur of the U.S. Departments of Education, Defense, Commerce, Labor, and Justice, as well as such impressive institutions as the National Science Foundation. How did this multi-agency forum find "objective" data to support the Kinseyan pansexual claims that intact, religious families are harmful to children?

Simple: these researchers imitated Kinsey, the master fraud, and eliminated facts that conflicted with their thesis. The FIFCFS study eliminates the pandemic consequences of Kinsey's gospel of pansexuality, which holds that any and all sexual activity should be considered normal. For example, the period from 1960 to 1999, according to the Department of Justice, saw violent crime increase 396 percent. This includes robbery, up 279 percent; aggravated assault, up 168 percent; murder up 70 percent; and *forcible* rape up 418 percent — despite the fact that fewer women or children stroll our parks and streets alone than pre-1960. The "child well-being" analysts, however, attempt to hide the rape plague by stripping it out of their statistics on "violent crime" affecting children.

Acknowledgments

This report reflects the commitment and involvement of the members of the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. It was prepared by the Writing Subcommittee of the Reporting Committee of the Forum. This year, the subcommittee was chaired by Kristin Smith, U.S. Census Bureau. Other committee members included Julia Rhodes and John Kiely, National Center for Health Statistics; Dawn Aldridge, Food and Nutrition Service; David Johnson, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Patrick Rooney, National Center for Education Statistics; Janet Chiancone, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention....etc

Suffer the Children

Most people definitely would consider child rape and other forms of child sex abuse to be serious indicators of “unwellness.” Most parents, I am sure, would consider information about the dangers to their children from sex offenders every bit as important as (if not more important than) the National Ambient Air Quality Standards of the area in which they live. Table POP9A, “Children’s Environments,” in *America’s Children* provides great detail on the threats to childhood wellness posed by sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and other air pollutants. Likewise, there is abundant statistical detail on family income distribution, childcare, parental employment, diet quality, exposure to second-hand smoke, and so on, ad infinitum. However, the politically correct FIFCFS researchers conspicuously gutted from their report all child “unwellness” data that would undermine belief in the so-called benefits of sexual liberation. Consider these glaring omissions:

- All violent sex crime *against children under 12 years of age* are gutted; yet girls under 12 are 37 percent of sex crime victims and boys under 12 are 25 percent.
- All child rape data are dumped, yet 67 percent of sex victims are kids.
- All statutory rape and rape that was plea-bargained down to a misdemeanor are gutted.
- All boy sodomy victim data are gutted, yet 67% of all forcible sodomy victims are boys.
- All child runaway data gutted—but perhaps 1.3 and 2.8 million children are runaways.
- All data on 350,000 to one million children in prostitution and pornography are gutted.
- All child AIDS, Herpes, HPV, and chlamydia data; all STD youth epidemic is gutted.
- All child kidnapping data are gutted, yet 58,200 were kidnapped *by non kin* in 1999.
- All increased school sexual assault, child suicide, and *sexual* homicide data are gutted.

As I said above, *America’s Children* would make Kinsey proud. Like Kinsey’s infamous “research,” it too shamelessly manipulates data and lies by commission and omission to promote a perverse agenda. It uses Kinseyan techniques regarding children’s “well-being” to undermine marriage, religion, parental confidence, and downplay the seriousness of child abuse.

Are fraudulent anti-marriage and, as I said, anti-family data the rotten fruit of pansexual “training”? You be the judge. In the past few years, trusted government-funded researchers inflated rates of *parental* sex abuse by redefining “parent” to include, “boyfriends or girlfriends or adoptive step-parent [or] parent substitute.” These researchers also defined a “family” predator as anyone in “a romantic or sexual relationship with a parent.” This is vicious attack on parenthood and families, the attempt to make *parents* appear to be the real danger to children, is addressed in more detail in the following chapters.

Criminal “Science”

Who are these agency researchers? One of the most important is Dr. Duane Alexander, director of the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development, a spokesman for the *America’s Children* publication.¹⁶ He also is a well-seasoned champion of ancient forms of “human sexuality.” Under Dr. Alexander the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) funded a series of bogus and possibly criminal sex studies. A significant amount of money was awarded under Dr. Alexander for a sex conference and sex research grants to the tainted and compromised Kinsey Institute at Indiana University.

* Last December, NIH funded a \$147,000 grant for a Northwestern University study....Women were paid as much as \$75 to "watch a series of commercially available film clips, some of which will be sexually explicit, while we monitor your body's sexual arousal," ... by psychology professor J. Michael Bailey. [Bailey is now being sued for science fraud, sexual exploitation, etc., by at least one of his “subjects.”]

* In May....a \$137,000 NICHD grant for a three-year study [was given] to "provide the most comprehensive picture to date of the sexual behavior of aging men."

* The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development [gave \$26,000 for] a four-day July conference on sexual arousal at the Kinsey Institute — where Mr. Bailey was a featured speaker...”¹⁷

It was in response to Mr. Souder's questions about the \$26,000 grant for the sexual arousal conference that NICHD Director Dr. Duane Alexander wrote: "Over the last five years, the NICHD has provided \$263,038 in support of research conducted under the auspices of the Kinsey Institute."

Mark Souder, Indiana Republican and chairman of the Government Reform subcommittee on criminal justice, drug policy and human resources noted:

Kinsey and his associates, at the very least, encouraged the rape and molestation of children under the guise of 'science' ...

I would hope that an institute dedicated to child health would be primarily focused on protecting children from sexual abuse, a mission inconsistent in my opinion with providing support for any institution built upon Kinsey's hideous legacy.¹⁸

Alexander vigorously defended his ongoing funding of Dr. John Money--who calls for an end to age-of-consent laws and whose surgical child sex-change program was exposed as a fraud and a failure--Dr. Alexander claims that Dr. Money (who pioneered sex changes for children) has proven that no one is born male or female. Alexander explained that if parents raise their sons as girls, they will be “female,” but if they raise their sons as boys, they will be “male.”

Girls and Boys are Made Not Born?

Alexander savaged the parents of Dr. Money's most famous sex-change victim for the boy's stubborn refusal to complete the “scientific” process of making him a girl. Tragically, the victim of Dr. Money's “experiment” committed suicide as an adult. Alexander's defense of Dr. Money's “continuous funding” was based on Money's claim that *gender is determined only by culture, not by biology*, hence sex change operations on children would be justified should a boy have a too small sex organ or a girl a too large one. Dr. Alexander said.

Basically, what this research showed ...was that the most important factor wasn't the chromosomes, wasn't the gonad....it was how the kid was raised by the parents....And if the parents accept this child as a female and raised it as a female consistently, gender identity was female. If they accepted it as male, raised it as male consistently, gender identity almost always was male.¹⁹


Dr. Alexander is emphatic that *the boy's parents* interfered with his evolution into a happy young woman.

[This case is] one that did not turn out well [because the boy's parents] never made the switch in their minds. They were not consistent in raising him as a female instead of a male, and

there's really lots of explanation for why this didn't turn out well.²⁰

Extensive documentation is available on Money's pedophile promotions, his forced incestuous pornography for his "twin study," and fraudulent work as well as the child sexual abuse protocols being defended by the Kinsey Institute.²¹ Yet, amazingly, Dr. Alexander is still being paid with our tax dollars and is one of the federal "experts" shaping family policy. Furthermore, the Kinsey Institute directors are on record as supporting and misrepresenting their institute's criminal child sexuality abuse as "data" on "normal" childhood sexual development.²² Dr. Alexander has since approved other Kinsey Institute sex research for over a million dollars for a three-year study.

That FIFCFS reports, 1997-2003 ignored school sex abuse, child prostitution and child pornography and its access on the Internet to children and adults, that there are no disclaimers citing the practice of "plea bargaining" that allows child molesters to avoid felony charges or records, all these missing data taint the FIFCFS report. These and other measures of child unwellness discredit the research claim that "*Children in the United*



States were less likely in 2002 to commit a violent crime or be a victim of one than in 2001.” I have included here just a few brief observations regarding the misleading nature of the “good news” presented in the child Well-Being report. The excerpted “Acknowledgments” in this chapter suggest indigenous denial across governmental agencies responsible for child welfare.

Dumping the “Bad” Data

Rape data hidden? As is seen above, the “rape” of children is hidden by collapsing rape in with other “violent” crimes including robbery. As you can see also, there are no data recorded on children under age 12, the graph reflecting only crimes to children from 12-17. By collapsing “rape” within the general data on “violence” FIFCFS statistically eliminated all sexual abuse crimes against children. A word search of the final FIFCFS report found no data on rape, sodomy, battery, statutory rape, date rape, kidnapping, general suicide, child prostitution, child pornography, molestation, venereal disease (including AIDS) or sex abuse in “America’s Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being 2003.” Similarly, no such data are available in the 2000 version or appear to exist in any other FIFCFS reports on children’s “well being.”

By eliminating the under age 12 child population the Forum’s “violence” data are invalid. For, even the scant NIBRS 2000 report found that “37% of all victims of sexual assault reported to the participating law enforcement agencies were juveniles under age 12 (roughly 2/3rds of the child population). If, as it appears, child victims and offenders are younger and younger, the FIFCFS methodology are wholly flawed as it eliminated any trends on violent crimes against young children. Says NIBRS, “one of every seven victims of sexual assault reported to the participating law enforcement agencies were under age 6.”

Suicide: The only FIFCFS data on juvenile suicide was suicide by firearms! Page 106 “Health” has a table describing Adolescent mortality: Death rates among adolescents ages 15 to 19” with “firearm suicide” at an average of 4.4 firearm suicide deaths per 100,000 adolescents. Overall youth suicide rates were not included. Why? According to the Harborview Injury Prevention and Research Center (HIPRC), approximately 13 per 100,000 15-

24 year olds commit suicide (this includes an older group). Even if this includes the 4.4 firearm deaths, this is a ratio of 9:4 non-firearm related suicide.

Suicide is the third leading cause of death for teens and young adults in the US and Canada. The suicide rate among young teens and young adults has increased by more than 300% in the last 3 decades. The rate in the US is now approximately 13 per 100,000 15-24 year olds.²³

Kidnapping hidden? Why hide the child suicide rate and cite the miniscule rate of alleged firearm suicide? Despite the fact that 58,200 children were cited as kidnapped by non kin in 1999 (who returned home within 24 hours, albeit nearly half sexually molested) the Forum ignored “kidnapping” as a report category in the “America’s Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being 2003.” Of the 58,200 children kidnapped in 1999:

Roughly 75% of these offenders are not significantly known intimates of their child victims. Strangers are responsible for 45% of the abductions, 21% are “acquaintances,” 3% “someone else” and 5% are similarly vague as, “neighbors...Abductions in this category involved forcibly moving or detaining the child for a relatively short period of time, usually in connection with another crime....Over 50% of the children kidnapped in non-family abductions were taken from the street, in a vehicle, or from a park or wooded area.²⁴

Despite their easy availability via “The Second National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children, known as NISMART,” these child “violence” data were not noted.

STD/VD rates hidden? As stated in an earlier report, here too despite the epidemic rates of youthful STDs, the Alexander methodology did not mention STDs among youths in their “Well-Being” analysis. Yet, the highest age-specific chlamydia rates were for girls, ages 15 to 19 (2,536 per 100,000). Gonorrhea rates were highest among girls 15 to 19 at 703 per 100,000.

Genital human papillomavirus (HPV), commonly known as genital warts, was five percent among youth ages 12 to 19.... Experts estimate that nearly four million teens [have an STD]....The gonorrhea rate among U.S. teens is 74 times higher than the rate among teens in either the Netherlands or France, 10 times higher than in Canada, and seven times higher than in England and Wales. The chlamydia rate among U.S. teens is 20 times higher than among teens in France, five times higher than in England and Wales, and twice as high as in Canada. Prevalence of gonorrhea and syphilis is increasing among some populations in Europe, heightening fears that people are being less careful about risky sexual behaviors.”²⁵

Since nothing in this FIFCFS study of child “well being” would raise alarms about the need for children or adults to be more “careful about risky sexual behaviors,” it is self evident that here, and in the other sample studies cited, we are dealing with Rotten Research(ers).

I have focused here on Rotten Research in justice department reports and child abuse issues because this is the center of my expertise. However, the failure of American scientists or of the state bureaucrats who direct them is found in scores of other profit making ventures. Research on the harms of Hepatitis B and other child intrusive vaccines; Aspartame; Monosodium Glutamate (e.g.: Hydrolyzed Vegetable Protein Hydrolyzed Protein; Hydrolyzed Plant Protein, Plant Protein Extract, Sodium or Calcium Caseinate, Yeast Extract, Textured Protein (Including TVP), Autolyzed Yeast, Hydrolyzed Oat Flour, Corn Oil); to Genetically Modified foods and fluoride is too sparse and too dubious.²⁶

Brief Summary

In sum, research conducted by Kinseyified researchers yields Rotten Research, conducted by those who have been “restructured” in their thinking about human sexuality, family, parenthood and so on. An inherent libertarian bias undermines the ability of researchers to see the forest for the trees as it were. Typical problems arise in the bias in definitions, from the studies of “Child Abuse Reported to the Police” to “Explanations for the Decline in Child Sexual Abuse Cases” and “Pornography Crimes Involving Juveniles,”

to “America's Children: Key National Indicators Of Well-Being,” a 20 Agency report

These are bad data in a highly critical area of concern that inevitably translates into bad programs and bad legislative and judicial decisions. The bias against biological families and biological fathers and for the use of pornography as harmless, should be seen as especially relevant and indeed systemic.

Such institutionalized definitions and denials directly impacts upon public self-confidence in their concerns for their children’s safety. By methodologically eliminating the public consequences of sexual license, public policy makers naturally demote the funds needed to study root causes for the current state of child sociosexual dysfunction and endangerment.

To that end, I urge that *all agency studies of crime and Well-Being* should supply data *from 1950* in their time lines and in their discussion in order to provide evidence of the “well being” of our nation pre and post the sexual revolution. This should be seen only as a preliminary draft of basic FIFCFS errors. A full study of the agency wide problem of child abuse reporting is urgently recommended.

ENDNOTES

¹ Organisations, Policies and Publics in Britain and Germany. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979, p. 424).

² Science magazine, April 24, 1998.

³ Denise Mann WebMD Feature <http://my.webmd.com/content/article/97/103990.htm> (undated, Nov. 2004)

⁴ John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman, *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*, Harper & Row, 1988.

⁵ D'Emilio and Freedman, *Ibid*.

⁶ Christie Hefner, in the Foreword to *Sexuality and Medicine*, Volume 11, Earl E. Shelp (ed.), Reidel Publishing Co., 1987.

⁷ Hefner, *Ibid*.

⁸ Karlan, Arno, interview in *Sexuality and Homosexuality* (1971). NYC: W.W. Norton & CO., Inc., p. 612

⁹ David Finkelhor, *Sexually Victimized Children*, The Free Press/Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York, NY, 1979 pp. 122-123.

¹⁰ David Finkelhor, Kimberly J. Mitchell, Janis Wolak , “Crimes Against Children Research Center,” June 2000. National Center For Missing & Exploited Children, Pp, 33-34.

¹¹ Finkelhor, et al, "Child Abuse Reported to Police," CACRC say: "[P]arents are responsible for 60 percent of all crimes. Stepparents and parents' boyfriends and girlfriends account for another 19 percent.... Biological fathers account for two-fifths (41 percent) of all offenders, and stepfathers and parents' boyfriends account for nearly one-fifth (18 percent) (figure 4)." CACRC immediately follow up their claim that biological dads are 41% of "all offenders," by saying, "Men account for 92 percent of caretaker sex assault" implicitly linking "biological fathers" with incest and 92 percent of sex assault. Since dads are documented, even by Finkelhor, as not having as high a rate of abuse as boyfriends or step dads, the analyst must ask, why then do CACRC never report the important statistics--incest by biological fathers--versus each of these other caretaker groups?

Systemic Redefinition of "Family" Removes Biological Parents From Database. Also, as these and similar US Justice Department reports implicitly urge the polity to see the biological family (and as we will see, the biological father in particular) as the most perilous font of child sexual abuse, where are the data identifying the role of mainstream pornography on child sexual abuse in dad's "family" home? Since the data are available and, based on my expertise, causally associated in most incest and child sexual abuse cases, where are the data on the use patterns of pornography (mainstream, hard-core, child, etc.)? Such data on "copy cat" crimes are highly valuable in the courtroom. In fact, pornography data can often prove a child's assertions of exactly what was done to him or her; such as forcing the child to dress in certain ritualistic clothes, the use of handcuffs, feathers, the poses and suchlike. In "**Sexually Victimized Children**" (1979) Finkelhor adds "Indeed our data give support to this picture. The rate of father-daughter incest is much higher in the families with stepfathers than in any other subgroup in the whole survey--almost five times higher....[G]irls in these families are more vulnerable to stepbrothers, stepsisters, step cousins...[and possibly] a coterie of friends and acquaintances who are not so protective toward a stepdaughter. (Emphasis added)."

Especially in light of the above, systemic redefinitions for parents and "family" by Finkelhor et al, are misleading. Anything that inflates the rates of sexual abuse within the biological family influences the legal and public policy treatment of family and marriage. "**The Sexual Exploitation Of Missing Children**" (October 1988) Moreover, in "The Sexual Exploitation Of Missing Children" (October 1988) Hotaling/Finkelhor claim that children are genetically homosexual and that family rejection of their homosexuality is largely responsible for boy runaways, prostitutes and suicides. H/F write: "**Sexual orientation.** Adolescent homosexuality may put a male at higher risk of running away and getting involved in juvenile prostitution. Because he faces stigma and harassment from his family and community, a homosexual adolescent may run away."(p. 15). H/F do not consider the fact that sexual abuse by boyfriends of the fathers or mothers (as "family") is causal in juvenile homosexuality (as it is known as causal in juvenile prostitution). Instead, H/F presume genetic homosexuality and ignore the early sex abuse that often triggers homosexual conduct in the first place. Moreover, H/F also, in this report define "child sexual abuse" as requiring "force" unless by a "caretaker or a much older person" while describing children as "participant" in--versus victimized by--pornographic productions. It is notable that, despite the recurrent theme of pornography in run away and throw away children's lives, H/Fs four-page "Research Agenda," does not recommend any study of pornography's early or later influences and harms to children.

¹² Finkelhor, et al., "Child Abuse Reported to Police," CACRC, 2001.

¹³ Finkelhor et al, "Pornography Crimes Involving Juveniles: The National Incident Based Reporting System," Draft, 2004, p. 1.

¹⁴ Haven Bradford Gow, "Child abuse: tragic result of sex revolution," The Washington Times, December 18, 1984, (4B).

Finkelhor's definition of "family" may be said to reflect an ideological bias toward Alfred C. Kinsey's views of family and child sexuality. Although Finkelhor seems to understand Kinsey's work as ideological, perhaps even harmful to children, in *Sexually Victimized Children* (1979), Finkelhor treats Kinsey in a benignly critical manner, citing positively to Kinsey's "findings" more than eleven times.

¹⁵ Finkelhor, *Sexually Victimized Children*, Ibid, p. 86.

¹⁶ Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics ("Teen birth rate down, youth less likely to be involved in violent crimes"). Dr. Alexander is supported by "the Child Well-Being Index" which finds that while more children are irreligious and fatherless they are "less likely to be victims of violence than their parents were."

¹⁷ Robert Stacy McCain, "Sex and child health," Culture, *The Washington Times*, September 19, 2003

¹⁸ Ibid (check hthis)

¹⁹ See Money's statements calling for an "end to the age of consent" and legalizing sex between boys and men in *Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia*, published in the Netherlands, Spring 1991, volume 2, number 3, pp.2-13.

²⁰ Robert Stacy McCain, "Sex and child health," Culture, *The Washington Times*, September 19, 2003.

²¹ See esp., Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* (1998, 2000, 2003).

²² Please see drjudithreisman.org, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* (1998, 2000, 2003), and the Yorkshire Television, UK, documentary, "Kinsey's Paedophiles" for full supportive evidence of these facts.

²³ Harborview Injury Prevention and Research Center (HIPRC), "Adolescent Suicide," <http://depts.washington.edu/hiprc/practices/topic/suicide/#top>.

²⁴ The data above on Kidnapping are taken from: The Second National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children, known as NISMART, The Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, National Center for Missing & Exploited Children. "The NCMEC website "Personal Safety for Children" cites "approximately 58,200 "non-family [child] abductions" in 1999.

²⁵ CDC. Sexually Transmitted Disease Surveillance, 2001. cited in "2002. Adolescents—At Risk for Sexually Transmitted Infections," <http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/publications/factsheet/fssti.htm>

²⁶ See Dr. Stan Monteith, Radio Liberty, January 2003 for a series of interviews with many recognized authorities addressing these important Rotten Research issues. <http://www.radioliberty.com/jan03.htm>