

THE CHILD EXPERIMENTS

Dr. Balluseck... [made measurements] of his crimes committed against children... while in correspondence with the American sexual researcher Kinsey... [doing this] research... over three decades.

[Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, May 22, 1957]

The nazis knew...[he] practiced his abnormal tendencies in occupied Poland on Polish children, who had to chose between Balluseck and the gas ovens. After the war, the children were dead, but Balluseck lived. Today the court has got four diaries ... [where] he recorded his crimes against 100 children....He sent the detail of his experiences regularly to the US sex researcher, Kinsey. The latter... with Balluseck kept up a regular and lively correspondence.

[National-Zeitung, May 15, 1957].


Balluseck... corresponded with the American Kinsey Institute for some time, and had also got books from them which dealt with child sexuality.

[Tagespiegel, October 1, 1957]

*Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*¹ included 23 chapters of supposedly scientific data and analysis. Perhaps the most baleful was Chapter 5, “Early Sexual Growth and Activity,” where Kinsey claimed to show that the tiniest of infants have the “capacity”² for orgasm. He contended that his data confirmed that sexual activity is natural to the human “animal” from birth, and that human children are therefore unharmed by sexual activity even from birth. Prior to Kinsey, sexual information (“sex

education”) focused on marriage, sexual hygiene (venereal disease) and family living, and was widely recognized as the responsibility of parents or legal guardians. After Kinsey, this crucial responsibility was gradually transferred to school teachers.

Kinsey’s philosophy of early childhood sexual development became the standard for today’s graphic sex instruction materials in



The 1,746 children in the Table above represents a cumulative total of the children Kinsey cites as sex subjects for the team's *Male* and *Female* volumes. The second column cites to the page number in the *Female* volume for 7 small girl test subjects. The next column represents 350 children mentioned in *Pomeroy*, and the remaining columns are data from Kinsey's *Male* volume with the page (:) or Table (T) numbers cited below the bar.



Indiana University's numerous publicity pictures of Kinsey and his staff were posed to promote the impression that the researchers were honest, stable, and normal.

many, of not most, American public, private, and parochial schools, usually camouflaged by such euphemistic captions as sex education, AIDS prevention or awareness, family life, health, hygiene, home economics, physical education, even “abstinence” education.³ Public health data confirm that as Kinseyan-based sex education has metastasized, levels of sexual disease and dysfunction have rocketed upward.

Kinsey asserted that “Erotic arousal could... be subjected to precise instrumental measurement if objectivity among scientists and public respect for scientific research allowed such laboratory investigation.”⁴ It is reasonable to assume that he meant what he wrote. He and his team did, in fact, conduct what he called “scientific research” on children involving the “precise instrumental measurement” of what he interpreted as “erotic arousal” in infants, toddlers and children. Whether “public respect” is due his “laboratory investigation” is for you, the reader, to judge.

His research was indeed groundbreaking. Prior to Kinsey, no child developmental specialists suggested that children were either sexual from birth or that they benefited from early sexual activity. One education professional, Mary Shivanandan, summarized the “developmental theories of the 20th century” as they relate to children, recalling that while Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) had argued that children were “polymorphus perversus” at birth, psychosocial identity was the childhood goal, with children going through various “stages” in their development, including the wholly asexual “latency” stage, on their way to maturity. Similarly, psychoanalyst Eric Erikson (1902-1994) stressed the child’s goals of trust, autonomy, industry, identity and spiritual development.

Cognitive theorists Jean Piaget (1896-1980), Lawrence Kohlberg (1927-1987), and Albert Bandura



Indiana University's favorable publicity on behalf of Kinsey helped solidify his position as the head of the emerging field of human sexuality.

(1925-) focused on mutual cooperation, moral thinking, and social learning as the child's major objectives. Humanists Carl Rogers (1902-1987) and Abraham Maslow (1908-1970) stressed the child's drive toward "self-actualization" as the motivating purpose. Learning theorist B.F. Skinner viewed the child's chief end as learning reason and obedience. And maturational theorists Arnold Gesell (1880-1961) and Robert Havighurst (1900-1991) cited "normal" development and task achievement as childhood goals.

Alfred Kinsey alone argued that sexual satisfaction was a childhood goal.⁵

PART I: THE LITTLE BOY EXPERIMENTS

The number of male infants and young boys observed undergoing sexual stimulation, as reported in the *Male* volume, is between 317 and 1,739 (seven girls were similarly tested). The child-subject totals may be calculated several ways, depending on the manner in which chart figures are tallied. In *Ethical Issues in Sex Therapy*, Volume II (1980), influential sexologists Masters, Johnson, Kolodny, and Weems present a series of papers reprising the history of the research on the "Ethics of Sex Research Involving Children and the Mentally Retarded." One important essay, by Albert Jonsen and J. Mann, states that Kinsey "included observational reports on the speed of reaching orgasm in 1,888 boys, ages 5 months to adolescence, who were timed with a stop watch," and "147 pre-adolescent" girls, for a total of 2,035 children.⁶ The authors cite their "personal communication" with Kinsey and co-author Wardell Pomeroy, who validated the 1,888 boys in the Kinsey reports.⁷

Where could the Kinsey team have found from 1,746 to 2,035 boys and girls for "instrumental measurement" of "erotic arousal" data, "timed with a stop watch," from infancy to teen years, without parental objection? And what about Kinsey's "trained observers"? The *Male* volume tells us virtually nothing, except,

Better data on pre-adolescent climax come from the histories of *adult males who have had sexual contacts with younger boys* and who, with their adult backgrounds, are able to recognize and interpret the boys' experiences. Unfortunately, not all of the subjects with such contacts in their histories were questioned on this point of pre-adolescent reactions; but 9 of our adult male subjects have observed such orgasm. Some of these adults are technically trained persons who have kept diaries or other records, which have been put at our disposal; and from them we have secured information on 317 pre-adolescents who were either observed in self-masturbation, or who were observed in contacts with other boys or older *adults*.⁸ [Emphasis added.]

Kinsey's record of what he perceived to be infant and child orgasmic potential is presented in Table 30 of the *Male* volume.⁹ Explanatory notes for Table 30 state,

All data based on memory of older subjects, except in the column entitled "data from other subjects." In the later case, original data gathered by certain of our subjects were made available for use in the present volume. Of the 214 cases so reported, all but 14 were subsequently observed in orgasm.¹⁰

Before reviewing the alleged child sexuality "data" about "preadolescent climax," let us take a brief look at some new information about "Kinsey's Paedophiles" that was uncovered in 1998 by the Yorkshire Television investigators. We will meet a few of the "adult males" whom Kinsey enlisted for his research team when compiling data for the chapters on "Early Sexual Growth and Activity" and "Pre-Adolescent Sexual Development" in his *Male* and *Female* volumes, respectively.

The Yorkshire documentary, entitled *Secret History: Kinsey's Pedophiles*, was broadcast in Great Britain on August 10, 1998. In a review, England's *BBC Radio Times* wrote that "this deeply unsettling documentary... makes a strong case that Kinsey cultivated [pedophiles whose crimes] he presented as scientific data." London's *Daily Mail* for August 11, 1998, agreed: "An academic study admitted the... repugnant... evidence of a child abuser as though this were a respectable scientific contribution." In the Yorkshire interview, Gebhard confirmed that "certain of our subjects," who joined Kinsey's child sexuality research team, were child molesters:

Interviewer: How did Kinsey come in contact with, say, the paedophiles?

Gebhard: That was rather easy. We got them in prisons, a lot of them.... We'd go after them.... Then there was also a paedophile organization in this country... not incarcerated... they cooperated... You had one in Britain... a British paedophile organization.

So, the Kinsey team found pedophile organizations and asked them to help with its child sex experiments. James Jones, in his Yorkshire interview, admitted the pathology of the man he called "Mr. X," or "Mr. Green" but who was in fact the U.S. federal government land surveyor named Rex King:

Kinsey relied upon [King] for the chapter on childhood sexuality in the male volume... I think that he was in the presence of pathology at large and... Kinsey... elevated to, you know, the realm of scientific information... what should have been dismissed as unreliable, self serving data provided by a predatory pedophile... I don't have any doubt in my own mind that man wreaked havoc in a lot of lives. Many of his victims were infants and Kinsey in that chapter himself gives pretty graphic descriptions of their response to what he calls sexual stimulation. If you read those words, what he's talking about is kids who are screaming. Kids who are protesting in every way they can the fact that their bodies or their persons are being violated.



Yorkshire Television British documentary, *Secret History: "Kinsey's Paedophiles,"* August 10, 1998.



James Jones. Outcut from interview for "Kinsey's Paedophiles."



Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy. Outcut from interview for "Kinsey's Paedophiles."

The interviewer asked, "Do you think it is right that the Kinsey Institute continues to protect him? Which is more important, confidentiality or those children?" Jones replied, "In my mind those children," and continued,

I don't think the Christian right is wrong on that. I think they have their right to be outraged... political ideology really doesn't have much to do with people's reactions to child abuse.

Countering the Kinsey Institute's defense that the children did not "complain" about their abuse, Jones asked,

How did they know they didn't complain? The person who was rendering that information is the same person who abused them. It seems to me that they have as much credibility as a rapist would have, saying that the victim enjoyed the rape.

Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy, a recent Kinsey biographer (*Sex the Measure of All Things; A Life of Alfred C. Kinsey*, London: Chatto & Winds, 1998), reveals that Kinsey Institute Director John Bancroft secretly allowed him to read and copy Kinsey's pedophile team reports:

[Kinsey] was deeply affected by five paedophile headmasters who... had... loving relationships with young adolescent boys of twelve or thirteen.... The reason the Kinsey Institute is so careful....is that... they have... evidence of sexual behaviors that even now are illegal. They are nervous that sons or grandsons will sue them if they let this information out. So they had to be very, very careful that names are not revealed in that way.

Gathorne-Hardy perused Rex King's records. He confirmed that King was indeed the individual whom Wardell Pomeroy said raped at least 800 infants, children, kin, and strangers:

Eight or nine typewritten volumes [were] typed up by Kinsey's wife... prior to 1945, which was, you know, before Kinsey admitted [he had employed King. King] went on having sex with everybody until the end... long after Kinsey got the journals. The material in that chapter almost entirely came from [King's] journals which Kinsey got in 1944/45.

I daren't put this on film. I did read [King's records] but Bancroft doesn't want me to say I read them. Bancroft says that if the people know I read them they will go to him and say, you've let one scholar have them, and I'm not going to do that. So what I had to say in my book is that I closely questioned Bancroft and Gebhard about the contents of the journals, but I didn't read them. In fact, I did read them. *But I can't say I read them.*

Kinsey photographer, psychologist, and implicit sex partner Clarence Tripp said that such pedophile researchers were cooperative and happy to demonstrate and share their activities:

You don't find out about what pedophiles think and do [unless] you talk to a man who has done pedophile... there is nothing like going to first sources and photographing you

see.... I photographed everything in the human animal when we could arrange it.... If the FBI were to come, demand to see our histories, I would destroy them first.

After graphically describing his own hands-on sexual activity with dogs, Tripp said,

I got hold of a young German boy prostitute... who I photographed with one of the younger ones.... This is the picture. This would probably be the epitome of child corruption in Reisman's mind.... Kinsey had a huge store of films done by myself, Bill Dallenbeck and other people.... Kinsey... would say "Show me," or "Do you mind if I watch?" Or "Let me come over."...Whenever possible Kinsey did validate it."

Interviewer: what you're saying then is that it is possible that Kinsey personally validated [King's] material [the sex with children]?

Tripp: Almost always... there is no mention of his observing people. But he did. He wanted to see everything. This is a hands-on scientist... he had to see it to really believe it.... He poked into, he looked at everything. He often had to have these things photographed because he simply didn't have time.... [Kinsey] was in the market for everything... people who are into special things, love to document it. And it seems to rev them up if they mark it down on a calendar.

Until the Yorkshire investigators located the reports in Berlin, only a few knew about Dr. Fritz Von Balluseck, the Nazi pedophile who contributed his child abuse data (from roughly 1936-1956) to Kinsey's research database. Their exchange of information is discussed later in this chapter. Meanwhile, Tripp confirmed Pomeroy's claim that Kinsey was collecting "early adolescent sperm" to study motility, and "had at least ten motility studies going."

As noted earlier, "motility" studies entail the microscopic evaluation of sperm to pin point the earliest age at which boys are fertile. This required that Kinsey and/or his aides masturbate young boys and/or monitor the self-masturbation of older boys for ejaculate to be examined for sperm count and motility. Paul Gebhard testified that their group recruited pedophiles and pederasts to collect child "orgasm" data wherever they could:

[King] had sex with men, women, children and animals.... Nursery school people... parents... couldn't give us the extraordinary detail that [King] did. It was illegal and we knew it was illegal and that's why a lot of people are furious... they say we should have turned him in instantly... *If we had turned him in it would have been the end of our research project.*

During his Yorkshire interview Tripp said that "we" ought to "rev up" children sexually "at an early age." He and his colleagues hoped that it would "fix" people like this author by "proving" that children have orgasms, thereby reducing disapproval of, and eliminating laws against, "molestation,"



Clarence Tripp. Outcut from interview for "Kinsey's Paedophiles."



Dr. Fritz von Balluseck, Nazi pedophile who contributed his on-going child sexual abuse "data" to Kinsey.

“abuse,” and the like:

If we could only get those children with some kind of masturbation or something that would rev up their sexual substrate at an early time it would fix people like Judith Reisman immediately because then they'd respond and then they'd know what the rest of the world was like....

Neither Kinsey nor members of this team used the terms “molestation” or “abuse” in a negative manner; they believed that their experiments were entirely acceptable, added Tripp:

Paedophilia is an almost non-existent kind of crime.... For instance they use words like child molestation. What is that? Nobody knows. Abuse of children? Are they talking about boxing them against the ear or hitting them with a stove pipe? Are they talking about tickling them a little? Are you talking about fondling? I hesitate to even call [Rex King] a paedophile.

Based on the evidence, child sex abuse was a prominent research protocol for the child “data” from Kinsey’s two volumes authoritatively cited as fact, worldwide.

TABLE 30: “PRE-ADOLESCENT EROTICISM AND ORGASM”

Table 30 deals with “first” orgasm data. Pomeroy asserts that “age of first orgasm” was “one of the most important parts of the sex history.”¹¹ Child developmental professionals prior to Kinsey pin-pointed puberty-related physiological factors as signs of budding sexual maturation. For Kinsey, sexual maturation was evident on the occasion of first “orgasm” experienced by the 214 little boys listed in Table 30. For his entire male sample, Kinsey reported a (for him) disappointing 93 percent who did not answer the interview question about when they had their first orgasm. Only 7 percent, he lamented, recalled orgasms prior to age 14.

AGE	FIRST PRE-ADOLESCENT EROTIC AROUSAL AND ORGASM NUMBER OF CASES						
	EROTIC AROUSAL			ORGASM			
	In Any Sex Play	In Heterosexual Play	In Homosexual Play	Data from Present Study	Data from Other Subjects	Total Cases	% of Total
1					12	12	2.5
2					8	8	1.6
3				2	7	9	1.8
4	10	9	2		12	12	2.5
5	30	23	8	5	9	14	2.9
6	26	21	8	15	19	34	7.0
7	32	29	6	21	17	38	7.8
8	38	29	12	27	21	48	9.9
9	38	37	3	24	26	50	10.3
10	83	71	17	56	26	82	16.8
11	72	67	13	54	22	76	15.6
12	92	84	13	51	23	74	15.2
13	37	37	3	15	9	24	4.9
14	10	10		3	3	6	1.2
15	3	2	1				
Total	471	419	86	273	214	487	100.0
Mean Age	10.28	10.41	9.62	10.40	8.51	9.57	
Median Age	9.75	9.87	9.26	9.77	8.10	9.23	

Table 30. Pre-adolescent eroticism and orgasm

Kinsey’s conclusion from these skimpy and unsupported data was that *most* pre-adolescents *can* experience orgasm. He writes of the “normality” of orgasm for little boys (despite the absence of memories or ejaculate), claiming that it is “not at all rare among pre-adolescent boys, and it also occurs among pre-adolescent girls.” He defines this as a “significant fact” which is not “well established in scientific publication,” therefore “profitable to record here...in some detail.”¹²

Kinsey quickly rebounded from this numerical setback by reporting that children who cannot

experience orgasm are have probably been rendered psychologically incapable due to environmental (read, parental) inhibitions:

The observers emphasize that there are some of these pre-adolescent boys (estimated by one observer as less than one quarter of the cases), who fail to reach climax even under prolonged and varied and repeated stimulation; but even in these young boys, this probably represents psychological incapacity more often than physiologic incapacity.¹³

Neither sexology's ethical guardians nor most of Kinsey's critics have sought further details about the "prolonged and varied and repeated stimulation" to which the children were exposed. And when the children did not respond with "orgasm," *how did they respond?* When this author's 1981 paper, "Child Sexuality or Child Sexual Abuse: A Critical Evaluation of the Kinsey Reports," was retrieved from the Kinsey Institute files during the 1993 deposition of their then director, one of the many handwritten "corrections" found on that trip was that child orgasm tests were for the orgasmic "capacity" and not the "potential" of infants and children.

The Kinsey team embellished the data even further, stating that the toddlers required a *fresh* social climate, and concluding that, in an "uninhibited" society, the majority of boys could be having orgasms by three or four years of age:

In the population as a whole, a much smaller percentage of the boys experience orgasm at an early age, because few of them find themselves in circumstances that test their capacities; but the positive record on these boys who did have the opportunity makes it certain that many infant males and younger boys are capable of orgasm, and it is probable that half or more of the boys *in an uninhibited society could reach climax by the time they were three or four years of age*, and that nearly all of them could experience such a climax three to five years before the onset of adolescence.¹⁴ [Emphasis added.]

Evolutionarily speaking, what use would infants or young children ages three to four years have for an orgasmic capacity without a physiological basis for early sexual maturity? Even current Kinsey Institute Director John Bancroft acknowledges that there is a "biological basis" for the genitals, and that it is generative. Testosterone is inhibited in the male until roughly 12 years of age and, Bancroft says, a young boy's "first ejaculation occurs" at about 13 years of age.¹⁵ To sexualize toddlers and young children without any "biological basis" for doing so renders them freaks of nature.

TABLE 31: "PRE-ADOLESCENT EXPERIENCE IN ORGASM"

Kinsey believed that human beings and their responses could be categorized like the gall wasps he had collected earlier. This taxonomic technique is evident in Table 31 of the *Male* volume, "Pre-adolescent experience in orgasm," which is a carbon copy in theory, structure, and groupings of his 1936 insect table on "Cynips." In Table 31, Kinsey reported the little boys' ages and "orgasm" responses to stimuli.¹⁶ Bancroft claims that Kinsey's "meticulous" boy tables report the "data" Kinsey received from King, who he called an old "technically trained" forester¹⁷ and who, Pomeroy and others claim, had sexual relations with 800 children of both sexes).

Kinsey stated that "some of the younger boys who have contributed to the present study" also described their "orgasm." However, the charts show that 28 of Kinsey's "younger boy" contributors/participants were infants, so unable to speak. Kinsey claimed in Table 31 that "orgasm" was "ob-


served” in a male infant of five months, although the table further notes failure to produce orgasms in male babies of two, three, four and nine months. Each age category included children tested for orgasm; that is, Kinsey confirmed 22 toddlers up to two years old, were test subjects. He claimed that 11 of these tykes “reached climax,” while 11 others did not. These could have been some of Rex King’s little victims, described by Gathorne-Hardy in his Yorkshire interview.

Two three-month-old babies were tested and coded as not having reached “climax.” Of twelve four-year-olds, Kinsey claims five were anorgasmic while seven were successfully orgasmic.

Such is the view of those collecting sex “data” on 317 boys in Table 31, men engaged in “actual observation” of the children. Some of the little boys were tracked for years. Kinsey writes, “In 5 cases of young pre-adolescents, observations were continued over periods of months or years, until the individuals [child subjects] were old enough to make it certain that true orgasm was involved.”¹⁸ In other words, at least five little boys continued to be subjected to

Spring 1997

Director's Column
by Dr. John Bancroft



This is an exciting time for the Kinsey Institute. We are in the midst of the first of two consecutive fiftieth anniversary years—this year, the founding of the institute; next year, the publication of *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, Alfred Kinsey's first groundbreaking volume. We intend to celebrate these occasions in a variety of ways, starting with a public exhibition and lecture series, which you can read about on page 2 of this newsletter.

After a period in which the Kinsey Institute has spent too much time defending itself against outside attack, we are ready to show the world our pride in the institute and its mission, which is to promote interdisciplinary research and scholarship in the fields of human sexuality, gender, and reproduction. Our mission, and the work we do in support of it, is more important today than at any time in the past, and with the developments and projects now underway, our leadership in this area will be even stronger as we enter the next century.

But we do need help. Indiana University is supporting us wholeheartedly, but at the present time, financing academic enterprises such as ours is becoming increasingly difficult. We must find additional sources of funding, and we are working hard on that right now.

We also need the support of people who recognize the Kinsey Institute's importance in this sexually troubled time, and who care about advancing knowledge of human sexuality. There are some people in the United States who object to research into sexuality and who attack our efforts and those of other serious sex researchers.

AGE WHEN OBSERVED	PRE-ADOLESCENT EXPERIENCE IN ORGASM					PERCENT OF EACH AGE REACHING CLIMAX
	TOTAL POPULATION	CASES NOT REACHING CLIMAX	CASES REACHING CLIMAX	CUMULATED POPULATION	CUMULATED CASES TO CLIMAX	
2 mon.	1	1	0			
3 mon.	2	2	0			
4 mon.	1	1	0			
5 mon.	2	1	1			
8 mon.	2	1	1			
9 mon.	1	1	0			
10 mon.	4	1	3			
11 mon.	3	1	2			
12 mon.	12	10	2			
Up to 1 yr.	28	19	9	28	9	32.1
Up to 2 yr.	22	11	11	50	20	57.1
Up to 3 yr.	9	2	7	59	27	
Up to 4 yr.	12	5	7	71	34	
Up to 5 yr.	6	3	3	77	37	
Up to 6 yr.	12	5	7	89	44	63.4
Up to 7 yr.	17	8	9	106	53	
Up to 8 yr.	26	12	14	132	67	
Up to 9 yr.	29	10	19	161	86	
Up to 10 yr.	28	6	22	189	108	
Up to 11 yr.	34	9	25	223	133	80.0
Up to 12 yr.	46	7	39	269	172	
Up to 13 yr.	35	7	28	304	200	
Up to 14 yr.	11	5	6	315	206	
Up to 15 yr.	2	2	0	317	206	
Total	317	111	206	317	206	65.0

Table 31. Ages of pre-adolescent orgasm
Based on actual observation of 317 males.

In Spring 1997, Bancroft, still refusing to name either victims or perpetrators of the Kinsey crimes, complains that the Institute has spent "too much time defending itself against outside attack."

experimentation “over periods of months or years” so that scientists and/or technically trained observers could know if what these men called “true orgasm was involved.”

TABLE 32: “SPEED OF PRE-ADOLESCENT ORGASM”

Table 32 details the “speed of pre-adolescent orgasm.”¹⁹ The table’s legend states: “Duration of stimulation before climax: observations timed with second hand or stopwatch. Ages range from five months of age to adolescence.” We read in *Ethical Issues in Sex Therapy*, Volume II, that Wardell Pomeroy confirmed the “observation” data on these

boys and that the 1,888 boys from age five months to fifteen years were observed being “erotically stimulated” in order to record “speed of reaching orgasm” while “timed with a stop watch.”²⁰ In an audio-taped interview, Kinsey associate Paul Gebhard was asked who collected such illegal data?

Gebhard: ...Most of it was done by one individual, a man with scientific training, and not a known scientist. The other cases were done by parents, at our suggestion, and, let’s see, then there were some that were done by nursery school personnel.

Interviewer: Was that at your suggestion too?

Gebhard: Yes... we would ask them to watch, and take notes, and if possible, time it and report back to us.... Once we asked people about giving us their observations, we would ask them later too. if [the pedophiles] got in contact with us later we would ask them more about it. We follow up by re-interviewing people occasionally...

Interviewer: So, do pedophiles normally go around with stop



Kinsey’s Table of wasps, he states, was based on the actual observation of 124,512 gall wasps he collected in the wild.

MATERIAL STUDIED IN CYNIPS					
Complexes	Number of Species	Insects Examined		Total Insects	Total Galls
		Before 1930	1930-1936		
Cynips					
Folii.....	4	646	51	697	1,200
Longiventris.....	2	129	6	135	370
Divisa.....	2	1,090		1,090	1,090
Agama.....	1	57		57	180
Disticha.....	1	13		13	5
Cornifex.....	1	4		4	12
Antroon					
Echinus.....	6	589	786	1,375	7,400
Guadaloupensis.....	3	18		18	140
Teres.....	3	55		55	190
Beebicus					
Multipunctata.....	4	175		175	1,200
Maculosa.....	2	29		29	70
Mirabilis.....	2	26	32	58	420
Atrusca					
Dugbei.....	29	164	3,306	3,470	18,000
Bulboides.....	5		840	840	1,500
Aggregata.....	5		318	318	1,500
Bella.....	5	56	2,410	2,466	15,000
Centricola.....	4	118	61	179	405
Philonix					
Plumbea.....	13	30	1,122	1,152	3,300
Fulvicollis.....	9	5,170	1,987	7,157	22,550
Acraspis					
Arida.....	11	27	1,071	1,098	3,800
Melles.....	11	431	147	578	1,840
Nubila.....	9	64	2,088	2,152	6,100
Villosa.....	9	367	191	558	2,280
Gemmula.....	5	746	10	756	680
Pezomachoides.....	9	5,890	1,554	7,444	23,500
Hirta.....	10	1,457	2,030	3,487	12,000
Totals 26.....	165	17,351	18,010	35,361	124,512

Kinsey claimed that his wasp Table was based on actual observation of 124,512 gall wasps.

TIME	CASES TIMED	PERCENT OF POPULATION	CUMULATED PERCENT
Up to 10 sec.	12	6.4	6.4
10 sec. to 1 min.	46	24.5	30.9
1 to 2 min.	40	21.3	52.2
2 to 3 min.	23	12.2	64.4
3 to 5 min.	33	17.5	81.9
5 to 10 min.	23	12.2	94.1
Over 10 min.	11	5.9	100.0
Total	188	100.0	


Mean time to climax: 3.02 minutes
Median time to climax: 1.91 minutes

Table 32. Speed of pre-adolescent orgasm

watches?

Gebhard: *Ah, they do if we tell them we're interested in it....* When we interview pedophiles, we would ask them, How many children have you had it with? What were their ages? Do you think they came to climax or not?... Are you sure it really was climax or not? (see 44.)

Gebhard was unusually candid for a member of the Kinsey team. A former director of the Kinsey Institute, he admitted collaborating in the child abuse. The Institute has understandably been extremely protective of the data, and refuses to reveal who collected them. Additionally, Gebhard admits that the team collaborated and interacted with their “observers” before and after the commission of criminal acts against children.



As recorded in *Ethical Issues in Sex Therapy and Research*, Volume 2, Gebhard was asked about the ethics of coercing people of all ages to participate in the Kinsey research. He replied that the Kinsey team did indeed coerce people, and that he would have no qualms about doing it again. He asserted:

Well, it is definitely coercion.... I think a certain amount of coercion is acceptable in the interest of encouraging research participation. I wouldn't hesitate to use that tactic again—though I might not spell it out in my proposal to the committee on human subjects.²¹

Whether or not coercion is part of a sex-research protocol, child responses remain subject to interpretation by the adult, for as Kinsey himself admitted, “Pre-adolescent boys, since they are incapable of ejaculation, may be as uncertain as some inexperienced females in their recognition of orgasm.”²² He claimed that he and his team could precisely interpret a child's response, and could unerringly recognize orgasm without ejaculation.

Kinsey testified that it had “been necessary to test the reliability of every... technique, at every point of the program.”²³ How, then, did he and his team “test the reliability” of child “orgasms” and the competence of their “technically trained observers”?

TABLE 33: "MULTIPLE ORGASM IN PRE-ADOLESCENT MALES"

Kinsey's Table 33 presented data about the number of orgasms among 182 pre-adolescent boys, as well as the time between orgasms for another 64. The legend for the table reads: "Based on a small and select group of boys. Not typical of the experience, but suggestive of the capacities of pre-adolescent boys in general."²⁴ Kinsey wrote,

The most remarkable aspect of the pre-adolescent population is

its capacity to achieve repeated orgasm in limited periods of time. This capacity definitely exceeds the ability of teen-age boys who, in turn, are much more capable than any older males....It is certain that a higher proportion of the boys could have had multiple orgasm if the situation had offered....Even the youngest males, as young as 5 months in age, are capable of such repeated reactions.²⁵

Kinsey's "interviewers" allowed a "time lapse" of from 2.25 minutes to 6.28 minutes between orgasm trials, which suggests that they were stimulating the boys to bring about "orgasms" as swiftly as possible. Just as Kinsey described adult sexual abuse of children as "sex play," Tripp saw such tests on young boys as play: "If you have paedophilia between an older male and a young boy is that homosexual?...It's that they are playing in a way."

TABLE 34: "EXAMPLES OF MULTIPLE ORGASM IN PRE-ADOLESCENT MALES"

Gebhard acknowledged during his Yorkshire interview that "science" was not part of Kinsey's agenda for the child chapters. He cited Table 34, admitting that they used the records of "Kinsey's though the deviates involved were ordinary parents and physicians. "Judith Reisman... [saw] this famous table 34 that had the data on children... [She] hit the ceiling... [A] good piece of it came from [King].

Table 34 was truly grotesque. It reported around-the-clock experimental "data" on infants and young boys.²⁶ The Kinsey team seemed completely at ease when describing the extraordinary data:

Even the youngest males, as young as 5 months of age, are capable of such repeated reactions. Typical cases are shown in Table 34. The maximum observed was 26 climaxes in 24 hours [in a 4-year-old and a 13-year-old], and the report indicates that still more might have been possible in the same period of time.²⁷

Gathorne-Hardy recalls that the "five month old boy in table 34 [King] did with a woman... Kinsey, however, did not use all of his figures." What figures did Kinsey disregard? Table 34 is said to show typical instances of the orgasmic "capacity" of male infants and children. As with the

NO. OF ORGASMS	CASES OBSERVED	PERCENT OF POPULATION	CUMULATED PERCENT	TIME BETWEEN ORGASMS	CASES TIMED	PERCENT OF POPULATION	CUMULATED PERCENT
1	81	44.5	100.0	Up to 10 sec.	3	4.7	4.7
2	17	9.3	55.5	11 to 60 sec.	15	23.5	28.2
3	18	9.9	46.2	Up to 2 min.	8	12.5	40.7
4	10	5.5	36.3	Up to 3 min.	10	15.6	56.3
5	14	7.7	30.8	Up to 5 min.	7	10.9	67.2
6-10	30	16.5	23.1	Up to 10 min.	11	17.2	84.4
11-15	9	4.9	6.6	Up to 20 min.	7	10.9	95.3
16-20	2	1.1	1.7	Up to 30 min.	1	1.6	96.9
21+	1	0.6	0.6	Over 30 min.	2	3.1	100.0
Total	182	100.0	100.0	Total	64	100.0	100.0
Mean No. of Orgasms: 3.72 Median No. of Orgasms: 2.62				Mean Time Lapse: 6.28 minutes Median Time Lapse: 2.25 minutes			

Table 33. Multiple orgasm in pre-adolescent males

adults, however, the precise number of children subjected to testing is impossible to determine. Kinsey states there were “some instances of higher frequencies” than those shown. Why were they not given? A two-, 12-, or 13-year-old

AGE	NO. OF ORGASMS	TIME INVOLVED	AGE	NO. OF ORGASMS	TIME INVOLVED
5 mon.	3	?	11 yr.	11	1 hr.
11 mon.	10	1 hr.	11 yr.	19	1 hr.
11 mon.	14	38 min.	12 yr.	7	3 hr.
2 yr.	7	9 min.	12 yr.	3	3 min.
		65 min.			2 hr.
2½ yr.	4	2 min.	12 yr.	12	2 hr.
4 yr.	6	5 min.	12 yr.	15	1 hr.
4 yr.	17	10 hr.	13 yr.	7	24 min.
4 yr.	26	24 hr.	13 yr.	8	2½ hr.
7 yr.	7	3 hr.	13 yr.	9	8 hr.
8 yr.	8	2 hr.	13 yr.	3	70 sec.
9 yr.	7	68 min.			11
10 yr.	9	52 min.	14 yr.	26	24 hr.
10 yr.	14	24 hr.			11

Table 34. Examples of multiple orgasm in pre-adolescent males

may have been tested more than once. Also lacking is an explanation of why orgasms claimed for the five-month infant are recorded, but not the time required to attain them. Moreover, Kinsey reports in detail, as an observer, about a “fretful babe” “distracted [from] other activities” by the experimenter. The “weeping” and “convulsive action” of the baby is labeled “orgasm” by the Kinsey team.

Kinsey admits that some of the children were tracked for months or years:

A fretful babe quiets down under the initial sexual stimulation, is distracted from other activities, begins rhythmic pelvic thrusts, becomes tense as climax approaches, is thrown into convulsive action, often with violent arm and leg movements, sometimes with weeping at the moment of climax. After climax the child loses erection quickly and subsides into the calm and peace that typically follows adult orgasm. *It may be some time before erection can be induced again after such an experience.* There are observations of 16 males up to 11 months of age, with such typical orgasm reached in 7 cases. In 5 cases of young pre-adolescents, observations were continued over periods of months or years, until the individuals were old enough to make certain that true orgasm was involved; and in all of these cases the later reactions were so similar to the earlier behavior that there could be no doubt of the orgiastic nature of the first experience.²⁸ [Emphasis added]



First of a series of child photos from Darwin's *Expressions of Emotion* that illustrate fear, anger, and rage.

In *Kinsey's Pedophiles*, the camera moved in for a close up of Rex King's records of “the orgiastic nature” of infant, child, and juvenile responses to manipulation. “Willy Price” is cited as one of King's 15-year-old victims. Gebhard stated in a phone interview that the Kinsey Institute has “names” of some child victims. Willy Price would be in his late 60s by now and may still be alive. Gatherne-Hardy reads, on camera, from hard copies of King's reports. The interview appears in the transcript of the Yorkshire documentary. Some of the brutally graphic language spelt out in Hardy's reading from the original has been excised for this book.

Out of 317 cases [King] records having to force cooperation on five occasions: aged 2, 4, 7, 10 15 (Willy Price).... He likes to arouse boys... King records in the history the color,

taste and smell of the semen. Also, when he can, examines adolescent semen for sperm.... Does it with mother and son... Some of his women masturbate their children for him....” [Gathorne-Hardy reads from record] "Experimented with baby.... Could take head of [male sex organ] in mouth easily.... His success in getting his huge range was, like Kinsey that he not only did not disapprove, he was happy to join in... seducing boys and men.... In a few minutes [the boy] was laughing and did not hold it against me. Fact is he seemed proud he had done it. I praised him and told him he was some kid to take a 7" **** down his throat and up his *** *the same night*.... [Got boys] round to discussing sex... excited them... [show graphic sex]. Listened.... They felt safe and warm and happy.”



For Darwin, an expression interpreted as “horror.” For Kinsey, a fretful babe’s “convulsive” orgasm.

Such activity easily qualifies as the delusional frenzy of a dangerous sexual psychopath. For Kinsey, his team and his disciples, including Dr. Bancroft, current Kinsey Institute president, Kinsey’s was quality “scientific research” that deserves “public respect.”

DARWIN VERSUS KINSEY: INTERPRETING PHYSIOLOGICAL RESPONSES

The Kinsey Institute insists that Kinsey’s pedophiles were “technically trained” adult “observers” who could reliably “interpret the boys’ experiences.” From King’s descriptive entries, Kinsey teased out the numbers that appear in the descriptions which follow. Kinsey described the “erotic stimulation” of 196 children to create “erections,” which he reported as orgasms. The standard definition of for normal male “orgasm” includes ejaculation:

The highest point of sexual excitement, characterized by strong feelings of pleasure and *marked normally by ejaculation of semen by the male* and by vaginal contractions in the female. Also called climax.²⁹ [Emphasis added.]

While adults supplied the following “data” about the boys’ experiments, the six types of “orgasm” described *refer only to boys, not men*. Kinsey’s repeated references to “adult males” is *deliberately* confusing. There are *no* “adult males” in the group of pre-adolescents he studied, so each mention of “older males” refers to boys *under 13-years of age*. Since Kinsey claimed that Charles Darwin was his methodological, scientific, and “biologic” mentor, a study of Darwin’s *Expressions of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1904), in regard to Kinsey’s descriptions of “orgasm” is very illuminating. Darwin’s *negative* descriptions of children’s rage, terror, anger, and fear, etc., mirror and conflict with Kinsey’s *positive* descriptions of “orgasm” in children.³⁰ The *Male* volume states,

Our several thousand histories have included considerable detail on the nature of orgasm; and these data, together with the records supplied by...older subjects who have had sex...with younger boys, provide material for describing the different sorts of reactions which may occur. In the pre-adolescent, orgasm is, of course, without ejaculation of semen.³¹ *In the descriptions which follow, the data supplied by adult observers for 196 pre-adolescent boys are the sources for the percentage figures indicating the frequency of each type of orgasm among such young males....six types are listed....*[Note, no “adult males” are studied.]

1. *Reactions primarily genital:* Little or no evidence of body tension... penis becomes more rigid and may be involved in mild throbs, or throbs may be limited to urethra alone; semen (in the adult) seeps from urethra without forcible ejaculation; climax passes with minor after-effects. A fifth (22%) of the pre-adolescent cases on which there are sufficient data belong here, and probably an even higher proportion of older males. [Recall, no "adult males" are studied.]

2. *Some body tension... twitching* of one or both legs, of the mouth, of the arms, or of other particular parts of the body... rigidity of the whole body and some throbbing of the penis; orgasm with a few spasms but little after-effect... involving nearly half (45%) of the pre-adolescent males, and perhaps a corresponding number of adult males. [Recall, no "adult males" were studied.]

3. *Extreme tension with violent convulsion:* Often involving the sudden heaving and jerking of the whole body... that the legs often become rigid, with muscles knotted and toes pointed, muscles of abdomen contracted and hard, shoulders and neck stiff and often bent forward, breath held or gasping, eyes staring or tightly closed, hands grasping, mouth distorted, sometimes with tongue protruding; whole body or parts of it spasmodically *twitching, sometimes synchronously with throbs or violent jerking of the penis... still more violent convulsions of the whole body; heavy breathing, groaning, sobbing, or more violent cries, sometimes with an abundance of tears (especially among younger children)*, the orgasm or ejaculation involving several minutes (in one case up to five minutes) of recurrent spasm... the individual is often capable of participating in a second or further experience. About one sixth (17%) of the pre-adolescent boys, a smaller percentage of adult males. [Recall, no "adult males" were studied.]

4. As in either type 1 or 2; but with *hysterical laughing, talking, sadistic or masochistic reactions*, rapid motions (whether in masturbation or in intercourse), culminating in more or less frenzied movements which are continued through the orgasm. A small percentage (5%) of either preadolescent or adult males. [Recall, no "adult males" were studied.]

5. As in any of the above; but culminating in extreme trembling, collapse, loss of color, and sometimes fainting of subject. Sometimes happens only in the boy's first experience, occasionally occurs throughout the life of an individual. Regular in only a few (3%) of the pre-adolescent or adult males. [Recall, no "adult males" were studied.] Such complete collapse is more common and better known among females.

6. Pained or frightened.... The genitalia... become hypersensitive...*some males suffer excruciating pain and may scream if movement is continued or the penis even touched.*



For Darwin, an expression interpreted as "fear." For Kinsey, an expression interpreted as orgasm.



For Darwin, an expression interpreted as "hysterical." For Kinsey, an expression interpreted as orgasm.



For Darwin, an expression interpreted as "pain." For Kinsey, an expression interpreted as orgasm.

The males in the present group become similarly hypersensitive before the arrival of actual orgasm will fight away from the partner and may make violent attempts to avoid climax, although they derive definite pleasure from the situation. Such individuals quickly return to complete the experience, or to have a second experience if the first was complete. About 8 per cent of the younger boys are involved here, but it is a smaller percentage of older boys and adults [Recall, no "adult males" were studied] which continue these reactions throughout life.³²



Rex King, hidden away as "Mr. X." Outcut from interview with Gathorne-Hardy in "Kinsey's Paedophiles."

Gathorne-Hardy states that Rex King constructed the "six kinds of orgasm" stated above by Kinsey as fact. Hardy also claims that Kinsey (himself a clinically defined sado-masochistic sexual psychopath) then "verified" King's descriptions of orgasm, apparently including the fainting, convulsing, and striking of the "partner:"

Kinsey... has a thing in there defining six kinds of orgasm... alerted to by [King]. Then he [Kinsey] looked for himself... and it turned out that [King's] observations were terribly feasible.... So, before the book was published, they packed off the galleys to [King]... [and] he patched it all up again.... *Kinsey was himself a super-expert at child sexuality, a super observer.... [King] was the only man I ever knew who could, who was more sensitive than Kinsey at looking at that [child sex] material... King had sex with all these relatives and brothers and sisters and aunts... but nobody is objecting. He makes it pleasant... He rented himself out as a baby sitter part of the time... [and abused the children] Most of this material eventually got transferred to the Institute for Sex Research.*

In the *Male* volume, Kinsey refers to another aspect of the sexual maturation of young boys, gleaned "from certain of our subjects who have *observed* first ejaculation in a list of several hundred boys."³³ Pomeroy has noted that the Kinsey team tested for sperm motility, with microscopic examination of seminal fluid for "mature" sperm, and Kinsey claimed to locate "11 out of 4,102 adult males in our histories" who allegedly had "orgasm" without ejaculate.³⁴

If Kinsey's "trained observers" are to be believed, such orgasmic but non-ejaculating men are either freaks of nature or men who have severe psychological and/or physical maladies. We are left to wonder what Pomeroy meant when he wrote that Kinsey believed students in the sexology field had all been "too prudish" to make an actual investigation of sperm count in early adolescent males.³⁵ Even Kinsey's harshest critics failed to realize, or did not understand, that the young ejaculate-less subjects were fainting and/or convulsing in pained response to sexual molestation.

SOME CHILDREN STRAPPED OR "HELD DOWN"

A review of the child data by prominent pediatricians and other health professionals confirms what most mothers and fathers know instinctively: children, especially the very young, would not willingly submit to such abuse. Dr. Lester Caplan, a Baltimore physician and member of the American Board of Pediatrics, confirmed in a letter to this author that the children could not have been voluntary participants in the Kinsey research protocol:

Regarding the data in Chapter 5, I have come to the following conclusions:

1. That the data was not the norm—rather was data taken from abnormal sexual activities, by sex criminals and the like.
2. Unnatural stimulation was used by the researchers to get results.
3. The frequencies and the number of orgasms in 24 hours was not normal nor the mean.
4. One person could not do this to so many children—these children had to be held down or subject to strapping down, otherwise they would not respond willingly.³⁶

Dr. Caplan was merely confirming common sense, empirical observation, and pediatric training. During their Yorkshire interviews, both Gathorne-Hardy and Gebhard stated that Kinsey's books were meant to convince the public that we are all sexual, womb to tomb, so Kinsey had to "prove" infants were lustful, even if it meant tying them down and labeling their "hysterical weeping" an "orgasm":

Gathorne-Hardy: [King] would masturbate little boys, tiny little boys, babies at 15 or 16 months. People don't normally do that.... Very small children can have orgasms, tiny children. There are even scans of a boy sort of playing with his cock in the womb. Kinsey knew the material would be less scientifically considered if he did reveal his source.

Gebhard: Children are sexual beings... [L]ittle males get erections even in the uterus. They are sexual from the word go.... [King] contributed a fair amount to our knowledge... and medicine's knowledge of sexuality in children. We made our point that children are sexual from birth.

Crooks and Baur's 1983 college human sexuality text, *Our Sexuality* (Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co.), a typical example of such works-cites the Kinsey team's findings on child sexuality as applicable to today's children:

In many Western societies, including the United States, it has been traditional to view childhood as a time when sexuality remains unexpressed and adolescence as a time when sexuality needs to be restrained.... However, with the widespread circulation of the research findings of Alfred Kinsey and other distinguished investigators, the false assumption that childhood is a period of sexual dormancy is gradually eroding. In fact, it is now widely recognized that infants of both sexes are born with the capacity for sexual pleasure and response.

Signs of sexual arousal in infants and children, such as penile erection, vaginal lubrication, and pelvic thrusting, are often misinterpreted or unacknowledged. However, careful observers may note these indications of sexuality in the very young. In some cases, both male and female infants have been observed experiencing what appears to be an orgasm. The infant, of course, cannot offer spoken confirmation of the sexual nature of such reactions.... *The following two quotations [from Kinsey's Male and Female Reports] are offered as evidence for this conclusion.*³⁷

Actually, the "misinterpretation" of certain physiological reactions in infants and children is entirely the authors'. The placing of a sexual connotation on these reflexive nervous and vascular reactions reflect hurtful, unethical, illegal and, consequently, invalid research.

But the acceptance of infant and childhood sexuality is powerfully entrenched in sexology circles. The "given" factor can be clearly seen in statements from Mary Calderone (past president and co-founder, with Lester Kirkendall, of SIECUS). Speaking before the 1980 annual meeting of the Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians, Dr. Calderone reportedly explained that providing today's society "very broadly and deeply with awareness of the vital importance of infant and childhood sexuality" is now the primary goal of SIECUS.³⁸ In 1983, Calderone wrote of the child's sexual capacities that,



With knowledge to the contrary, Indiana University consistently presented Kinsey as working under their safe and respectable auspices.

[these should] be developed-in the same way as the child's inborn human capacity to talk or to walk, and that [*the parents*] role should relate only to teaching the child the appropriateness of privacy, place, and person-in a word socialization³⁹

Or, in a typical Christian sex education resource, "Children are Sexual Beings, Too." It may be surprising to realize that our children are *sexual beings from birth*. For instance, a parent changing a male infant's diaper may accidentally stimulate the child and be shocked to realize the *child is having an erection*. Similarly, *researchers tell us that baby girls have vaginal lubrication regularly*. In fact, a little girl being bounced on her parent's knee may feel pleasant sensations and begin to make natural pelvic thrust movements.⁴⁰

Which "researchers tell us" these things about children? Who is Butth's source? Only those trained by "sexologists" "tell us" about "child sexuality." The author first read the above dogma, eroticizing a baby girl's "vaginal lubrication" and a baby boy's erection in a 1977 pro-pedophile essay. But, all mucosal exit/entry organs; ears, mouth, vagina, anus, (even eyes) "have lubrication regularly," while the reflexive nervous and vascular reactions of the penis, "erectile tissue," respond to *many* biological stimuli; urinary build-up, friction, infections, (or fear), all wholly unconnected to libido. Clearly, Butth relies upon Freud's discredited child sexuality theories but, like Kinsey, Butth guts Freud's latency period.

Yes, children can be sexually abused and *prematurely* disturbed and aroused, by fear-sex stimuli like pornography as well as genital trauma due to antibiotics, medication or yeast infections and (more likely) pinworms. Even *Webster* states that ejaculation is required for the male "orgasm" and that eliminates babies, prepubertal children, from this category. Would God so mock His people so as to, or nature, the animal world, make little children "sexual" when an early libido could cripple the child's development?

"SCIENTIFICALLY TRAINED OBSERVERS"

So, Kinsey was not merely an "interviewer" as his supporters would have us believe. He and his team had long conducted laboratory experiments on human sexual response. Kinsey acknowledged that they had "unpublished gynecologic data that have been made available for the present project... some special data on the... detailed anatomy... involved in sexual response... physiologic experiments on the sexual activities of... the human animal."⁴¹ The experiments occurred both in the field and at Indiana University, where perverts of all sorts kept detailed records of their child molestations and

sent them to Kinsey for inclusion in his studies. As Kinsey explains in the *Female* volume,

It is difficult... to acquire any adequate understanding of the physiology of sexual response from clinical records or case history data, for they constitute secondhand reports which depend for their validity upon the capacity of the individual to observe his or her own activity, and upon his or her ability to analyze the physical and physiologic bases of those activities. In no other area have the physiologist and the student of behavior had to rely upon such secondhand sources, while having so little access to direct observation. This difficulty is particularly acute in the study of sexual behavior because the participant in a sexual relationship becomes physiologically incapacitated as an observer. Sexual arousal reduces one's capacities to see, to hear, to smell, to taste, or to feel with anything like normal acuity, and at the moment of orgasm one's sensory capacities may completely fail.

It is for this reason that most persons are unaware that orgasm is anything more than a genital response and that all parts of their bodies as well as their genitalia are involved when they respond sexually... The usefulness of the observed data to which we have had access depends in no small degree upon the fact that the observations were made in every instance by scientifically trained observers. Moreover, in the interpretation of these data we have had the cooperation of a considerable group of anatomists, physiologists, neurologists, endocrinologists, gynecologists, psychiatrists, and other specialists. The materials are still scant and additional physiologic studies will need to be made.⁴²

We've shown that Kinsey and his pedophiles reported on the sexual "responses" of between 317 and 1,739 or 1,888 male infants and children.

Let us now turn to Kinsey's treatment of little girls.

PART II: THE LITTLE GIRL EXPERIMENTS

Adult Offenders: The accompanying table presents figures regarding adult offenders whom Kinsey euphemistically labeled "Partners." Chapter 4 of the *Female* volume, entitled "Pre-Adolescent Sexual Development," contains the Kinsey data on female *child* sexuality. They vary considerably from that having to do with male children. For instance, there are no data about tests of "speed to orgasm." Most of his female child "data" are obtained from adult recall. Pomeroy and Gebhard confirmed Jonsen and Mann's report⁴³ that the boys were timed to orgasm with a stop watch by adults and that "147 pre-adolescent females ranging in age from 2 to 15 years" were similarly "observed." So, Kinsey's data on the "Adult Partners" of 609 girls (unnumbered table) claims that, as pre-adolescents, 24 percent of his subjects were approached by adults in a sexual manner. He reports that 84 percent of those "approaches" were by non-kin and 23 percent by kin, and that *all were harmless*.

Of the 609 girls, 52 percent were victimized by strangers; 32 percent by friends (family friends, brothers of a friend, and others); and 140 (23 percent) by relatives. That latter figure translates to an incest rate of roughly 2.4 percent of the 5,940 females sampled (percentages for the various Kinsey categories add-up to 107 percent).

While Kinsey included all sorts of arcane data in his tables on male and female sexuality, there are *no* similar tables for child molestation or incest.

As noted earlier, Kinsey termed adults who had sexual intercourse with their children the children's "partners." Sexual activity was called "play." In his listing of relatives, Kinsey does not differentiate the non-biological family (live-in, step, adopted relations) from biological relations. This is critical information for a nation told by sexologists that divorce and live-in partners are harmless and preferable for children over that of a strained marriage.

The Kinsey team presents a small sample of seven girls under four years of age on whom direct sexual experiments had allegedly been performed: "We have similar records of observations made by some of our other subjects on a total of 7 pre-adolescent girls and 27 pre-adolescent boys under four years of age (see our 1948 study: 175-181)."⁴⁴


The public deserves to know more about those seven (or 147) little girls. In a letter dated March 11, 1981, Gebhard claimed that no follow-up information on any of the children was available. Regarding the 27 boy "subjects" who were also under "four years of age," Kinsey had stated that "observations made by some of our other subjects" strongly suggesting these small children were sexually tested by older "persons." Subsequent investigation by Yorkshire Television confirmed that speculation.

"ESTHER," INCEST SURVIVOR INTERVIEW FOR "KINSEY'S PAEDOPHILES"⁴⁵

Esther: My grandfather was a student here... when Alfred Kinsey was here... in a biology class in 1922... My father actually did mail some questionnaires... I believe, to the Kinsey Institute about the sexual abuse that he was doing on me... since 1938, which makes me about four years old... I had to meet with him and with Alfred Kinsey... Alfred Kinsey asked me some questions, was I happy... did I love my daddy? Of course, I was instructed... to be very nice to this man, that he was a very famous man... the conflict of emotions [in the sex abuse] actually ended up in convulsions... it was crying and uncontrollable shaking...

At the very peak of when all the abuse was going on, there was a time when there was a paper in a brown envelope and it... had little questions on it, with little blocks in front of it... but I didn't understand one of the words... orgasm... my father explained to me what an orgasm was. And he asked me to let him know when there was an orgasm. He always looked at his watch... he said, he had a deadline to meet and you had to send [the paper] away. So he put it in this envelope and I have never seen it since...

...I know he had a... camera that he used, but I don't know how much he took... one incident he could have taken... in the act... There was one time that may have been





Alleged Kinsey incest survivor, "Esther", at about age 9. (Yorkshire Television outtake.)

photographed... there was one time when I do remember it [a movie camera] was running and he says, oh, don't pay attention to that.

...I think what he did, at least in my case was use the figures for incest in the 1953 book... Now I understand, they have passed on that incest information onto someone else who is publishing a book and that makes me angry... They didn't ask my permission to publish...

...I went into a psychologist myself and I found Kinsey's lies coming right back at me. And then I realized that the Kinsey Institute is teaching the psychologist, I just got through paying money to see.. most people seek [help] from a psychologist or psychiatrist that was trained by [Kinseyans].

[The Kinsey books] are republished... reams of that information is going to be used in our public schools and perpetuate the lie again. Who is financing it...?

Those archives need to be opened up so people can understand that if they feel they were connected with the

Kinsey Institute that they can go back and know for sure... they used me and they used those children and that is a terrible way to feel, to feel that you've been used for a lie, and they perpetuated it so that it would happen again...

My grandfather's perpetuation to my father was generational, and I think that's what Alfred Kinsey was after... They didn't think that molesting children was wrong, so they didn't want to interrupt it, the abuse that was going on. They wanted that to continue, that is what they are doing this book for... [re-release of the Kinsey Reports, 1998]

The names of some or all of the children are in the Kinsey records. In fact, during his November 2, 1992, phone interview,⁴⁶ Gebhard stated that the Institute has the names of "some" of the children who were so used: "Most of the cases we don't have the names of the children, but there are a small number of cases where we do have some names."⁴⁷

RECORDS OF 23 YOUNG GIRLS IN "ORGASM"

There are justified concerns about what happened to these little boys and girls. First, if it is indeed true that seven girls less than three years old were directly observed by the Kinsey team reaching "orgasm,"⁴⁸ why are they not recorded as a separate group? No precise information (age, family data, race, religion, and other basic demographics) is provided for this unique, and apparently unprecedented, "population sample."

Hyman and Sheatsley have noted that "[o]ne's credulity is occasionally strained by a reported datum which Kinsey presents without qualification."⁴⁹ And the "actual observation" of three-year-old girls "masturbating" entailed a highly unethical indeed criminal procedure in the 1930s, even

today. Hyman was a Rockefeller grantee and a highly respected interview specialist, while Sheatsley was well-known in the world of military analysis. Their article appeared in *An Analysis of the Kinsey Reports*,⁵⁰ where they remarked that it was scientifically irresponsible for the Kinsey team to combine direct experimentation with memories gleaned from adult interviews.

The Kinsey team claimed to have witnessed four infant girls reach “orgasm” at less than one year of age. Developmentally, such infants would be nursed or bottle-fed at one year, [perhaps could walk, but perhaps could walk,] but could not speak, could not yet control their bowels, jump, or eat with a fork or spoon, etc. But the Kinseyites were certain that they had attained orgasm!

Kinsey’s Table 10⁵¹ produces the following numbers on “pre-adolescent orgasm from any source.”

KINSEY’S ALLEGED GIRL “ORGASM” DATA (FEMALE, P. 127)

“Table 10. Accumulative Incidence: Pre- Adolescent Orgasm From Any Source”

AGE	% OF TOTAL SAMPLE	CASES
3	-	5,908
5	2	5,862
7	4	5,835
9	6	5,772
10	8	5,762

Having claimed that it had “just recorded” “orgasm” data on one-year-old and three-year-old infants, the Kinsey team later indicated that no orgasm was recorded by age three “from any source.”⁵² Combining information from Kinsey Table 21⁵³ and 25 (see below) yields the following information about girls who *allegedly* masturbated to orgasm. Whether the girls had the adult “help” that Kinsey admits in the *Male* volume is concealed:

GIRL “MASTURBATION” DATA (FEMALE, PP. 177 & 180)

AGE	PERCENTAGE (Table 21, P. 177)	ORGASM (Table 25, P. 180)
3	1% (of 5,913)	0% (of 5,913)
5	4% (of 5,866)	2% (of 5,866)
7	7% (of 5,841)	4% (of 5,838)
10	13% (of 5,808)	8% (of 5,802)
12	19% (of 5,784)	12% (of 5,778)

While fluctuating totals are not explained, another contradiction emerges: the sample size for orgasm from one source—masturbation (Kinsey’s Table 25; Figure 5 above)—is larger than the sample size for orgasm from all sources (Tables 10 and 147) for ages three, five, seven, 10, and 12. If lack of orgasm by age three is *explained as a problem of recall*, as Kinsey claimed (Table 25; Figure 5 above), then the 23 girls under three years of age to whom Kinsey referred on page 105⁵⁴ (not merely the seven noted earlier) would also have been “direct observation” subjects.

Typically, according to Kinsey, the statement about “just” recording the baby “orgasms” was made alongside *recollections* by adult women of orgasms they allegedly experienced as children.⁵⁵

Such information is essentially worthless unless we know the truth about the interviewers and those interviewed. Following is an oft-quoted graphic description from the *Female* volume about an “intelligent mother” who allegedly frequently observed her three-year-old masturbating:

Lying face down on the bed, with her knees drawn up, she started rhythmic pelvic thrusts, about one second or less apart. The thrusts were primarily pelvic, with the legs tensed in a fixed position. The forward components of the thrusts were in a smooth and perfect rhythm which was unbroken except for momentary pauses during which the genitalia were readjusted against the doll on which they were pressed; the return from each thrust was convulsive, jerky. There were 44 thrusts in unbroken rhythm, a slight momentary pause, then 10 thrusts, and then a slight momentary pause, 87 thrusts followed by a slight momentary pause, then 10 thrusts, and then a cessation of all movement. There was marked concentration and intense breathing with abrupt jerks as orgasm approached. She was completely oblivious to everything during these later stages of the activity. Her eyes were glassy and fixed in a vacant stare. There was noticeable relief and relaxation after orgasm. A second series of reactions began two minutes later with series of 48, 18, and 57 thrusts, with slight momentary pauses between each series. With the mounting tensions, there were audible gasps, but immediately following the cessation of pelvic thrusts there was complete relaxation and only desultory movements thereafter.⁵⁶

And on the Yorkshire Television interview, said Gathorne-Hardy:

[Kinsey] was an established professor who could go anywhere and do anything...
[M]oralists go around, horrified at the fact that quote unquote, Kinsey used pedophiles to get information.... Well, it's true that [King]... had intercourse with hundreds of males and females of every conceivable age... His girlfriend did the whole thing with her own daughter.

Apparently, King's “girlfriend” did not merely *record* her daughter's bizarre conduct. This is an admission that she and/or King *caused* the child's behavior.


This alleged “scientific” record has been cited by professionals in law and medicine worldwide. Typically, college sexuality texts by such authors such as Crooks and Bauer cite this page in Kinsey as evidence that children under age three are capable of orgasm. Future teachers, doctors, and other professionals, as well as parents, are told that “intelligent” parents should not be disturbed by such activities.

Though graphic, anecdotal stories are hardly science, when they were couched in scientific verbiage by Kinsey they helped pave the way for intimate physical examinations of children in their



Another picture from Indiana University's "Uncle Kinsey" publicity series (with Martin's daughter).

schools. For instance, the “Tanner Maturation Guide”⁵⁷ claims the areola size of the breast and the presence of pubic hair determine whether a child is physically mature enough to play school sports. Using that guide, children in New York were required to strip so they could be examined to see if they were qualified for team sports. One New York mother was impelled to file suit against her daughter’s school, rather than allow her youngster to undergo the humiliation and embarrassment of a nude examination by her female coach.⁵⁸



GIRL'S SEXUALLY VICTIMIZED BY MEN AND OLDER BOYS (FEMALE, P. 118)

“Ages of Females Having Adult Contacts”

AGE	% OF ACTIVE SAMPLE	AUTHOR'S ANALYSIS	%TOTAL SAMPLE
4	5	52	1
5	8	83	2
6	9	94	2
7	13	135	3
8	17	177	4
9	16	166	4
10	26	270	6
11	24	249	6
12	25	260	7 [sic, should be 6]
13	19	197	6 [sic, should be 4]
1,039		1,682 Girls Molested	4,407 Females

Another Kinsey table of girls under age 13 “Pre-Adolescents” is captioned “Age of Females Having Adult Contacts” (p. 118). It includes figures for pre-adolescent females who were sexually molested by males over 15-years-old. (My daughter would not count as a molestation victim since her rapist was 13-years-old.) Similar to other Kinsey team data, it entails a confusing and incoherent set of numbers. Clarence Tripp offers a few thoughts beyond quantification; beyond Kinsey’s numbers. It would have been helpful to the public in 1948 to read his descriptive narrative about King’s “fit problem,”

The children thought he was wonderful.... There was no force, no damage, no harm, no pain.... Well, there were two instances in which a young boy or girl – I think it was a girl— agreed to the sexual contact but then they found it very painful and yelled out when it actually took place. This was because they were very young and had small genitalia and [King] was a grown man with enormous genitalia and there was a fit problem.

Kinsey catalogued some adult-child “contacts” of his girl victims, but such details as Tripp’s “fit

problem,” when “they were very young” were not revealed to the millions of Kinsey readers and Kinseyan disciples.

“Age” in the adjacent Figure refers to that at which a sexual approach by an adult male was recalled. The “% of Active Sample” appears to refer to 1,039 women who, Kinsey claimed, recalled an adult male molestation or attempted molestation. The shadowed column, added by this author, is a rough estimate (by age) of the number of girls who allegedly recalled molestations. And “% of Total Sample” refers to the 4,407 women who are not viewed as “active” molestation victims. The figures leave much to be interpreted by the reader.

This crucial and revealing table, as does virtually all of Kinsey’s data, falls short of the “meticulous” taxonomic “perfection” attributed to Kinsey by Indiana University, the Rockefeller Foundation, and almost all of Kinsey’s supporters. Kinsey’s child data were never challenged by anyone—other than this author.


It should be noted that 32 girls were actually raped, even according to Kinsey’s data (3% of 1,075), while the rest were subjected to exhibitionists or fondling. Kinsey states on page 120 that the men and boys exposed themselves specifically to upset the little girls, and that the offenders gained pleasure from seeing the “fright or surprise or embarrassment” on the children’s faces. He discounted the “harm” factor, claiming that the procedure provided “a source of pleasure to some children.” According to Kinsey:

- 5% of the molested girls appeared to be “aroused”;
- 1% were brought to “orgasm” by the offender(s);
- 80% reported some fear, terror, and/or guilt.

It is unclear why the total number of molested female child victims was reduced from 1,075 (as noted elsewhere) to 1,039, or why the total sample dropped from 4,441 (also noted elsewhere) to 4,407. Moreover, it is a mystery why so much of the scientific world has accepted Kinsey’s claim that only one child out of 4,441 *perhaps* suffered some “serious injury” by adult sexual abuse. Or, why the word abuse or molestation never occurs in Kinsey’s two books.

INCEST OFFENDERS DEFINED AS CHILDREN’S SEXUAL “PARTNERS”

One technique for hiding information is failure to list relevant words in a book’s index. The



Female volume claimed to be an objective report on female sexual behavior. Yet the term “incest” does not appear in its 31-page index of some 4,300 entries. (It was, however, listed once in the *Male* volume.)

The Kinsey team allegedly recorded when children were molested by Kinsey’s “adult partners,” as recalled by female interviewees from childhood. You will recall Pomeroy’s claim

that Kinsey chose terms meticulously, avoiding “euphemisms” that would distort meanings. Kinsey used the euphemism “partner” to mask adult molesters, pedophiles, and others who sexually assault children. The use of the term “partner” suggests the activity was mutually agreed upon. It serves to discount the harm resulting from adult sexual abuse of children. As reported by Donna Friess and Esther White (see extensive endnotes), Kinsey’s incest data had, and continues to have, a dramatic impact on children. In fact, those who have suffered from the abuse perpetrated by Kinsey’s pedophiles may yet obtain access to the files sequestered at the Kinsey Institute. According to Gathorne-Hardy, who believes that “As a scientist I thought Kinsey was marvelous, exemplary,” the Institute fears that some of Kinsey’s victims may yet come forward:

[The Kinsey Institute] is nervous, people will read the journals and identify someone in them. [King] described having sex with this... little girl, this little boy or this man or this pig.... I think the Kinsey Institute felt... right wing figures... would pluck out things.... I think they are right to keep them undercover because they are not dealing with scrupulous scholars, they are dealing with people out to wreck them... there are descriptions of [King] bugging boys nigh on 13 ...[who] doesn't enjoy it. I mean it's quite sort of harsh stuff some of it.

The pedophile claim that adult sex with children is harmless has obtained a large following during the last half-century. Current estimates of “one in four females (and one in seven boys) having been molested by age 18”⁵⁹ suggest that American children are today experiencing unprecedented rates of sexual abuse.

Figure 9 presents figures from Kinsey’s table on prepubescent girls and their adult “partners.” This author has added a “victim” data column for clarification. As noted earlier, an incest rate of 2.4 percent (147 cases among the 5,940 female subjects) was indicative of a serious problem for society in general and law enforcement in particular. From the Kinsey team’s child-sex normalcy perspective, however, there was a motive to obscure the data. And again, Kinsey’s “% of Active Sample” category totaled 107 percent, which reflects Kinsey’s pattern of well-funded bad statistics. Are there 645 child abuse victims (based on his percentages) or are the added 36 cases multiple abuses? For a study alleged to be the most “meticulous” work on sexuality ever conducted, Kinsey actually hides the number of child victims in both his *Male* and *Female* volumes.

RELATIONSHIP OF ADULT TO GIRL INCEST “VICTIMS” ADDED TO KINSEY’S ORIGINAL UNNAMED TABLE [FEMALE, P. 118]

	% OF ACTIVE SAMPLE	[AUTHOR’S ANALYSIS]
ADULT “PARTNERS”		[Number of Girl “Cases”]
Strangers	52	317
Friends/Acquaintances	32	195
Uncles	9	55
Fathers	4	24
Brothers	3	18
Grandfathers	2	12
Other Relatives	5	30
Cases Reporting	609	651

“Author’s Analysis:” This column was added to show the actual number of children represented by Kinsey’s percentages.

Among the many aspects of incest that the Kinsey team opted to ignore were,

- number of resulting pregnancies;
- number of resulting abortions;
- relationship of victim to perpetrator (father, brother, uncle, stranger, etc.);
- instances of venereal disease;
- number of girls victimized by more than one relative;
- duration of the incestuous relationship;
- number of offenses per child;
- number of girls who reported their ordeal to parents and/or authorities;
- ages at which the offenses occurred;
- number of victims battered, blackmailed, or photographed for pornography;
- number of girls given pornography as model behavior to copy;
- number of victims attempting suicide;
- number of victims subsequently entering prostitution or becoming substance abusers.

The list could go on and on. Failure to raise such points suggests a strong—indeed pathological—bias aimed at blinding readers and other researchers to the critical, often life-threatening situations facing boy and girl victims of incestuous abuse. Kinsey purged all homosexual incest from his report.

Many persons responded to Kinsey's call for diaries and sexual calendars. They were "solicited" and "urged" to keep records of any future or on-going "outlets."⁶⁰ One woman's recollection of her grandfather includes the "forms" he mailed to the Kinsey Institute, on which he apparently recorded his sexual abuse of his granddaughter, and her alleged "responses." Kinsey states,

Many of the calendars have come from scientifically trained persons who have comprehended the importance of keeping systematic records. Many of the calendars are a product of our call for such material in the Male volume.... Persons who... are willing to begin keeping day-by-day calendars showing the sources and frequencies of their outlet, are urged to write us for instructions.⁶¹

Follow-up data on the child molestation and incest cases have, according to the Kinsey Institute, been maintained from time to time, but are yet to be made public. It is understandable, since the team sought-out actual and potential offenders and urged them to keep records of their future planned sex acts with children to "help science." The recent admissions by Gathorne-Hardy, Paul Gebhard, and Kinsey Institute Director Bancroft that the Institute has some of the abused children's names, and some of the original child abuse data, confirms that the information has been, and is being, deliberately suppressed.

If, as the Kinsey team claimed, a parent was always present during interviews, and if the name of each subject was coded in the Institute data base, why cannot the children be traced? And why was there apparently no follow up to determine their subsequent physical and emotional status? Such data could have helped to confirm or refute Kinsey's allegation that adult sex with children is harmless.

Childhood incest and the sexual abuse of women has been shown to result in; divorce, battery of wives and children, jealousy and rivalry between mothers and siblings, obesity, anorexia, venereal disease, pregnancy, abortion, attempts to run away, suicidal ideation, and suicide, promiscuity, "voluntary" and forced prostitution and/or pornography, addiction to alcohol and drugs, early marriage, incest on younger siblings and later child victimization.⁶² All are current, commonly recognized variables of the incest victim profile.⁶³

As academic dean of the Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality, Kinsey co-author Wardell Pomeroy sanctioned incest as beneficial when advising readers of *Penthouse*, *Chic*, and other pornographic magazines. He based his position on Kinsey Institute data supposedly supporting the notion of “positive incest.” Pomeroy stated in his sexuality text, *Girls and Sex* (1969), that the “medical” reasons for “the incest taboo” are that “the children of an incestuous union will be likely to inherit the outstanding good characteristics of both [parents].”⁶⁴

Hardly. The *British Medical Journal*, reporting on studies of first generation father-daughter and brother-sister incest births, ignoring the emotional costs, found 42 percent to be apparently normal, 58 percent diseased, retarded, or still-born.⁶⁵

During a December 1977 *Penthouse* interview, past Kinsey Institute Director Paul Gebhard also claimed that incest was harmless. With their reputations enhanced as Kinsey co-authors, the opinions of Pomeroy and Gebhard have been widely quoted by others, and cited authoritatively in state and federal court decisions (see Chapter 9, “Kinsey and the Law”).

Kinsey’s incest data were requested from the Institute by this author in 1981. In his reply, Director Gebhard stated that it had been passed along to Warren Farrell, who was said to be working on a book entitled, *The Last Taboo: The Three Faces of Incest*.⁶⁶

We omitted incest (in the *Female Report*), except for one brief mention, because we felt we had too few cases: 47 white females and 96 white males, and most of the incest was with siblings. We have turned our incest data over to Warren Farrell to supplement his larger study which I think is still unpublished.⁶⁷

Gebhard’s letter underscored the contradictions of the Kinsey incest data. The *Female* volume listed 147 instances of female incest victims, (23 percent of the 609-subject “Active Sample”), not 47.⁶⁸ Moreover, most of the incest alleged by the team was committed by uncles and fathers not by “siblings.” Again, Kinsey says nothing about whether these incest offenders were biological or non-biological (step family/adoption) kin.

As of this writing, Farrell’s “positive incest” book remains unpublished.

SEXUALIZED IMAGES OF CHILDREN

According to *Newsweek*, Kinsey Institute Director June Reinisch once stated that she found the Institute’s “collection of child pornography so distasteful... that she cannot bear to look at it.”⁶⁹ Yet Pomeroy and Gebhard both reassure their audiences that adult sex with children, including incest, is not only harmless, but in some



Kinsey publicly claimed that his "scientific" findings showed children "derived definite pleasure" from their experiences.



While incest was largely committed by adults in the past, as "soft" pornography entered the home, sexual abuse by older children has become an increasing problem.



Pomeroy wrote about the “benefits” of incest for *Penthouse Forum* consumers.



Pomeroy sits on the *Penthouse Forum* board, alongside a veritable “Who’s Who” in the human sexuality traffic.

instances beneficial. Dr. Pomeroy is on the Board of Consultants for *Penthouse Forum Variations*, a periodical which refers to incest as “Home Sex.”

Along with articles and images recommending and demonstrating bestiality, sadism, homosexuality, and bisexuality, *Penthouse Forum Variations* published Pomeroy’s article, “A New Look at Incest.”⁷⁰ It appeared alongside a letter from a supposedly happy incest daughter who wrote, “My early memories of a typical morning when I was five or six are of getting in bed with dad when my mother left for work.” The *Penthouse* editor graphically described sex with “father” as “marvelous.”⁷¹ In his book, *Boys and Sex* (1981) Pomeroy recommended sex with animals as “potentially joyous,” unless one is discovered by the inhibited and sexually repressive “Mrs. Grundys” of the world.⁷²

Also accompanying Pomeroy’s *Penthouse Forum Variations* article was a letter-to-the-editor from an anonymous woman. Entitled, “Another Look at Incest,” it graphically described a five-year-old girl, deserted by her mother, who lived sexually with her father for years. The youngster was described as healthy and loved. Indeed, the writer claimed that after dating and sleeping around with a number of boys, she planned to marry someone wonderful—like her dad.

Pomeroy “scientifically” reinforced what the reader had just learned about the benefits of incest and adult sex with children. He wrote:

When we look at a cross-section of the normal population (rather than look at a selection of those in prison for incest), we find many beautiful and mutually satisfying and healthy relationships between fathers and daughters. These may be

transient or ongoing, but they have no harmful effects.⁷³

Needless to say, Pomeroy never had a “cross-section of the normal population.” So, the Kinsey team did not provide any reliable data confirming that “we find many beautiful and mutually satisfying relationships between fathers and daughters... [that] have no harmful effects.” Writing about “positive incest” in the December 1977 issue of *Penthouse*, Philip Nobile, erstwhile *Penthouse Forum* editorial director, advocated an end to the incest taboo by calling on the expertise of then-Kinsey Institute Director Gebhard:

Actually, Kinsey was the first sex researcher to uncover evidence that violation of the [incest] taboo does not necessarily shake heaven and earth. Unpublished data taken from his original sex histories (some 18,000 in number) imply that lying with a near relative [incest] rarely ends in tragedy. “In our basic sample, that is, our random sample, only a tiny percentage of our incest cases had been reported to police or psychologists,” states Kinsey collaborator Dr. Paul Gebhard, currently director of the Institute for Sex Research in

Bloomington, Indiana. “In fact, in the ones that were not reported, I’m having a hard time recalling any traumatic effects at all. I certainly can’t recall any from among the brother-sister participants and I can’t put my finger on any among the parent-child participants.” The nation was hardly prepared for such talk in the ’50s, but Gebhard is releasing Kinsey’s startling incest material for incorporation in Warren Farrell’s work-in-progress, *The Last Taboo: The Three Faces of Incest* [Emphasis added].⁷⁴

Interestingly, that was presumably the same “incest material” that Gebhard, in his later letter to this author, claimed entailed “too few cases [so that] we omitted incest, except for one brief mention” in the *Female* volume.

WHO CONDUCTED, TIMED, AND FILMED THE EXPERIMENTS?

Kinsey’s experiments were understandably conducted in secrecy. His zoologist’s taxonomic categorization methods are evident everywhere. Many subsequent schools of “sex science” have adopted his zoological methods of collecting, organizing, and classifying. In Kinsey’s words:

The techniques of this research have been... born out of the senior author’s long-time experience with a problem in insect taxonomy. The transfer from insect to human material is not illogical, for it has been a transfer of a method that may be applied to the study of any variable populations.⁷⁵

Such human sex measurements and categorizing were virtually unknown in the 1940s. According to Kinsey,

None of the older authors, with the possible exception of Hirschfeld, attempted any systematic coverage of particular items in each history, and consequently there was nothing to be added or averaged, even for the populations with which they dealt... The present study is designed as a first step in the accumulation of a body of scientific fact that may provide the basis for sounder generalizations about the sexual behavior of certain groups and, some day, even of our American population as a whole.⁷⁶

Kinsey effected the sexual reform of “our American population as a whole” via zoological quantification, accumulating copious statistics, tables, charts, measurements and percentages. Kinsey senior researcher John Gagnon, speaking of himself and his colleagues, noted that as a teenager:

[A local homosexual] plied us with beer and evidence from the Kinsey Report showing that although homosexuality might be a crime and a sin, it was statistically common, phylogenetically normal, and might indeed be pleasurable and profitable. This was my first experience in the use of sexual science for practical goals... Kinsey wished to justify disapproved patterns of sexual conduct by an appeal to biological origins... Putting a percentage in front of the topic made it speakable.⁷⁷

If Kinsey was not responsible for any experimentation on children, as maintained by Kinsey Institute Director John Bancroft and former Director June Reinisch,⁷⁸ who was? In their attempt to minimize the public outcry over Kinsey’s



A young John Gagnon, sex researcher for the Kinsey Institute and current human sexuality science authority.

scientific solicitation and collaboration with pedophiles, Bancroft, Reinisch, the Kinsey Institute, and Indiana University pointed to a single, anonymous individual. But they never produced a name. Why?

Pomeroy first introduced the mysterious “gentleman,” or “elderly scientist,” in 1972. The man we now know, (thanks to the Yorkshire television investigative team) to be Rex King, the traveling government surveyor, is called “Mr. X.” by James H. Jones in his Kinsey biography. Pomeroy described him as a “quiet, soft-spoken, self-effacing... unobtrusive fellow... a college graduate.” In his 1972 book on Kinsey, Pomeroy firmly stated that this “unobtrusive fellow” had sex with 800 children, had been initiated into sex by his grandmother and his father, and had sex with various animals. John Bancroft called their mystery man an “elderly scientist,”⁷⁸ “educated in some technical field, perhaps holding a college degree,”⁸⁰ and most interesting, as “an omniphile, an extraordinarily active man” whose “training was in forestry.”⁸¹ Jones writes:

Kinsey began his courtship of Mr. X in the fall of 1943... [He] correctly divined that Mr. X longed for recognition and approval. From the beginning, therefore, Kinsey treated him like a colleague, a fellow seeker of truth who had compiled valuable scientific data. In a letter that combined flattery and praise, Kinsey wrote, “I congratulate you on the research spirit which has led you to collect data over these many years.”... [H]e was “very much interested in your account [of certain illegal behaviors Mr. X had practiced in hotels, such as drilling holes in walls to film people engaged in sex in adjacent rooms].... There are difficulties enough in this undertaking to make it highly desirable for all of us who are at work to keep in touch. I hope we keep in touch with you.” Much to Kinsey’s delight, the materials arrived by return mail, the first of many shipments over the next several years. “Your instant willingness to cooperate and your comprehension of the problems involved in these studies make me all the more anxious to meet you,” replied Kinsey... “Mrs. Kinsey and I should be glad to entertain you in our home.... Everything that you accumulated must find its way into scientific channels.”⁸²

Kinsey offered to cover the expense of bringing the serial child molester to his family home in Bloomington, and expressly hoped “to work out further plans for cooperating with you.” Jones continues:



Kinsey claimed that children's screams of pain, and struggles to escape from their "partners," were evidence of the children's pleasure.

Kinsey’s benign view of pedophilia does not fully explain why he was so taken with Mr. X. To fathom their relationship, one must understand that Kinsey considered Mr. X not merely a sexual phenomenon but a scientific treasure. Privately, Kinsey had long believed that human beings in a state of nature were basically pansexual. Absent social constraints, he conjectured, “natural man” would commence sexual activity early in life, enjoy intercourse with both sexes [any and all ages] eschew fidelity, indulge in a variety of behaviors, and be much more sexually active in general for life. To Kinsey, Mr. X was living proof of this theory. Describing Kinsey’s joy in discovery, Nowlis [a junior Kinsey staffer] declared, “This was like finding the gall wasp which would establish not a new species but a new genus” ...As Nowlis put it, *Kinsey looked upon Mr. X as a “hero” because “the guy had the courage and the*

ingenuity and the sexual energy and the curiosity to have this fantastic multi-year odyssey...and never get caught."⁸³ [Emphasis added.]

Jones admits that Kinsey's "hero," Rex King, copulated with "countless adults of both sexes."⁸⁴ Hence, he would be at the very least a statistical vector for sexually transmitted diseases. Jones records Pomeroy's testimony that Mr. X could "masturbate to ejaculation in ten seconds from a flaccid start... [which] our subject calmly demonstrated,"⁸⁵ meaning that he was, as we now know, still an active serial, not merely nostalgic, child molester. Jones does not, however, directly relate King's sexual feats to the abuse of even a single child. He does not tell us, for instance, the age of the youngest girl and boy molested by Kinsey's "hero," whom the Kinsey Institute considered to be an expert on the "truth" about child sexuality.

Jones writes:


Kinsey [was determined] to exhaust Mr. X's collections and personal expertise. In March, 1945, *Kinsey offered to pay Mr. X's salary if he would take a leave from government and pull together his materials...* Confessing that his own data on preadolescent orgasms were "definitely scant," Kinsey wrote to Mr. X in March, 1945, "Certainly you have very much more material than we have in our records." Specifically, Kinsey asked for information about the average age at which orgasm occurred in preadolescent boys, their capacity for multiple orgasms, and the earliest age at which orgasms have been observed in boys... it took months for him to... pull this material together. "This is one of the most valuable things we have ever gotten and I want to thank you most abundantly for the time you put into it and for your willingness to cooperate.... Anyone who is scientifically trained must comprehend how valuable the data are."⁸⁶ [Emphasis added]

That Kinsey admired this criminal serial child molester whose "courage and ingenuity" in his child sexual "odyssey" were outstanding because he was not "caught," is further documented in Kinsey's personal correspondence, where child sexual abuse is transmogrified into acts of virtual heroism. Only Vincent Nowlis, then a junior Kinsey staffer, appeared to have voiced any objection to the Kinsey team's support of Mr. X and his "research." Jones recalls,

Nowlis saw things differently. He regarded Mr. X as a monster pure and simple and thought it was wrong to use data that came from immoral research. Decades later, he recalled telling Kinsey, "Look, that material on timing infants and youngsters to orgasm—I don't think that belongs in this book." But Kinsey was adamant.... Kinsey meant to change the public's thinking on sexual matters... Kinsey was determined to provide those data.... The end justified the means.⁸⁷

Indiana University records confirm that Kinsey did not report Mr. X to authorities. Indeed, for over fifty years the entire Indiana University Kinsey Institute team collaborated in covering-up sex crimes perpetrated against children involved in its research.

During an appearance on the *Donahue* television talk show in December 1990, Kinsey colleague Clarence Tripp stated that several pedophiles gave testimony about their sex crimes to Kinsey, but they were not criminals because they had not been prosecuted or served prison time. This author asked Tripp, as we waited in the Green Room prior to our joint appearance on the program, "Are you



James H. Jones, another Rockefeller grantee, worked closely with the Kinsey Institute while writing his Kinsey biography.



Paul Gabheard, Director of the Kinsey Institute.

saying that if one kills an unarmed person, a child or two, unless one is caught, tried and convicted one is not a murderer, a criminal?” Tripp repeated the Kinsey position: that one is not an offender, not a criminal, unless one is caught and convicted. And while Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Gebhard emphatically admitted the involvement of the Kinsey team with *several* pedophiles,⁸⁸ and Gebhard affirmed that their team was “amoral” and “criminal,” and Pomeroy documented Kinsey’s own personal collection of “early adolescent...sperm,”⁸⁹ Jones neglects to report such critical information. We are told only of the dead Kinsey, while information that could trigger prosecution of the living remains in limbo.

During a 1995 Canadian television program, Kinsey Institute Director John Bancroft stated that the reason he had determined that there was “only” one man who had experimented on hundreds of children was that “some otherwise” reasonable people were asking how Kinsey could have gotten specific information about “speed” of climax, time between “climaxes,” and so on. Yet, Gebhard and Bancroft both spoke of “Mr. X” as “pedophiles” (plural). And in the *Male* Volume, Kinsey asserts that there were “nine” men involved in the laboratory experiments:

Better data on pre-adolescent climax come from the histories of adult males who have had sexual contacts with younger boys... 9 of our adult male subjects have observed such orgasm... in contacts with... adults.⁹⁰

But, we now know that it was Kinsey’s mentor and colleague Robert Dickinson who “trained” Kinsey and King in the “proper” techniques of child sexual abuse. Yorkshire Television investigators discovered that Dr. Robert Dickinson, Kinsey’s famous “mentor in sex research,” had “collaborated with the pedophile [King] for several years, and taught him how to record his child abuse in scientific detail.” Tripp reported:

Dickinson taught him [Rex King] how to measure things, and time things, and *encouraged* him to—he knew he was going to do his ordinary behavior anyway, Dickinson couldn’t have stopped him from being a pedophile—but he said, at least you ought to do something scientific about it so it won’t be just your jollies, it’ll be something worthwhile, so he gave him some training by letter and correspondence. [Emphasis added.]

Obviously, by reporting this serial child rapist to law enforcement authorities, Dickinson and Kinsey could have “stopped him from being a pedophile” who harmed children.

Dickinson confirmed in his Foreword to Ernst and Loth’s *American Sexual Behavior* (1948) that “nine” men were involved in the study:

The total of the case histories carrying rather full details of sex experience, gathered by nine different investigators during twenty-five years, [Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, Gebhard and five other men] is something like two-thirds of the present Kinsey collection of 12,000.⁹¹

We were left to wonder exactly who those “nine” men were, and why the identity of the notorious “Mr. X” was kept a secret. Thanks to the Yorkshire documentary, we now know that “Mr. X” was Rex King, and we also know the name of at least one other key Kinsey pedophile. In a classic case of truth being stranger than fiction, one of Kinsey’s child sex experimenters was a World War II Nazi

Storm Trooper. Yorkshire Television researchers uncovered his name, photograph, history, and court records. After the war, Dr. Fritz von Balluseck became a respected lawyer.

PART III: KINSEY'S NAZI PEDOPHILE

Yorkshire investigators had followed up this author's original questions regarding Kinsey's association with Nazis and the possibility that some of the abused children were obtained from WWII Germany and/or Russia. At least one of Kinsey's sex collaborators was a documented Nazi, the infamous George Sylvester Viereck, a convicted German spy who had worked among Washington D.C. power brokers. David Brinkley in his history of the period, *Washington Goes to War* (1988: 26) wrote that Viereck was "one of the...masterminds of the propaganda cabinet that Germany set up here early in the war." Yorkshire researchers flew to Berlin (as did this author), interviewing and digging through old files and press reports. There they discovered Dr. Friedrich Karl Hugo Viktor von Balluseck, who was tried in Berlin in 1957 for a child sex murder. According to Paul Gebhard who took over serving as the prestigious Director of Indiana University's Kinsey Institute, just after Kinsey's death:

[Kinsey] wrote him questions in the letter and they carried on quite a correspondence.... Police [seeking a child sex murderer] went through his possessions... found his correspondence with Kinsey.... They got Interpol.... The FBI put pressure on Kinsey to reveal the guy's sexual diary. Kinsey said, absolutely not. [T]he poor paedophile... had his reputation destroyed... finally quit corresponding with us.

Like Kinsey, fascist scientists in Germany⁹² believed that they had a right to experiment on anyone. Dr. von Balluseck⁹³ was an incest offender who raped and sodomized not only his own offspring, but Jewish, Polish, and German children as well, from roughly 1927 to 1957. The German press reported Kinsey's visit to Frankfurt during his world tour in 1956. Little else is available regarding the German stopover, or if Kinsey met with Balluseck, and there was no mention of Kinsey's visit to Frankfurt in the approved writings about Kinsey's European travels.

"THE MOST IMPORTANT PEDOPHILE IN THE CRIMINAL HISTORY OF BERLIN"

Dr. von Balluseck's trial for the murder of 10-year-old Loiselotte Has, who was "found... naked and throttled... on a piece of wasteland," was widely covered in Germany. It was "completely unprecedented in the moral history of the post war era," and von Balluseck was described as "the most important pedophile in the criminal history of Berlin." Kinsey collaborator Balluseck was tried for the abuse of 50, or "more than 100," or "several hundred" children. As noted, he had sexually violated children for "over the last three decades" (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, May 22, 1957).



Dr. Fritz von Balluseck. Outcut from Yorkshire Television's "Kinsey's Paedophiles."

News of Kinsey's role in the case was splashed across the headlines of Germany's largest newspapers. Judge Heinrich Berger "emphasized again and again the important function played by the press

in warning the public against paedophiles like Balluseck, who approach children as understanding friends and helpers in their sexual need" (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, May 22, 1957). Despite Alfred Kinsey's shocking role in the explosive case, the U.S. press was uniformly silent about it.

According to Yorkshire Television's research department, from 1942 to 1944 Dr. von Balluseck was the Department of Justice District Kreishauptmann, the commandant of the small Polish town of Jedrzejow. It was there that he targeted the children he sexually assaulted, warning them, according to German news accounts, that "It is either the gas chamber or me." *The Encyclopedia Judaica*⁹⁴ reports that all Jedrzejow Jews ended up in the gas chambers. All, including the children, were under the control of Dr. von Balluseck.

The German press described early attempts to "cover up" who Balluseck really was, including efforts to keep his photograph under wraps and the court description of the influential attorney as a "shop-worker." And commenting on the experiments recorded in volumes found in von Balluseck's desk, Judge Berger exclaimed: "This is no longer human! What was this all for? To tell Kinsey about?" (*Morgenpost*, May 16, 1957). Here are additional excerpts from German press accounts:

The Nazis knew and gave him the opportunity to practice his abnormal tendencies in occupied Poland on Polish children, who had to choose between Balluseck and the gas ovens. After the war, the children were dead, but Balluseck lived.

[*National-Zeitung*, May 15, 1957]

Balluseck's career catapulted because he was a fanatical member of the Nazi party... he was a Nazi Occupational officer in Poland and he abused 10-12 year old girls. [*Neues Deutschland*, May 17, 1957]

Balluseck... corresponded with the American Kinsey Institute for some time, and had also got books from them which dealt with child sexuality [*Tagespiegel*, October 1, 1957]

[N]ot only did he commit his crimes in Germany, but also during the war as an occupation officer, he committed numerous sexual crimes against Polish girls of between 10 & 14 years old.

[*Der Morgen*, May 15, 1957]

Dr. Balluseck... [recorded measurements] of his crimes committed against children between 9 and 14 years old... in four thick diaries... of a pseudo-scientific character... while in correspondence with the American sexual researcher Kinsey... about his research results which as he said himself, took place over three decades.

[*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, May 22, 1957]

Judge Berger: "I had the impression that you got to the children in order to impress Kinsey and to deliver him material."

Balluseck: "Kinsey himself asked me for that [asked me to do so]"

As a role model for his perverse actions Balluseck named the so-called sexual psychologist Kinsey... [*Neues Deutschland*, May, 17, 1957]

Today the court has got four diaries, and in these diaries, with cynicism and passion, he recorded his crimes against 100 children in the smallest detail. He sent the detail of his

experiences regularly to the US sex researcher, Kinsey. The latter was very interested and kept up a regular and lively correspondence with Balluseck
[*National-Zeitung*, May 15, 1957]

Sharp criticism of American sex researcher by presiding Judge... Heinrich Berger... because of the correspondence between Regierungsrat Dr. Fritz von Balluseck, accused of many counts of sexual crimes, and Kinsey. The presiding judge exclaimed, "*Instead of answering his sordid letters, the strange American scholar should rather have made sure that Mister von Balluseck was put behind bars.*" [*Morgenpost*, May 16, 1957]

"KINSEY...ASKED THE PAEDOPHILE SPECIFICALLY FOR MATERIAL OF HIS PERVERSE ACTIONS"

The connection with Kinsey, towards whom he'd showed off his crimes, had a disastrous effect on [von Balluseck]... [I]n his diaries he'd stuck in the letters from the sex researcher, Kinsey in which he'd been *encouraged to continue* his research.... He had also started relationships... *to expand his researches*. One shivers to think of the lengths he went to.
[*TSP*, May 17, 1957, **emphasis added**]

Indeed, the German press reported that Post WW II von Balluseck sexually assaulted his own daughter, and the 11-year-old son of a vicar, and forced the boy to write down the acts for Kinsey.

Kinsey had asked the paedophile specifically for material of his perverse actions. The presiding judge, Dr. Berger noted that it was Kinsey's duty to get Balluseck locked up, instead of corresponding with him. [*Berliner Zeitung*, May 16, 1957]

He made statistics of all these experiences and he sent them with comprehensive reports to the American sex researcher, Kinsey. In one reply, which apart from a "thank you," contained the warning "be careful" (or "watch out") Balluseck cut out the signature from this letter, and stuck it in his diary. [*TGSP*, May 16, 19957]

In the diaries, described as volume 1 & 4, he described with pedantic exactness, how he committed his crimes....Balluseck had close contact with the so called American sex researcher, Kinsey, to whom he'd repeatedly and explicitly reported his perverse crimes. Balluseck had also described those in pedantic detail in his diaries. [*National-Zeitung*, May 15, 1957]

So Balluseck was not only sending Kinsey his old child abuse data, recorded during his days as a Commandant in Jedrzejew; he was also seeking to "continue" and "expand" his sexual seduction of children for Kinsey's use.

The University of Indiana press office regularly forwards international articles about the school (especially those containing damaging information) to the administration. According to Paul Gebhard, the University and its president, Herman Wells, were aware of Kinsey's collaboration with Balluseck. Kinsey refused to provide evidence that the FBI knew he had regarding Balluseck's crimes.

After serving his sentence for child sex abuse (he was not convicted on the murder charge), Balluseck continued his correspondence with Gebhard, while the latter indignantly protested that

this “poor pedophile” had trouble obtaining a job after his release from prison.

During a seminar on *The Ethics of Sex Research* (Masters, Johnson & Kolodny, 1972), Gebhard told the assembled sexology “experts” that it was ethical to use Balluseck’s child data. None registered disagreement, nor did any protest when Gebhard revealed how the Kinsey team had covered up for the erstwhile Nazi.



Dr. John Bancroft. Outcut from interview in “Kinsey’s Paedophiles.”

We [were] amoral at best and criminal at worst.... An example of our criminality is our refusal to cooperate with authorities in apprehending a pedophile we had interviewed who was being sought for a [child] sex murder.⁹⁵

The sort of conjecture that enabled the Yorkshire researchers to uncover Balluseck’s connection to Kinsey seems once again in order. Were some of Kinsey’s 317 to 2,035 boys and girls mentioned in the *Male* and *Female* volumes exterminated in Treblinka? Were sexually abused and murdered children included in the records that Balluseck “repeatedly and explicitly” mailed to Kinsey? If so, these war-crime “data” have been used by psychopathic sexual revolutionaries to uproot American laws and culture.

Current Kinsey Institute Director Bancroft, a medical doctor with a behavioral modification background, has described Alfred Kinsey as his own youthful “model.” At first, he refused to be interviewed by Yorkshire Television, but subsequently agreed, provided that all questions were submitted for his advance approval. His carefully crafted answers to the 14 questions were still revealing.

Yorkshire producer Tim Tate, a long-time Socialist, asked Bancroft: “If its scientific value is uncertain, why have you republished [Kinsey’s] material?” Bancroft replied, “We haven’t republished, we have reprinted” Kinsey’s books. Yet in the next figurative breath he stated that he was “very keen that these books are being republished,” since he wanted critics to read “what Kinsey actually says.” He then defended adult sex abuse of children as a method of avoiding “ignorance”:

[I]f you want to remain in ignorance then so be it... But for many of us, there is the belief that there is a need for better knowledge and... you can’t do that if you then turn round and report [child molesters] to the police.⁹⁶

Tate then asked: “But what has the material in Table 31 to Table 34 actually contributed to science’s understanding of sexuality in children?” Bancroft replied that it showed that boys “before puberty were capable of experiencing more than one orgasm, whereas, after puberty that is not the case.” Otherwise, he said, Kinsey’s child sex data have been scientifically “irrelevant.”⁹⁷

Bancroft’s justification for immoral and unethical conduct is that facts are needed to dispel “ignorance,” yet he falsely claims that Kinsey made no “moral judgments”; that Rex King died before Kinsey’s books were completed; that the 40-year-old King was an adult molester “for about 30 years before Kinsey met him,”⁹⁸ and so on. Bancroft became increasingly hostile, finally blurting:

All this crap about Table 31 and 34!.... [Kinsey] opened up the subject... made it possible to talk about in a sensible way... He has de-mystified the subject of sexuality... He stands... above the rest of researchers in the field.... He is a superb scholar... a fine mind... a pioneer. I have great respect for the man and for his integrity.⁹⁹

In fact, however, Kinsey's devious and deviant data has "opened up" children to precocious early sex activity (encouraged by pornography in our homes, schools and libraries), based on Kinsey's widely repeated and wholly unproven mantra that children are sexual from birth. These data from child rapists now influence our courts, education, medicine, theology, and politics, generating laws which violate parental rights to protect their children while undermining our culture in ways too numerous to count.

PART IV: THE "NEW BIOLOGY" AND "THE KINSEY'S MODEL"

The Kinsey team contended that if Americans would follow their analysis of human sexual conduct, they would eventually arrive at a socio-sexual paradise. Here is a summary, prepared by this author, of the key findings that were to pave the way to Kinsey's nirvana:

- All orgasms are "outlets" and equal— whether between husband and wife; boy and dog; man and boy, girl, or baby—since there is no such thing as abnormality or normality.
- As the aim of coitus is orgasm, the more orgasms from any "outlet," at the earliest age, the healthier the person.
- Early masturbation is critical for sexual, physical, and emotional health. It can never be excessive or pathological.
- Sexual taboos and sex statutes are routinely broken, so they should be eliminated. That includes laws against rape and child rape, unless serious "force" is used and serious harm is proven.
- Since sex is, can be, and should be commonly shared with anyone and anything, jealousy is passé.
- All sexual experimentation before marriage will increase the likelihood of successful long-term marriage, while venereal diseases and other socio-sexual maladies will be reduced dramatically.
- Human beings are naturally bisexual. Religious bigotry and prejudice force people into chastity, heterosexuality, and monogamy.
- Children are sexual and potentially orgasmic from birth and are not harmed by "consensual" incest or sex with adults. Indeed, they often benefit from such practices.
- There is no medical or other reason for adult-child sex or incest to be forbidden.
- All forms of sodomy are natural and healthy.
- Homosexuals represent ten to thirty-seven percent of the population or more. (Kinsey's findings were fluid on this point.) Some educators have interpreted his findings to mean that only four to six percent of the population is exclusively *heterosexual*, so it is "heterosexual" bias that should be eliminated.

Each of these "findings," gleaned from Kinsey's reports, has been disproven by credible research and actual human experience over the past fifty years. Yet "accredited" AIDS and sex education in elementary, secondary, college, graduate, and post-graduate schools is almost entirely predicated on the Kinseyan "variant" sex model.

In 1948, the Kinsey model began to permeate the educational establishment. It would indoctrinate doctors, teachers, ministers, social workers, attorneys, the military, and United States Supreme

Court Justices. The accompanying chart tracks the development of America's sex establishment, beginning with the research base, the funders, and Indiana University. Notice how often the same names show up on the boards of societies and accrediting agencies.



"[Alan] Bell [on floor] meeting with group facilitators before the [sexual] attitude reassessment workshop. *Dallenback.*" These are the "laid back" teachers who teach our teachers who teach our children about sex. Photographs of "nude body workshops" in which "reassessment" learners commonly participate were not published in this book. (Martin Weinberg, Ed, *Sex Research Studies* from the Kinsey Institute, Oxford University Press, New York, 1976, p. 245.)

THE RESEARCHERS

It began at Indiana University and included the men who formed the official Kinsey Institute research base: Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, Gebhard, and later Gagnon, Simon, Weinberg, Bell, and Money, among others. All were Ph.D.s and sexual pedagogical (teaching) authorities. They stood, and stand, four-square on the false data base compiled by Kinsey.

THE FUNDERS

The original patron of the Kinsey research in 1938 was publicly-funded Indiana University. Thereafter, the tax-exempt Rockefeller Foundation backed Kinsey's work through the National Research Council. By the 1960s, the pornography industry, primarily *Playboy*, supported the Kinsey team's "New Biology."

THREE PIONEERING CENTERS

Of the three pioneering sex-study centers,¹⁰⁰ the National Sex & Drug Forum in San Francisco, established in 1968 and later renamed The Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality (hereafter Sex Institute), offers the most extensive training and advanced degrees. It was directed by Kinsey co-author and *Penthouse Forum* board member Wardell Pomeroy (now retired) and *Hustler* magazine contributors Ted McIlvenna and Erwin Haerberle.

In 1964, an accredited sexology degree became available from the New York University Health Department's School of Education, under youthful homosexual activist Deryck Calderwood, who died of AIDS. In 1978, the University of Pennsylvania Department of Health's School of Education began offering similar Kinseyan New Biology training and degrees, directed by homosexual advocate Kenneth George.



Martin Weinberg trains attendees. *Ibid.*




Colin Williams lectures on nudism. *Ibid.*

As of this writing, the Sex Institute offers a doctorate of education, four graduate programs, and seven basic credentials (including a “Safe Sex Certificate”) which can be obtained swiftly with little or no prior training. Pomeroy, the Institute’s then-academic dean, acknowledged that advanced sex degree applicants are accepted “off the street,” provided that they do not have traditional pre-conceptions about sexual mores. The demand for Kinseyan-only standards is evident in the Institute’s codified “Basic Sexual Rights” ethical oath, which legitimizes the Kinsey New Biology model of “consensual” adult-child sex, incest, child prostitution, and child pornography.


The Sex Institute’s degree program includes “advanced graduate” studies such “erotic sensate and massage therapy,” and focuses most of its scholarly training on student viewing (and making) of “erotic” films. Other key credit courses include how to use sex surrogates (prostitutes) in sex therapy and an analysis of the Kinsey reports including Chapter 5 on the children. The Institute provides training in the design and implementation of “sex education curricula” for all ages largely directing America’s classroom sex education. Dr. Pomeroy, an original SIECUS official, teaches child sexuality. “Forensic sexology” is a popular course. And “accredited” Sex Institute “experts” are trained to testify on behalf of sex offenders and businesses which specialize in the production of obscenity and pornography.¹⁰¹

In 1980, Pomeroy himself testified on behalf of a pornographer in

Scientific Authority for Human Sexuality Education in the Second Half of the 20th Century



Kinsey Institute & The Human Sexuality Researchers




Happy Day v. Kentucky, a court case in which Pomeroy admitted under oath that he had sought funds from the sex industry to produce his own child pornography.¹⁰²

The March 1991 “Department of Defense Report on Homosexuality and Personnel Security” cited Kinsey, Pomeroy, Gebhard, Martin, Gagnon, Ford, Beach, and Bell as DoD consultants, along with *Journal of Pedophilia* editor Vern Bullough and pedophile advocate John Money.¹⁰³ Such men helped give a cover of “science” to

the subsequent DoD decision to recommend the acceptance of homosexuals in the military. A 1993 Rand study of homosexuality in the armed forces was similarly based in large part on Kinsey’s data and conclusions.

Many of the Sex Institute’s sex films and videos have been distributed by Focus International (FI) to universities and colleges nationwide. Among its other “erotic” media, FI offers “The Kinsey Three (Hetero, Homo & Bisexuality)” and “About Your Sexuality” (for junior high children). The latter features scenes of condomless heterosexual and homosexual oral and anal sodomy. All three centers (Sex Institute, NYU, and the University of Pennsylvania) have long taught sex using the Sexual Attitude Restructuring (SAR) technique. Dr. Pomeroy has noted, “The SAR is designed to desensitize,” that is to disinhibit, all viewers.



The editorial board of *PAIDIKA: The Journal of Paedophilia* boasts major leaders in American sexology. All of its editors are self-admitted pedophiles. The magazine is published in Amsterdam.

SEXUAL ATTITUDE RESTRUCTURING (SAR)

In December 1982, George Leonard reported his Sexual Attitude Restructuring (SAR) experience at The Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality (IASHS) in *Esquire* magazine. Noting that at least 60,000 people had been trained in colleges and universities by the SAR since the early 1980s, Leonard viewed his experience as typical:

The sensory overload culminated on Saturday night in a multi-media event called the F—korama... in the darkness... images of human beings—and sometimes even animals—engaging in every conceivable sexual act, accompanied by wails, squeals, moans, shouts, and the first movement of the Tchaikovsky Violin Concerto. Some seventeen simultaneous moving pictures.... Over a period of several hours, there came a moment when the four images on the wall were of a gay male couple, a straight couple, a lesbian couple, and a bestial group. The subjects were nude.... I felt myself becoming disoriented... was she kissing a man or a woman? I struggled to force the acts I was watching into their proper boxes... and now I couldn't remember which was which. Wasn't I supposed to make these discriminations? I searched for clues. There were none. I began to feel uncomfortable. Soon I realized that to avoid vertigo and nausea I would have to give up the attempt to discriminate and simply surrender to the experience.... The differences for which lives have been ruined, were not only trivial, but invisible. By the end... [n]othing was shocking... [b]ut nothing was sacred either. But as I drove home, I began to get a slightly uneasy feeling. It was almost as if I had been conned... by my own conditioned response of taking the most liberated position... whatever my deeper feelings... love had not been mentioned a single time during the entire weekend.




The SAR has served as a critical tool to reshape views of human sexuality. The New Biology media, an orgy of pornographic couplings on film and video, is regularly utilized in academia to restructure students' modest sexual attitudes into the bizarre Kinseyan alternative. To understand how this works, it is useful to study the mechanics of the SAR in desensitizing and disinhibiting the human brain to allow a shift in pedagogical attitude and performance. The SAR literally scars the viewer's brain as it circumvents, short-circuits, his or her cognition and conscience. Neuroscientist Dr. Gary Lynch says of all high resonance stimuli: "What we're saying here is that an event which lasts half a second, within five or ten minutes has produced a structural change that is in some ways as profound as the structural changes one sees in (brain) damage."¹⁰⁴

**SAR AS SEX EDUCATION IN
"THE DECADE OF THE BRAIN"**

The 1990s were declared "The Decade of the Brain" by the U.S. Congress. More has been learned about this vital organ during the last three decades than in all prior history. Of special import to the discussion of classroom sexuality curricula is that the brain knows no present. Relevant experience "conjures up images of scenes witnessed...in the past." What does it mean for sex education courses, then, if "*inhibition*" rather than "*excitation*" is the hallmark of the healthy brain.¹⁰⁵

Functionally speaking, the SAR, (and to a lesser degree, yet with more consistency, today's mass media) breaks down the "inhibitions"



of “the healthy brain.” The SAR is effective because all human brains obey what neurologists call “a law of strength.” Simply put, this means that novel, scary, exciting stimuli from the outside world are processed faster and with more force than non-threatening, pleasant stimuli. Neurochemical pathways in the brain are chemically imprinted by hetero-and homo-erotic media stimuli; hence, they fuse sex, violence, fear, and anxiety into one felt emotion. The SAR reprograms students in education, medicine, psychology, criminals sexology and so on, by reconfiguring their neurochemistry—their human “nature”—producing a cadre of educated leaders who are part of Kinseyan deviance.

The effect of television experiences, and other modern media stimuli on the developing brains of children, is addressed convincingly by educational psychologist Dr. Jane Healy in her book, *Endangered Minds* (1984).¹⁰⁶ The neurochemical impact of sexualized media, whether commercial or educative, upon children’s nascent brains, minds, and memories, is producing a new breed of children, hence a new breed of adults and a new type of society.

In *The Brain* (1984),¹⁰⁷ Richard Restak reported that a visual image passes from the eye through the brain in three-tenths of a second. The brain is structurally changed and memories are created. We literally “grow new brain”¹⁰⁸ with each experience, and we have no choice in the matter; we are designed to believe what we see. What sexologists and pornographers call sexual “fantasy” is sexual reality to the human brain. Visual data are processed as memories and emotions, and as such they are *really* neurochemically etched into the pathways of the brain as real.

Our brain controls our body, as well as our emotional and physical health, so “false” visual stimuli recorded as “real” can change our vital signs (heart rate, perspiration, intensified breathing, etc.) the same as “real” images. Neuropsychologist Margaret Kemeny states:

[A]nytime we feel anything...think anything...imagine anything, there is activity in the brain that is taking place...that can then lead to a cascade of changes that have an impact on health.¹⁰⁹

One wonders how have days and nights of SAR films portraying anal and oral sodomy, bestiality, and sadistic sex (as well as homosexual, heterosexual, group, child, and child-adult coitus) affected and changed the brains of the medical professionals, psychologists, criminologists, educators, sociologists, ministers, and sex “experts” exposed?

THE PROFESSIONAL SEX FIELD ACCREDITING AGENCIES AND SOCIETIES

Human Sexuality Programs at the three major academic centers mentioned above are designed to produce SAR-conditioned sexperts and sexologists from all pertinent disciplines. Sexuality “experts” have generated dozens, then hundreds, then thousands of three-unit AIDS prevention and other sex accreditation seminars, schools, and conferences. The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex (SSSS) established a Commission of Accreditation for the field, originally controlled by key Kinseyans Pomeroy, Gebhard, George, Calderwood, and Bullough.

Founded in 1957, the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex (SSSS) is an international organization of professionals dedicated to the advancement of sexual knowledge...it publishes the *Journal of Sex Research*, sponsors programs to award research excellence, holds annual and regional conferences to promote interdisciplinary cooperation among researchers, educators and clinicians.¹¹⁰


Growing out of the Kinsey model, this sexology monopoly set standards in the field of sexology. It annually grants the Alfred C. Kinsey Award for Excellence in Scientific Study. Operationally, the SSSS largely directs and controls who is, or is not, recognized as a sexology professional. It influences who is hired, fired, or promoted within academia. In 1989, homosexual advocate Kenneth George headed both the SSSS board of directors and the University of Pennsylvania's Human Sexuality Program.

Today, students hoping to advance in fields dealing with issues related to human sexuality are expected to acknowledge agreement with Kinsey's scientific-variant view of sexuality, as taught in their schools. This, for all practical purposes, has long eliminated from the sexuality field those who might insist on maintaining a virtuous, moral standard of sexuality.

Let us close our brief look at the SSSS by noting that during its 1987 AIDS conference in Atlanta, Georgia, it successfully jumped onto the AIDS gravy train, giving SSSS access to copious AIDS prevention research funds. Sexology fundamentally promotes all of the sexual activity said to result in AIDS, including anal sodomy. For years their sexology films produced at San Francisco's Sex Institute modeled and promoted unprotected multiple heterosexual and homosexual sex acts, inclusive of both sodomies. Under the guise of AIDS education, this profession has become even more aggressive in modeling its variant-sexuality standard for our nation's schoolchildren. For example, the late Deryck Calderwood, a onetime SSSS president who headed New York University's School of Education Sexuality Department, created a curriculum for middle-school children (subsequently a film-strip and video) entitled, *About Your Sexuality*, which graphically glamorized unprotected homosexual and heterosexual anal sodomy. As noted in the *New York Tribune*, Calderwood, who died young of AIDS, was "a disciple of sex pioneer Alfred Kinsey (who) believed, with Kinsey, no type of sexual behavior is abnormal or pathological."

Another accrediting organization, the American Society of Sex Educators, Counselors and Therapists (ASSECT), was formed in 1967 by Drs. Phyllis Schiller and Albert Ellis. ASSECT has also long utilized the SAR technique as a desensitizing educational tool. Dr. Ellis served on the board of *Penthouse Forum*. Both the SSSS and ASSECT joined together to sponsor the 1998 "World Pornography Conference" held at California State University


Kinseyan Professional Sexological Societies & Accrediting Agents



at Northridge, which was branded, by the Democrat-controlled California legislative committee that investigated its origins, a “pornography trade show.” Hardly surprising, the CSUN’s “Center for Sex Research” had been dubbed “The Kinsey Institute of the West.” Its director, James Elias, is a Kinsey Institute and Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality alumnus. Its founder, Vern Bullough sent threatening letters to this author for identifying him as a pedophile editor of *Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia*.

Kinsey’s data laid the groundwork for the academic pornography produced by gynecologist William Masters who left his wife to marry Virginia Johnson. By 1957, utilitarian research on orgasms was being publicly advocated by the Kinseyite first couple of sex therapy (now divorced) at Washington University’s Medical School. The Masters & Johnson studies fell into disfavor following a spousal lawsuit which publicly exposed their use of therapeutic prostitutes (called “sex surrogates” by sexologists).

In the 1980s, the Masters and Johnson, *Playboy* Foundation grant recipients, appeared in *Playboy* to reveal their finding that “some” women (seven anonymous female subjects identified elsewhere as probably prostitutes) enjoy anal sodomy (the key known source for AIDS). Many *Playboy* consumers who undoubtedly read this as an oral and anal sodomy endorsement, would have been angry and resentful at wives or girlfriends who did not respond “properly” to the dangerous, painful and historically unnatural act as “love.”



SIECUS

In 1964, the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) was launched at the Kinsey Institute. Its objective was to teach Kinseyan ideology as sex education in our schools. SIECUS (which now calls itself the *Sexuality* Information and Education Council of the United States) imprinted the new Kinsey variant standard on almost all sex education curricula. Its early leader, Dr. Mary Calderone (past medical director of Planned Parenthood) was the direct link between Kinsey’s university-based research, Planned Parenthood’s grassroots outreach, and SIECUS. SIECUS was a “Resource Center [operating] Specialized Programs to Distribute Information about Human sexuality [through] learned journals, research studies, training materials for health professionals and sample classroom curricula.”¹¹¹

IS THE SIECUS/PLAYBOY PARTNERSHIP A RICO CASE IN THE MAKING?

As SIECUS is regularly funded by the State, questions need to be asked about the January 1979 *Annual Playboy* which announced that “*Playboy* Foundation provide[d] the first of several major

grants to The Sex Information and Education Council of the United States to support its nationwide educational programs.”

As Christie Hefner added, *Playboy* also provided the original seed money for SIECUS:

Through the *Playboy* Foundation, Hefner put his money where his mouth was. It made the initial grant to establish an Office of Research Services of the Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS) in the late 60s.



Christy Hefner of *Playboy Magazine*, and SIECUS patron.

So, has such funding been a covert form of taxpayer-subsidy for the pornography industry (remember, *Playboy* was the corporate spokesperson for the “Media Coalition,” with its seedier pornography members). Did Mr. Hefner give SIECUS its “initial grant to establish an Office of Research Services” knowing that SIECUS would serve his corporate product interests in the schoolrooms of America? Did Mr. Hefner know the “nationwide educational programs” of SIECUS “education” would push “sexually explicit materials” to school children? For, under SIECUS’s sex education brainchild “Comprehensive Health Education,” Planned Parenthood and colleagues have delivered “sexually explicit materials” to Tom Sawyer and Becky Thatcher for decades. Remember, SIECUS sex information is directed at elementary and secondary school children, not college youths. Listen to the SIECUS February/March 1996 “Position Statement” on “Sexually Explicit Materials”:

When sensitively used in a manner appropriate to the viewer’s age and developmental level, sexually explicit visual, printed, or on-line materials can be valuable educational or personal aids helping to reduce ignorance and confusion and contributing to a wholesome concept of sexuality [p. 21].

It is still illegal to sell “sexually explicit materials” (pornography) to children under the age of 18 years. Posturing as an independent scholastic group training school teachers, has SIECUS been covertly desensitizing and recruiting millions of vulnerable, child consumers for the pornography trade? Is this pornography insider-trading with stock options, funded with taxpayer dollars? In an undated 1980s SIECUS press release, SIECUS claimed it sought donations to *combat* children’s exposure to sexually explicit materials:

The overwhelming majority of parents had never discussed sexual issues with their children at all.... That’s why SIECUS exists.... [I]t must not be left to X-rated movies, TV ads, and sleazy magazines, as the Moral Majority would have us do.

SIECUS director Mary Calderone and other SIECUS associates have been advantaged by the pornography commerce—appearing as interviewees in *Playboy* and other sex trade materials,



This Planned Parenthood booklet, “You’ve Changed the Combination,” typifies the organization’s use of the Kinsey Model in sex education circa 1974 (The author has blacked-out some explicit imagery.)

and receiving other promotional benefits from their alliance. Rather like the current government investigation of the unfair marketing of beer, cigarettes and “R-rated” movies to children, marketing “sexually explicit material” to schoolchildren subverts parent approval and is very possibly criminal. For example:

- Does SIECUS use the Kinsey Model, providing inaccurate, false advertising and fraudulent information about sex to teachers and children, facilitating confusion and trauma?
- Does SIECUS use the Kinsey Model to "contribute to the delinquency of minors" by exposing children to material illegal for them to purchase until age 18?
- Has SIECUS disclosed its corporate pornography connections in its grant applications?
- Would SIECUS and *Playboy* share corporate responsibility for sex crimes committed by schoolchildren whose sexual inhibitions and “confusion” were compromised after exposure to the Kinsey Model via SIECUS' “sexually explicit materials?”



One of several illustrations in *Playboy* magazine indicating distress regarding the discrediting and debunking of Alfred Kinsey (circa 1998).

As noted, in the early 1980's *Time* dared twice to expose SIECUS matriarch Mary Calderone and other key sex educators who claimed “anything goes,” for and with children. The April 14, 1980 issue of *Time* cited the SIECUS paper on incest, “Attacking The Last Taboo,” which claimed, “We are roughly in the same position today regarding incest as we were a hundred years ago with respect to our fears of masturbation.” Concluded *Time*, SIECUS was part of an academic “pro-incest lobby... conducting a campaign to undermine” the “taboo against incest” and all other sexual inhibitions--the Kinsey Model.

In 1991, SIECUS launched its series of “Guidelines for Comprehensive Sexuality Education.” The guidelines were aimed at institutionalizing Kinseyan sexuality nationwide and influencing legislation dealing with sexuality issues. SIECUS claimed they would “provide accurate information about human sexuality.” Building on a virtual sex education monopoly, only Kinseyan-trained teachers would be permitted in American schoolrooms (K-12) to develop “sexuality literacy:”

Sexuality education should only be taught by specially trained teachers. Professionals responsible for sexuality education must receive specialized training in human sexuality, including the philosophy and methodology of sexuality education. Ideally, teachers should graduate from academic courses or programs in schools of higher education that provide the professional with the most time-intensive and rich training. At a minimum, teachers should participate in extensive in-service courses, continuing education classes, or intensive seminars.¹¹²

What “human sexuality information” has SIECUS provided to children, parents, school boards, teachers, doctors, nurses, clergy, psychologists, social workers and the general culture?¹¹³ In full agreement with the Kinsey Model, the organization suggested,

A partial list of safe sex practices for teens could include... massaging caressing, undress-

ing each other, masturbation alone, masturbation in front of a partner, mutual masturbation.... By helping teens explore the full range of safe sexual behaviors, we may help to raise a generation of adults that do not equate sex with intercourse, or intercourse with vaginal orgasm, as the goal of sex.¹¹⁴

Like Kinsey, nowhere in this “expert advice” does SIECUS mention marriage, or indicate that it should play a part—much less a central part—in the sexual scheme of things. Nowhere does it caution that the suggested activities might undermine love and trust, not to mention mental and physical health. Like Kinsey, SIECUS discourages “intercourse as the goal of sex,” instead offering youngsters masturbatory activity with erotic entertainment (endorsed in their 1991 Guidelines as “erotic literature” and art”). In 1992, SIECUS produced a pamphlet, “Talk about Sex,” which urged children not to reject the sexually exploitive media that surrounds them, but to “use” it as a sexual aid:

When talking to a friend or a possible sex partner, speak clearly... Movies, music and TV... often have a message about sexuality and can help possible sexual partners express their affection and sexual interest.... Use entertainment to help talk about sexuality, TV, music videos... magazines are a good way to begin to talk about sexuality....¹¹⁵

Like Kinsey, the *SIECUS Report* (1996) urged the use of “sexually explicit visual, printed or on-line materials” for schoolchildren in order to “reduce ignorance and confusion” and to help the children develop “a wholesome concept of sexuality.” The official SIECUS position equates sodomy with marital sex as “any type of unprotected sexual intercourse (oral, anal or vaginal).”

Few people realize that the great library collection of... the Kinsey Institute... was formed very specifically with one major field omitted: sex education. This was because it seemed appropriate, not only to the Institute but to its major funding source, the National Institute of Mental Health, to leave this area for SIECUS to fill. Thus we applied and were approved for a highly important grant from the National Institute for Mental Health that was designed to implement a planned role for SIECUS to become the primary data base for the area of education [indoctrination] for sexuality.”¹¹⁶

The SIECUS Sex Education Curriculum Board was also led by Pomeroy, Bell, Calderwood, Calderone, and McIlvenna—all Kinseyans and all committed to Kinsey’s research findings, deviant standards and pedophile promotions. What has been the damage of the ideas unleashed by the documented SIECUS/*Playboy* partnership? Has SIECUS violated the 1992 *Federal False Claims Act*, which provides damages and civil penalties for individuals or persons who knowingly submit a false or fraudulent claim to the United States government for payment or approval?

Beyond fraud and child endangerment, do such violations rise to the standard of a criminal conspiracy, as in the *Racketeer Influence Corrupt Organizations* (RICO) statute? Or, at minimum does the evidence unite the recently estimated \$11.5 billion sex syndicate with SIECUS? That *Playboy* and other “sexually explicit materials” do encourage illegal juvenile sexual activity and copy-cat crimes, including incest and child sex abuse, is documented in my peer-approved US Department of Juvenile Justice report, obtainable via the US Department of Justice website.

Did Playboy partner with SIECUS in its “initial grant to establish an Office of Research Services” so that SIECUS would be a stealth invader, serving the sex trade at the expense of America’s children? The question deserves to be on the Congressional floor.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD, BRIEFLY

Planned Parenthood (PP) has a history as fraught with special interests as has SIECUS and scores of books have been written about its movement into the schools, carrying the SIECUS banner of pseudo-science. PP was given a boost by Kinsey's claims that children are sexual and that "normal" women commonly have sex prior to marriage. Kinsey also urged that abortion be legalized, based on his wholly spurious data on the commonality of abortion in the USA, and in April 1955 he delivered a preliminary report on his abortion data at a PP abortion conference at Columbia University's Arden House which became a foundation for the pro-abortion movement.¹¹⁷

A Planned Parenthood booklet given by teachers to secondary level schoolchildren, entitled "You've Changed the Combination!!!" was decorated with illustrations of nude, *Playboy*-like, large-bosomed women towering over small, wimpy nude males. It recommended that children have sex—but only with their "friends." It also equated virginity with prostitution since some girls remained virgins until they married:

Do you want a warm body? Buy one. That's right. There are women who have freely chosen that business, buy one.... Do you want a virgin to marry? Buy one. There are girls in that business too. Marriage is the price you'll pay, and you'll get the virgin. Very temporarily.¹¹⁸

One of several other "special interest" associations whose economic and social base now includes "sexuality instruction" is the American Association of Marriage and Family Counselors. The current decisions by the American Psychiatric Association (1994) in its *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV* to remove pedophilia, masochism and sadism as mental or psychological disorders and a 1999 article in the *American Psychological Association Bulletin* which would normalize adult sex with "willing" children, means these two powerful mental health agencies have joined forces with Kinsey's other pedophile advocates.¹¹⁹

Virtually without exception, the basis of professional training is Kinsey's duplicitous data, and that of his disciples who have built upon the false foundation he established.

From the "informal" sex education reaching nearly all children via pornography, to the "formal" sex education from doctorate to kindergarten, the Kinsey Model is the monopoly. The foundation of the modern sex industry then, from sex commerce to the sex "expert" who serve as expert witnesses for pornographers, all stand on the legitimacy of wholly illegitimate pseudoscience. Next we will examine how this "education" process has been used to reshape our laws on sex offenses, to fit the Kinsey Model, impacting the lives of every American.

CHAPTER 7 NOTES

1. Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, W.B. Saunders, Philadelphia, 1948, is *Male* volume in each chapter citation section; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*, W.B. Saunders, Philadelphia, 1948, is *Female* volume in each citation section.
2. The handwritten notations by the Kinsey Institute representative were made on a copy of a proposed book chapter, from the paper given by Reisman (Bat-Ada) at the 5th World Congress of Sexology in Jerusalem, 1981. There were several titles, but the one at issue was "The Empirical Study and Statistical Procedures on 'Child Sexuality' Undertaken by the Institute for Sex Research and Dr. Alfred Kinsey: A Critical Analysis of Child Sexual Experimentation." The document was obtained during a deposition of Kinsey Institute Director June Reinisch on December 7, 1993.
3. SIECUS, *Sexuality in Man*, Scribners, New York, 1970, pp. 6-7.
4. *Male*, p. 157.

5. Mary Shivanandan, "Childhood and Educational Development" in *Foundations for Family-Life Education*, Educational Guidance Institute, Inc. Arlington, VA., 1991.
6. Masters, Johnson, Kolodny, and Weems, *Ethical Issues in Sex Therapy*, Volume II, Little Brown and Company, Boston, 1980, p. 71. Albert Jonsen is Professor of Ethics in Medicine, School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco. Jay Mann is Associate Clinical Professor of Medical Psychology, School of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco and Stanford University.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
8. *Male*, p. 177.
9. *Male*, p. 175.
10. *Male*, p. 175.
11. Wardell Pomeroy, Carol Flax, and Connie Wheeler, *Taking a Sex History*, The Free Press, New York, 1982, p. 5.
12. *Male*, p. 175.
13. *Male*, p. 178.
14. *Male*, p. 178.
15. John Bancroft, M.D., *Human Sexuality and its Problems*, Churchill Livingstone, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1989.
16. *Male*, p. 176.
17. *The Washington Post*, December 8, 1995, p. F1-4.
18. *Male*, p. 177.
19. *Male*, p. 178.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Masters, et al, p. 256.
22. *Male*, p. 176.
23. *Male*, p. 11. Note that the author has removed the word "other" and inserted ellipsis to aid the reader in avoiding the language maze constructed by Kinsey in his two reports. Kinsey told readers that he verified *all* of his data, not just "some" or "other" parts it.
24. *Male*, p.179.
25. *Male*, p. 179.
26. *Male*, p. 180.
27. *Male*, p. 180.
28. *Male*, p. 177.
29. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1992.
30. Charles Darwin, *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, John Murray, London, 1904, pp. 65-67.
31. *Male*, p. 160. Orgasm in the normal male is specifically defined as including ejaculation. "The highest point of sexual excitement, characterized by strong feelings of pleasure and marked normally by ejaculation of semen by the Male and by vaginal contractions in the Female. Also called climax." This is not possible for boys prior to physical/sexual maturity. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 1992.
32. *Male*, pp. 160-161. [Emphasis added.]
33. *Male*, p. 185.
34. *Male*, p. 158.
35. Wardell Pomeroy, *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research*, Harper & Row, New York, p. 315.
36. Letter to Dr. Judith Reisman from pediatrician Lester Caplan, M.D., November 29, 1983.
37. R. Crooks and K. Baur, *Our Sexuality, 2nd Ed*, Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co, Menlo Park, 1983, p. 410.
38. *Obstretical Gynecological News*, December 1, 1980, p. 10.
39. [SIECUS Report, May-July 1983, p. 9. [Emphasis added.]
40. (Lenore Buth, *How to Talk Confidently with Your Child about Sex*, Concordia, 1998, page 23. [Emphasis added.]
41. *Female*, p. 570.
42. *Female*, p. 570.
43. Albert Jonsen and Jay Mann, "Ethics of Sex Research Involving Children and the Mentally Retarded," in Masters, Johnson, Kolodny, and Weems, *Ethical Issues in Sex Therapy*, Little Brown & Co., Boston, Massachusetts, 1980, p. 71.
44. *Female*, p. 105.
45. The Case of "Esther," Esther White: The Kinsey team had the name of at least one of their victims. According to an affidavit by Esther White, they were in regular contact with her abusers and even arranged to meet with them on one occasion. Mrs. White is a lovely, quiet lady with a tragic past who prefers to avoid publicity. She has kindly agreed to the inclusion of her story here. It details incestuous violations by her father and grandfather, whom she believes were two of Kinsey's "observers." Mrs. White appears as "Esther White" in the Yorkshire television documentary, *Kinsey's Paedophiles*.

Esther White's sworn statement identifies her as "a victim of acts of sexual abuse perpetrated upon me by both my paternal grandfather and my father between the years of 1938 and 1946," the years of Kinsey's sex research project, when he was soliciting sex "histories" nationwide. Her abuse "began when I was four years of age and continued until I was age 12," when her mother found out (1946) and

stopped it. Mrs. White's grandfather was a graduate of Indiana University, 1922, and "learned of the Institute's existence and its subject area of studies from alumni bulletins or some similar communications."

Mrs. White had reason to believe her grandfather was "personally acquainted with Alfred Kinsey." She adds, "My father did not tell me that he was sharing information about the acts of abuse with the Kinsey Institute *until it had stopped*. My first knowledge that he was providing information about his abuse to the Institute occurred in 1947, when I was age 13." Her father asked her if she had had "orgasm as a result of specific acts of abuse." She believes "this questioning was done at the behest of the Kinsey Institute. He was documenting on papers (kept in an envelope) that he sent away. *There was a deadline by which he had to return them*. I had no idea at the time what they were for, or what he wrote."

Mrs. White states that in or about 1943 she was taken by her father to meet a man she recalls as "Mr. Stockman," and another man named "Pomeroy." In an interview with this author on October 3, 1997 in Washington, D.C., she stated that a third man, whom she did not know, was also in the room. He asked her several questions relating to her emotional state:

"He wanted to know if I was happy, if my life was good with my father. I had been told what to say, of course and I answered in the affirmative. This seemed to satisfy the man. I had never seen a picture of Dr. Kinsey and recently received a brochure with his photograph on it and I definitely recognize that man as being Dr. Kinsey."

Following the interview, Mrs. White states that her "father and grandfather then left with these men to attend a meeting at Ohio State University." A few years later, her father gave her a "signed copy" of the Kinsey report and "suggested that I read it to *see the contributions he had made to the scientific findings it contained* that would revolutionize the way the world would view sexuality in the future." When her father died, Mrs. White threw the book away. She would now like to know what part Indiana University, through its Kinsey Institute, may have played in encouraging the abuse to which she was subjected. Mrs. White recalls films her father made of her abuse.

We also have the testimony of Donna Friess, Ph.D., detailing her father's use of the Kinsey report as justification for the sexual abuse of her and her sisters. Friess wrote of her traumatic experiences in her book, *Cry the Darkness: One Woman's Triumph Over the Tragedy of Incest* (Health Communications, Inc., Deerfield Beach, Florida, 1993). It is not known if her father supplied Kinsey with information. In a letter to this author, Dr. Friess wrote that her father admitted that he "decided a long time ago to allow myself anything that dogs do." Kinsey "advocated the animal model of human sexual behavior. My father subscribed to it. Everyone of his children own their own copies of the Kinsey reports. He forced me to make a gift of the *Male* report to my boyfriend (now my husband) when I was in college."

Writing in the July, 1992 issue of *The California Psychologist* Dr. Friess stated her belief that Kinsey was fully aware of the abuse of children, yet insisted on calling it "play." She noted: "Kinsey does not distinguish between child-to-child sexual contact and child-to-adult sexual contact" (p. 27).

46. See Gebhard's telephone interview, his testimony in the Masters and Johnson seminar on *Ethics in Sex Research and Therapy*, his articles in the press cited throughout this book, John Gagnon's admission of the Kinsey Institute team's crimes in his book *Human Sexualities*, Wardell Pomeroy's statements in his biography of Kinsey, etc.

47. Gebhard, November 2, 1992, telephone interview with J. Gordon Muir, M.D., editor of Reisman et al., *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, 1990.

48. *Female*, p. 105.

49. Herbert Hyman and Paul Sheatsley "The Scientific Method," in, Donald Geddes, Ed., *An Analysis of the Kinsey Reports*, A Mentor Book, New York, 1954, p. 106.

50. Hyman, *Ibid.*, pp. 91-117.

51. *Female*, p. 127.

52. *Female*, p. 544.

53. These girls are typical of the youngsters about whom the Kinsey Institute claims it has no records. The location of these children remains an issue.

54. *Female*, p. 180.

55. *Female*, p. 104-5.

56. *Female*, p. 104-5.

57. The "Tanner Maturation Rating" questionnaire authorized by the New York Board of Education follows the Kinseyan pattern of sexuality "measurement": "Starting this year, schools require applicants for everything from football to cheerleader to fill out the new form....The definitions of the five stages include descriptions of the amount of pubic hair, and the size and shape of the penis, breasts and areolas.... Deputy Health Commissioner Mark Rapaport, whose office requires the form, defended it as perfectly sensible... it applies to kids who may be immature, a small kid who may be 14 and wants to compete" (*NY Post* June 28, 1988). The size of the areola has as little relationship to physical maturity as does hair color. One wonders why coaches and health teachers would want to read and rate the sizes and shapes of their student's genitals and the pigment surrounding their nipple area? In this modern extension of the Kinsey "measurement sexuality" mentality, as children develop in growth spurts, would boys classified as "too immature" for sports have an option to make the team should they "prove" sudden penis maturation? It seems preposterous to point out that a boy's penis size and a girl's breast size are irrelevant to their ability to swim, jump, kick a ball, or play a sonata.

58. *New York Post*, June 28, 1988.

59. Judith Reisman, *SoftPorn Plays Hardball*, Huntington House, Lafayette, LA, 1991.

60. *Female*, p. 84.

61. *Ibid.*

62. See the growing body of literature on incest research and data.

63. Reisman, *SoftPorn.*, *Ibid.*

64. Wardell Pomeroy, *Girls and Sex*, Pelican Books, New York, 1969, pp. 133-4.

65. *The British Medical Journal*, 282:250, 1981. Scrutinizing combined data from two 1967 studies, the *Journal* reported that “of 31 children born to father-daughter (12) and brother-sister matings (19) only 13 were normal,” and, “[T]wo died from recessive disorders (optic fibrosis and glycogen-storage disease) and one from an almost certainly recessive disorder causing progressive cerebral degeneration and loss of vision. Two of those alive probably had disorders, both with severe mental retardation with cerebral palsy, and one a possibly recessive disorder, severe non-specific mental retardation. Two others died in the neonatal period...Two had congenital malformations....Eight others...were mentally retarded, with IQs in seven ranging from 59 to 76.”
- And this excerpt from *Female*, pp. 121-122: “There are, of course, instances of adults who have done physical damage to children with whom they have attempted sexual contacts, and *we have the histories of a few males who had been responsible for such damage*. But these cases are in the minority and the public should learn to distinguish such serious contacts from other adult contacts which are *not likely to do the child any appreciable harm* if the child’s parents do not become disturbed.” [Emphasis added.]
66. Gebhard’s letter to Reisman, March 11, 1981, in the author’s archive.
67. *Ibid.*
68. *Female*, p. 118.
69. *Newsweek*, “Keepers of the Flame,” June 18, 1984, p. 15.
70. Wardell Pomeroy, *Penthouse Forum Variations*, “A New Look at Incest,” 1977, pp. 85-90.
71. *Penthouse Forum* “Letters,” *Ibid.*
72. Wardell Pomeroy, *Boys and Sex*, Penguin Books, New York, 1981, pp. 134-135.
73. Pomeroy in *Penthouse Forum*, *ibid.*
74. *Penthouse*, “Incest, the Last Taboo,” December 1977, p. 181. Kinsey did not call it incest, or sex with kin, but (according to Nobile) “lying with a near relative.” Pomeroy, in his 1977 *Penthouse Forum Variations* article, “A New Look at Incest,” claimed that adult-child incest could not only be harmless, but could benefit the child emotionally. He wrote: “Incest between adults and younger children can also prove to be a satisfying and enriching experience.... When there is a mutual and unselfish concern for the other person, rather than a feeling of possessiveness and a selfish concern with one’s own sexual gratification, then incestuous relationships can—and do—work out well....[Incest] can be a satisfying, non-threatening, and even an enriching emotional experience, as I said earlier.” (*Penthouse Forum Variations*, 1977, pp. 86-90).
75. *Male*, p. 9.
76. *Male*, p. 9.
77. John Gagnon, “Reconsiderations,” *Human Nature*, October 1978, Volume 1, No. 10, pp. 93.
78. See May 7, 1993 deposition materials re: *Reisman vs. The Kinsey Institute*, in the author’s archive.
79. *Indianapolis Star*, September 19, 1995, A1-4.
80. *The Humanist*, “Sex, Science and Kinsey,” September/October, 1996, pp. 23-26.
81. *The Washington Post*, December 8, 1995, F1-4.
82. James Jones, *Alfred C. Kinsey: A Public/Private Life*, WW Norton, New York, 1997, pp. 507-513.
83. Jones, pp. 512-513.
84. Jones, *Ibid.* Pomeroy reported this information in his 1972 biography of Kinsey (ghost-written, reports Gathorne-Hardy, by John Toffel, as were all Pomeroy’s books). See: *Alfred C. Kinsey: Sex, the Measure of All Things*, Chatts & Wendres, London, 1998, pp. 231, 444.
85. Jones, *Ibid.*
86. Jones, pp. 510-511.
87. Jones, p. 513.
88. Gebhard admitted his (and the team’s) collaboration with the several pedophiles in a telephone interview, and in several press articles, all in this author’s archive.
89. Pomeroy, p. 315.
90. *Male* p. 177.
91. Robert Dickinson, Forward in Ernst and Loth, *American Sexual Behavior*, The Greystone Press, New York, 1948, p. vii-viii.
92. Max Weinreich, *Hitler’s Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany’s Crimes Against the Jewish People*, Yiddish Scientific Institute, Yivo, New York, 1946
93. A photocopy of Dr. von Balluseck’s Nazi membership card, dated August 1, 1930, obtained from the German document center, is on file in the author’s archive. Max Weinreich, *Hitler’s Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany’s Crimes Against the Jewish People*, Yiddish Scientific Institute—Yivo, New York, 1946
94. *The Encyclopedia Judaica*, Keter Publishing, Vol. 9, 1972, p. 1310-1311.
95. Masters, Johnson, and Kolodny, Ed., *Ethical Issues in Sex Therapy and Research*, Little Brown and Company, Boston, 1977, p. 13.
96. Tim Tate video interview with John Bancroft at Indiana University, excerpted from the complete interview transcript, July 21, 1998, p. 18.
97. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
98. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
99. *Ibid.* p. 20.
100. The discussion of the sexology profession is extracted from *RSVP America*, 1996, First Principles, Inc., and The Institute for Media Education, Crestwood, Ky. Complete citations available in RSVP document.

- ¹⁰¹. Word of one California college-level sex course taught by Barry Singer, board member of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex's *Journal of Sex Research*, reached the press. It provides insight into the procedure for receiving extra credit for some sexology courses. Dr. Singer taught his students as he had been taught. Hence, his field work included extra credit for married students who would engage in adultery, and "straight" students who would engage in homosexual sex. The "field" research, including trips to gay bars, swingers' clubs, etc., is typical of the courses offered through other credentialed sexuality institutes. *Time*, June 7, 1982, p. 49.
- ¹⁰². To illustrate the shift in standards from absolute obscenity to the variant "pornography," an historical context is helpful. "Pornography" was not included in the 1828 edition of *Webster's Dictionary*. Only "obscenity" was defined in the words, images, and concepts that we term pornography today. Pornography, from the Greek *pornea*, means "fornication"; "writing about or drawing on prostitutes." Somewhere between 1828 and 1857, pornography was transported to America from England and Europe.
- ¹⁰³. *Paidika: Journal of Paedophilia*, "Statement of Purpose," Amsterdam, The Netherlands, September 1987, Vol. 1, pp. 2-3.
- ¹⁰⁴. *The Brain: Learning and Memory*, The Annenberg CPB Collection, Santa Barbara, CA., WNET, 1984.
- ¹⁰⁵. Richard Restak, *The Mind*, Bantam Books: New York, 1988, p. 283.
- ¹⁰⁶. Jane Healy, *Endangered Minds*, New York City, Bantam Books, 1984.
- ¹⁰⁷. Bill Moyers interviewing Gary Lynch in Richard Restak's Public Broadcasting System program, The Annenberg/CBP Collection, *The Brain*, eight documentaries on brain behavior, 1984.
- ¹⁰⁸. *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰⁹. Bill Moyers, *Mind & Body*. Public Broadcasting System Television, February 1993.
- ¹¹⁰. Quote taken from the SSSS program brochure *Expanding the Boundaries*, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 1989.
- ¹¹¹. SIECUS brochure, "Are you going to stand by; will you?" undated, circa late 1980s.
- ¹¹². SIECUS "Guidelines for Comprehensive Sexuality Education, the National Guidelines Task Force, 1991, p. 9.
- ¹¹³. See *Time* magazine article citing this issue of SIECUS ("Attacking the Last Taboo," April 14, 1980) for a discussion of "sex researchers" promoting incest.
- ¹¹⁴. "Safe Sex and Teens," by Debra W. Haffner, *SIECUS Report*, September/October 1988, p. 9.
- ¹¹⁵. SIECUS, "Talk About Sex," 1992.
- ¹¹⁶. Mary Calderone, writing about SIECUS' role in promoting Kinsey's message, *SIECUS Report*, May-July 1982, p. 6.
- ¹¹⁷. Wardell Pomeroy, *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research*, Harper & Row, New York, 1972, p. 394.
- ¹¹⁸. Distributed by Planned Parenthood and published by Rocky Mountain Planned Parenthood, Colorado, 1974.
- ¹¹⁹. *Los Angeles Times* for July 19, 1999 published an article by libertarian Carol Travis entitled "Uproar Over Sexual Abuse Study Muddies the Waters." Travis writes: "I guess I should be reassured to know that Congress disapproves of pedophilia and the sexual abuse of children. On July 12, the House voted unanimously to denounce a study that the resolution's sponsor, Matt Salmon (R-Ariz.), called 'the emancipation proclamation of pedophiles.' What got Congress riled was an article last year in the journal *Psychological Bulletin*, which is to behavioral science what the *Journal of the American Medical Assn.* is to medicine." The authors of that article—Bruce Rind, Philip Tromovitch and Robert Bauserman—concluded, from their meta-analysis of a non-random selection of 59 "studies" of child sexual abuse, that if the child is "willing," sex with an adult may be rewarding and harmless and that "non-judgmental" language should be used when referring to child molesters (i.e., terming sex with children "adult-child sex" rather than "child sexual abuse). Following the Congressional resolution and massive pressure from "Dr. Laura," the APA apologized and backed down from its publication of this pedophile promotional piece. Recent revelations that two of the three supposedly objective APA authors have ties with *Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia* raise serious questions about their objectivity. An article by Robert Buserman, entitled "Man-Boy Sexual Relationships in a Cross-Cultural Perspective," appeared in the Summer 1989 issue of *Paidika*. The Winter 1995 issue includes a book review by Bruce Rind, and recommends an article by Bauserman and Rind.