

# **KINSEY REVIVES ANCIENT SEXUAL THEOLOGY**

## **KINSEY RESEARCH TO BE INVESTIGATED**

### **H.R. 2749:**

#### **THE CHILD PROTECTION AND ETHICS IN EDUCATION ACT**

**Judith A. Reisman, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>  
The Institute For Media Education**

Americans bestow authority--and billions of tax dollars--upon science in the belief that scientists will make important contributions to society. There is the further belief that scientists, in their responsibility and trust, will behave ethically, especially in research that involves human subjects.<sup>1</sup> While the former is certainly historically accurate, such trust in the class "scientists" as honest, humane persons who deserve unquestioned public faith is neither sustained by historic, cross-cultural or American science history.

Several articles in this series cite to the role of Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey in deceiving the world by claiming Americans are 10% to 47%, more or less, homosexual while scores of homosexual activists cite Kinsey as the man who made the homosexual movement possible. Kinsey's homosexual percentage was seized upon by Harry Hay, the father of the homosexual "civil rights" movement, when Hay formed the Mattachine society, urging that homosexuality be seen no longer an act of sodomy but as a 10% minority class.

But what if all of Kinsey's work was fraudulent and worse. What if it reflects scientist-felons? That scientists could conduct sexual experiments on children or could allow or encourage child abusers to conduct such experiments is almost beyond imagining for civilized women and men. The possibility that this actually occurred--and indeed that the claimed results of such experiments might play a critical and sustained role in our law and public policy--has led Congress to submit legislation which calls for an examination of the relevant facts. The legislation focuses on the research and publications of Dr. Alfred Kinsey and his colleagues "The Kinsey Institute" conducted at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana from the late 1930's to the early 1950's.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Institute For Media Education, Box 7404, Arlington, Virginia, 22207.

The legislation is known as H.R. 2749, "The Child Protection and Ethics in Education Act."

Before proceeding with a brief overview of the documentation of Kinsey Institute fraud and felonies, a few housekeeping items should be settled. In placing these felonies before both establishment media and establishment science, I have been commonly told that the Kinsey Institute and its team were neither morally nor criminally obligated to report interviewees who were child rapists (and at least one murderer) to the proper authorities because few rapists (or murderers) would then give their histories to Kinsey for inclusion in his report. That is, science (i.e.: truth) would suffer. Let me quickly answer these prevailing defenses, employed also by all Kinsey Directors, of the Kinsey data.

## MOLESTING CHILDREN IN THE NAME OF SCIENCE

### The Science Crime & Fraud Historical Context

**Nazi Germany, Imperial Japan and Communist Russia** are modern cross-cultural examples of totalitarian regimes which produced highly educated scientists who served their leaders without question, with frightening and disastrous results. As cruel as were the actions of key scientific brutes like Dr. Mengele, just as instructive is the evidence of wholesale collusion by colleagues, universities, colleges and higher order think tanks. Thousands of state and private professional and pedagogical clubs and agencies were aware of the science-felons, but rare was there a protest made. Instead, their educated colleagues obsequiously bowed and coveted the chosen scientific barbarians. But, it has not only been totalitarian governments which have produced scientist-felons. Our own nation--a government designed to be of and by and for the people--was betrayed by our fantasy of non-judgmental, objective science. It is only the trust in scientists as a "special" moral population which permits the nation to approve of fetal and DNA experimentation, as well as other forms of God-like tamperings.

The following quotes are taken from the Department of Health and Human Services, "Protection of Human Subjects" report, FR 52880, November 23, 1982 (: 26, -29). The establishment press remains amazingly silent in the face of the most vile scientific barbarisms for the Willowbrook school scandal as well as scores of other inhumane scientific abuses reflect but a few of the science felonies to reach the public.

Pappworth published *Human Guinea Pigs*, a detailed recitation of experiments reported in reputable journals in which subjects were exposed to a variety of risky procedures not intended to benefit them. [FN28]. In chapter after chapter, he described the insertion of catheters and biopsy needles into important organs of the body (bladder, kidney, heart, liver) and resulting meningitis, shock, liver damage and cardiac arrest. The subjects of these procedures were newborns, infants and children (both healthy and diseased) pregnant women, prisoners, patients undergoing surgery, the mentally disabled, the aged, the critically ill, and the dying...[revealing] little concern on the part of investigators for their subjects ....experiments which involved injecting hepatitis virus into mentally retarded children at the Willowbrook State School in New York. [FN34]. [*The Lancet*, April 1971].

For example, examine some cites from *Harry S. Truman And the War Scare of 1948* by Frank Kofsky (1995):

Beginning in the late 1940s, under programs authorized by Truman, the U.S. government deliberately dropped radioactive material from planes or released it on the ground in a dozen experiments after World War II. . . .Eight of the tests occurred in Tennessee and Utah in an effort to create a battlefield radiation weapon. In four other tests, radiation was released into the air in New Mexico....In at least four of these 12 experiments, radiation spread beyond the planned boundaries of the test....(p. xvii).

[And] All the tests were conducted between 1948 and 1952. The implication is clear: so vile were these "experiments" that even Eisenhower administration could not stomach their condition....Nineteen mentally retarded boys who thought they were participating in a science club in the 1940s and 1950s were actually fed radioactive milk by scientists who wanted to learn about the digestive system, the

*Boston Sunday Globe* reported.” The “scientists” in question were affiliated with such ruling-class institutions as Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; their too-trusting subjects came from the Fernald State School....

[On radiating expectant mothers to see what the results would be] The figures in the *Boston Globe’s* initial stories, however, proved to be far short of the mark, for the number of expected women actually dosed with radioactive materials during these “experiments” probably numbered in the thousands. . . .several of the children exposed to the radioactive iron during their mother’s pregnancy died....Army spokesmen acknowledged that 239 populated areas from coast to coast had been blanketed with bacteria between 1949 and 1969. These involved covering areas of Alaska and Hawaii and the cities of San Francisco, Washington, D.C., Key West, and Panama City in Florida. Some tests were more focused, such as those in which bacteria were sprayed onto the Pennsylvania Turnpike [and inside] the New York City subway system.

“Distinguished scientists,” writes Leonard A. Cole, “testified at the hearings that the tests were inappropriate and dangerous....the incidence of illnesses suddenly increased in some areas near the tests.” (xviii).<sup>2</sup>

Who, by now, who has not heard of the Tuskegee syphilis experiments? If some American scientists could knowingly allow men to die slowly of syphilis, if others could infect pregnant women and endanger the lives of their unborn children, if still other science-felons could inject healthy and mentally retarded children with hepatitis, could not some scientists teach pederasts and pedophiles techniques for sexually abusing children for “science”? Looking candidly at the facts of American scientific felons and the commonality of collegial collusion through silence or support, could scientists—who often feel unconstrained by Biblical standards or fears---not deceive a plebeian public about the percentage of men engaging in illicit sex, and those who are homosexual?

Could scientists, together with philanthropic, pedagogical and legal colleagues of like mind and sexual proclivity, not strategize to change America’s attitudes and sex crime laws to favor their personal interests? Author *Frank Kofsky* argues that Harry Truman’s “War Scare of 1948,” was calculated to wrest popular control away from the common people to empower a new, elite, aristocratic American cadre to remold the character and future of the nation in their own interests. To that end, argues Kofsky, Truman illegitimately expanded Presidential powers to undermine Congress.

Truman assumed more and more power at the expense of Congress ....authorizing U.S. troops in Korea without prior congressional consent. He [established] the National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency....independent of the State Department and Congress.....[T]he White House staff and the bureaucracy of the executive office grew dramatically, and the president’s Bureau of the Budget took over... [powers of] congressional committees. This gave Truman and subsequent presidents more ability to function outside congressional restraints [creating] big

government.....some critics actually saw Truman's centralization of authority as evidence of Communist influence.<sup>2</sup>

Truman took office in 1945 and shortly thereafter released the Atomic bomb. Kofsky's documentation suggests that Kinsey's revolutionary report was a welcome public diversion for Truman's administration. For, it has been argued that while the A Bomb took the lives of thousands and did untold damage to Japan, Kinsey's Bomb took the lives of millions and is all but destroying local school, university, and public service control, statewide. Without an informed public directing its own community affairs, science historically serves the elite and is necessarily subversive of a self-governing republic.

## **The Historical Context**

**The 1945 A-Bomb:** World War II ended in 1946, after American scientists under Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer--like a modern Prometheus--dropped the Atomic Bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In an instant, all of American was reeling, as both joy and anguish hit the nation with the force of that nuclear blast. Emotion rode high, for along with the immense relief that "it worked" and the brutal war was ended, came the quaking realization that while God had created the earth, science could now destroy it. On the one hand, Americans were awed by Oppenheimer's ability to end the worldwide threat of Hitler's jack booted brutes.

On the other hand, our faith in ourselves as the world's savior was shattered by both the nuclear scare and ensuing film footage of burning Japanese children, subverting our sense of moral integrity and who we really were as Americans. Aided by an army that now dispensed condoms, Yankee soldier-saviors of Europe and Asia broke the bonds of their Puritan motherland. GIs returned home to wives and sweethearts in 1946 with the highest rate of venereal disease since the original VD epidemics of World War I. Yet, the overwhelming VD epidemic which raged overseas was quenched in the US as young lads riddled with penicillin waited for the marriage bed to carnally embrace the "girl next door."

**The 1948 A-Bomb:** Three years later, after decades of clandestine preparation and a brilliant Blitzkrieg publicity campaign, Dr. Kinsey launched what was then called "The Kinsey A-Bomb" on America's now fragile sense of moral virtue. Wrapped in Oppenheimer's flag of science as the final authority, Kinsey's fraudulent sex science statistics proved middle America a nation of sexual hypocrites, liars, cowards and closet deviates. All of Kinsey's data were repudiated by the public health data. The Armed Services, which found skyrocketing VD and illegitimacy rates abroad, found no such rates for these disorders or for abortion, rape and other sex crimes and sexual disorders). Wrong or right, the fighting men might be misbehaving overseas but by and large they *were not doing over here, what they were doing over there.*

Despite the common sense fact of low rates of illegitimacy and VD, despite personal knowledge of faithful and virtuous family and friends, mainstream America was dramatically shaken by Kinsey's data. The popular press hawked Kinsey as a diversion

---

<sup>2</sup>"Truman, Harry S.," 1993-1995 Funk & Wagnalls.

from Truman's ominous cold war warnings, heralding the astonishing scientific findings; that 98% of men and roughly half of women had pre-marital sex, 95% of American men were legally sex offenders and 10% or more of men were largely homosexual. While *no one noted* that 317 infants and children were sexually tortured by pedophiles for Kinsey's child sex data, educators repeated his pedophile conclusions--that children were sexual from birth hence school sex education should be mandated.

**INSERT page 5** after "While *no one noted* that 317 infants and children were sexually tortured by pedophiles for Kinsey's child sex data, educators repeated his pedophile conclusions--that children were sexual from birth hence school sex education should be mandated."

**INSERT**

Kinsey fathered not only the sexual revolution, as Hugh Hefner and others have said, but the homosexual revolution as well. Harry Hay gave Kinsey that credit when Hay read in 1948 that Kinsey found "10%" of the male population homosexual. Hay, a long-time communist organizer said 10% was a political force which could be melded into a "sexual minority" only seeking "minority rights." With that wind under his sails, Hay formed the Mattachine Society.

But 1,400 (26%) of Kinsey's alleged 5,300 white male subjects were already "sex offenders," an additional 25% were, as far as the data can be established, incarcerated prisoners, some numbers were "pimps," "hold-up men," "thieves," roughly 4% were male prostitutes as well as sundry other criminals and some hundreds of homosexual activists at various "gay bars" and other haunts from coast to coast. This group of social outcasts and deviants were then redefined as representing your average "Joe College." With adequate press and university publicity, the people believed mass sexual perversion was common nationwide.

Following the release of *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, the then Kinsey Institute Director, Dr. June Reinisch, initiated a "CONFIDENTIAL" international 86 page mass mailing of accusatory materials about me, calling upon recipients to repudiate "Judith Reisman's accusations..." One of the accusations Reinisch wanted repudiated was the fact that Kinsey's 10% to 47% or more homosexual data were fraudulently generalized to the "general public." In her letter to past Kinsey Director and Kinsey co-author Paul Gebhard, Reinisch denies any culpability for the child sex abuse data and states that the Kinsey team never did "conduct experiments." She asks Gebhard's aid in discrediting Judith Reisman. She adds:

"Further, with regard to sampling and the generalizability of the findings to a broader portion of Americans, throughout both volumes Kinsey very clearly identifies exactly which data from which groups he is referring to when drawing conclusions. He never used data from the special samples, derived from such populations as the gay community or prisons, to generalize to the general public."

Unfortunately, Dr. Gebhard wrote back to Reinisch on December 6, 1990 that she was wrong and that Kinsey did use pedophiles and other imprisoned sex criminals to generalize to Joe College: He says:

"In your recent letter of December 3, which I gather was sent to a number of individuals as well as me, you refuted Judith Reisman's allegations

about Kinsey and the Institute. However, I fear that your final paragraph on page 1 may embarrass you and the university if it comes to Reisman's attention. Hence I want to warn you and relevant university officials so that some damage control might be devised. The paragraph ends with this sentence: He never used data from the special samples, derived from such populations as the gay community or prisons, to generalize to the general public." This statement is incorrect. Kinsey did mix male prison inmates in with his sample used in Sexual Behavior in the Human Male....As to generalizing to a wider population, in his first volume Kinsey did generalize to the entire U.S. population. See, for one example, the tables on page 188 and 220 where he clearly extrapolates to the U.S. " (Deposition Exhibit #31, May 7, 1993)

With the above in mind, it is shocking to realize that, almost overnight, following release of Kinsey's *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (and a succession of earlier private, public relations briefings at the Kinsey Institute for favorable interviewers) books, articles, films, news clips, cartoons, radio, TV, front page stories appeared coast to coast as part of a publicity campaign to institutionalize Kinsey's fraudulent claims about average American men. Americans believed "the most famous man for ten years" that primitive, sexually permissive cultures were happier than were Mr. and Mrs. Jones. Did the Kinsey team participate in the pedophile abuse of these 317 infants and children? Listen to Dr. Paul Gebhard.

## 1. The Pedophile with the Stopwatch



Four excerpts from a taped telephone interview with Dr. Paul Gebhard, former head of the Kinsey Institute and Kinsey co-author

**Interviewer:** So, do pedophiles normally go around with stopwatches?

**Dr. Paul Gebhard:** Ah, they do if we tell them we're interested in it!

\* \* \*

**Interviewer** And clearly, [the orgasms of] at least 188 children were timed with a stopwatch, according to....

\* \* \*

**Dr. Gebhard:** So, second hand or stopwatch. OK, well, that's, ah, you refreshed my memory. I had no idea that there were that many.

\* \* \*

**Interviewer** These experiments by pedophiles on children were presumably illegal.

**Dr. Gebhard:** Oh yes.

\* \* \*

**Interviewer** . . . back in 1977, where you were talking about an example of criminality in the Kinsey research, and I'm quoting, "An example of criminality was our refusal to cooperate with the authorities in apprehending a pedophile we interviewed who was being sought for a sex murder." Do you think that's defensible ethically?

**Dr. Gebhard:** Yes....When we promised people absolute confidentiality we meant it....

## **2. Dr. Alfred Kinsey's Research on Child Orgasm**

Dr. Alfred Kinsey's research on child orgasm is described in Chapter 5<sup>3</sup> of his book *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948). Some of the observations are summarized in Tables 30-34 of the book. The numbers of the children in the five tables were, respectively, 214, 317, 188, 182, and 28. The minimum ages were, respectively, one year, two months, five months, (ages of children not recorded for Table 33) and five months. The tables identify sex experiments, for example, Table 32: "Speed of pre-adolescent orgasm; Duration of stimulation before climax; observations timed with second hand or stop watch."

Did Kinsey instigate or encourage these practices among the pedophiles who provided the data for Tables 30-34? In his book, Kinsey did not clearly describe his own role. However, Kinsey's close colleague, C. A. Tripp, made a revealing statement in a 1991 televised interview by Phil Donahue:

Dr. Tripp: [Reisman is] talking about data that came from pedophiles, that he would listen only to pedophiles who were very careful, used stopwatches, knew how to record their thing, did careful surveys . . . .[T]hey were trained observers.<sup>4</sup>

One question cries out for an answer: What was the nature of the training given to these "trained observers"? Perhaps Dr. Tripp or others an answer this question.

A 1991 book review in the respected British medical journal *The Lancet* noted:

[T]he important allegations from the scientific viewpoint are the imperfections in the [Kinsey] sample and unethical, possibly criminal observations on children....Kinsey...has left his former co-workers some explaining to do.<sup>5</sup>

## **3. Defective and Fraudulent Research Techniques**



In *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948), Dr. Kinsey reported that the data on the 317 children came from “9 of our adult male subjects.”<sup>6</sup> However, Dr. John Bancroft, current Director of the Kinsey Institute, contradicted this claim. After examining the data, Dr. Bancroft indicated that the data for Table 31 came from a single adult male subject.<sup>7</sup> There are a number of other instances where Kinsey’s published claims about numerical or factual data--claims with important implications if true--are now believed to be misleading or false.<sup>8 9 10</sup> A review of Kinsey’s original data and claims is long overdue.<sup>11</sup>

#### **4. Taxpayer Funding of the Kinsey Institute**

In most of their recent news releases, Indiana University denied they received any federal money which served to support Dr. Kinsey’s research efforts.

However, in addition to the grants cited in this endnote, in 1957 the National Institute of Mental Health granted approximately \$50,000.00 per year for three years to the Institute, several years before Kinsey’s sex study concluded.<sup>12 13 14</sup> Furthermore, many millions of dollars from tax-free institutions were diverted to Dr. Kinsey’s research during his lifetime, and millions of federal, state and tax-free funds continue to be funneled into the Kinsey Institute.

#### **5. What Congress Could Do**

H.R. 2749, the Child Protection and Ethics in Education Act of 1995, is a bill to determine if Kinsey’s two principal books on human sexual behavior “are the result of any fraud or criminal wrongdoing.”

Clearly a useful step would be the gathering of facts on the work of Kinsey and his colleagues and a public disclosure of these facts in a responsible fashion. The U.S. Congress is in a strong position to carry out this kind of fact-finding as a precursor to legislation. An attempt should be made to answer certain questions that bear directly or indirectly on H.R. 2749:

- Did Kinsey and his colleagues behave in an ethical fashion in the way they collected and published data from human subjects, especially children?
- Apart from the ethical considerations, did they analyze and publish their data correctly from the scientific point of view?
- Were federal funds solicited, used, and accounted for appropriately?
- Do the answers to the preceding three questions indicate any violations of federal law?
- If the information collected and published by Kinsey proves, on examination, to be badly flawed or to involve fraud or criminal wrongdoing, what are the implications for the use of this information in science, education, law and public policy? Specifically, to what extent

should the federal government fund the dissemination and use of this information?

## **6. Citizens Have the Right to Know**

There are serious questions which must be answered by the Kinsey Institute Directors. "How did the Kinsey team know an 11-month-old had 10 orgasms in one hour". How did they verify these data. Where were the children's parents. Who did these experiments. Have attempts been made to locate the children. Who were the subjects of Table 34.<sup>15</sup> As noted, the Kinsey team reported on a cadre of "trained observers:" Certainly these were not the children pictured in the publicity photographs which were distributed to the the press and the gullible academic world of a little braided girl of roughly four-years, sitting with "Uncle Prock" in innocent play?

Better data came from adult males who have had sexual contacts with younger boys and who, with their adult backgrounds, are able to recognize and interpret the boys' experience... Unfortunately [only] 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...on 317 pre-adolescents who were either observed masturbating or with other boys or older adults (Male report, p. 177).

## **7. Kinsey Team Describes The Children's Orgasms**



Cover of Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences

Kinsey's "trained observers" tested babies "5 months in age," for repeated orgasms via:

empirical study and statistical procedures... which resulted in...reported observations<sup>16</sup> on such specifically sexual activities as erection, pelvic thrust and several other characteristics of true orgasm in a list of 317 pre-adolescent boys, ranging between infants of 5 months and adolescence age.<sup>17</sup>

Dr. Kinsey reported some pedophile observers "induced....erections....over periods of months or years"<sup>18</sup> but they interviewed no "psychotics who were handicapped with poor memories, hallucination, or fantasies that distorted the fact."<sup>19</sup> Orgasm was defined as follows:

Extreme tension with violent convulsions:...sudden heaving and jerking of the whole body ... gasping ... hands grasping, mouth distorted, sometimes with tongue protruding; whole body or parts of it spasmodically twitching ... violent jerking of the penis ... groaning, sobbing, or more violent cries, sometimes with an abundance of tears (especially among younger children)....hysterical laughing, talking, sadistic or masochistic reactions ... extreme trembling, collapse, loss of color, and sometimes fainting of subject....some...suffer excruciating pain and may scream...if the penis is even touched....some....before the arrival of orgasm, will fight away from the partner and may make violent attempts to avoid climax although they derive definite pleasure from the situation.<sup>20</sup>

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.
	7	9 min.		3	3 min.
2 yr.	11	65 min.	12 yr.	9	2 hr.
2.5 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	2.5 hr.
7 yr.	7	3 hr.	13 yr.	9	8 hr.
8 yr.	8	2 hr.	yr.	3	70 sec.
9 yr.	7	68 min.	13 yr.	11	8 hr.
10 yr.	9	52 min.	yr.	26	24 hr.
10 yr.	14	24 hr.	14 yr.	11	4 hr.

Table 34. Examples of multiple orgasm in pre-adolescent males  
Some instances of higher frequencies.

Lester Caplan, M.D., Diplomate, the American Board of Pediatrics, reviewing Kinsey's Chapter 5 (as above) said "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,"<sup>21</sup> especially if, as Dr. Gebhard notes, a cinema record was being made.<sup>22</sup>

Child interviews were unusually long. Kinsey said after two hours "the [adult] becomes fatigued and the quality of the record drops."<sup>23</sup> Still, Kinsey reported 24 hour orgasm "interviews" of a four,-a-10-and a 13-year-old,<sup>24</sup> a four-year-old for 10 hours; a nine and 13-year-old for eight hours, and so on.<sup>25</sup> Dr. Gebhard's taped phone interview further details some of these techniques.<sup>26</sup>

Further, Gebhard claimed in his letter to Reisman, that they did no follow-up on these children since it was "impossible or too expensive."<sup>27</sup> Later Gebhard said Kinsey was correct, some children were followed-up and "**we do have some names**" of the children.<sup>28</sup> There is still no answer to the question, "Where are the children of Table 34?" It is finally in the hands of Congress to determine what really happened at the Kinsey Institute.

### **8. The Children Of Table 34**

Beyond *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* (1990) the recently released video documentary, produced by Bob Knight of the Family Research Council, *The Children of Table 34*, narrated by Efrem Zimbalist Jr., is a very important tool for understanding the way in which the Kinsey data have used to mislead the nation. This half-hour video documents the history of the Kinsey fraud and it establishes Kinsey as the foundation of current homosexual advocacy and classroom sex education and AIDS Prevention. *The Children of Table 34, Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* and the *Reisman & Johnson Report*

(comparing In Search Of homosexual and heterosexual ads) can be obtained via this website.

Since the establishment media has largely censored this information, the reader is obligated, it seems to me, to obtain these materials, read and distribute them to the extent that his or her resources will allow. Should you have any information on Kinsey, the use of his materials or his role in your life or the lives of others, kindly call contact me at this website.

## ENDNOTES

*Science Magazine* editorial, January 9, 1987.

<sup>2</sup> Frank Kofsky, *Harry S. Truman and the War Scare of 1948*, New York: St. Martin's Press (1995).

<sup>3</sup> See Exhibit B: Key pages from Kinsey's Male book, pages. 157-192, "Early Sexual Growth and Activity."

<sup>4</sup> Exhibit F; December 5, 1990.

<sup>5</sup> Exhibit J: *The Lancet*, March 2, 1991, p.547.

<sup>6</sup> Kinsey et al, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) p. 177: The nine men "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 engaged in self masturbation, or who were observed in contacts with other boys or older adults." *The Washington Post* (December 8, 1995, p. F1, F4) reports Dr. Bancroft saying, "Kinsey gives the impression that the data came from three or four men, but it was just the one," Bancroft said. He speculates that Kinsey kept that bit to himself because he thought the public might not react well to his use of data from a sex criminal." Elsewhere Bancroft is reported saying "I have looked at the data on which these tables appear to be based, and I am fairly confident that the data for all 317 cases came from the one old man ..." (September 19, 1995, *Indianapolis Star*, A1, A4), etc.

<sup>7</sup> See Exhibit D, *The Indianapolis Star*, September 19, 1995, p. 4, col. 1, "an elderly scientist."

<sup>8</sup> Activities such as "forcing" correct answers from subjects and suggesting that investigators might find some way to treat the data should they find these answers unacceptable, may or may not be poor science, Male volume, Op. cit., p. 55

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

<sup>10</sup> Pomeroy, Wardell, *Dr. Kinsey and The Institute For Sex Research*. Harper & Row, New York (1972), pp. 208-209. "By 1946, he, Gebhard and I had interviewed about 1,400 convicted sex offenders in penal institutions scattered over a dozen states." (On this page Pomeroy notes Kinsey's explanation that all American males are really sex offenders, by law, hence the need to largely eliminate sex offender laws). Kinsey's data included these deviants and prisoners as average American men. In court documents, former Kinsey Institute Director, Dr. June Reinisch writes that Kinsey "never used data from the special samples, derived from such populations as the gay community or prisons, to generalize to the general public" and Dr. Gebhard replied, "I fear that your final paragraph will embarrass you and the university if it comes to Reisman's attention. . . .This statement is incorrect. Kinsey did mix male prison inmates in which his sample used in" the Male volume." However, it is perhaps most relevant here to note the "**Interviewing young children.**"

"For younger children, especially for those under eight years of age....**One of the parents has been present in all of our interviews**....The technique is one in which the interviewer looks at dolls, at toys of other sorts, joins in games, builds picture puzzles, romps and does acrobatics with the vigorous small boy, tells stories, reads stories....candies and cookies, and withal makes himself an agreeable guest...An interview with a young child becomes an information test rather than an examination of the child's overt activity." [Emphasis added.]

<sup>11</sup> See Maslow and Sakoda, "Volunteer Error in the Kinsey Study," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 47, 1952 (pp. 259-262).

<sup>12</sup> "[I]n 1957, under Gebhard's leadership, new sources of federal and private funding were found....During the 1970s, with funding from the National Institute of Mental Health, the Kinsey Institute was able to develop an information service," SIECUS Report, September 1985, 6-7.

<sup>13</sup> Official Brochure, *Institute for Sex Research, Indiana University*, 1970, "News of Kinsey's efforts reached the National Research Council's Committee for Research on Problems of Sex when he applied for a grant....in late 1940 [and was awarded] \$1,600, the monies being provided by the Medical Division of the Rockefeller Foundation....increased to \$7,500....by 1946, reached \$35,000....the National Institute of Mental Health awarded the Institute the first in a series of grants which were destined to continue for years and to constitute the major financial support of the [Kinsey] research. In the Customs case a federal district court ruled in favor of the Institute, empowering it to import for research purpose any sort of erotic material and allowing such materials to be sent through the mails....**regarded as a landmark in the history of the relationship between science and law.**" pp. 3, 6. (Emphasis added.)

<sup>14</sup> Pomeroy, Wardell, *Dr. Kinsey and The Institute For Sex Research*. Harper & Row, New York, 1972, pp. 403 - 425: Kinsey insisted that 80 decibels, not 40 were needed for his work to proceed; 30 is normal conversation; 40 is light traffic; 70, normal traffic; quiet train; 80, rock music, subway; 90, thunder; 100 jet plane at takeoff. *The World Almanac*, 1993. Funk and Wagnalls. (A child's scream is only "30 times louder than normal conversation.")

<sup>15</sup> See Exhibit C: After Dr. Reisman asked these questions in 1981, the Kinsey Institute launched a 12-year-long national campaign to undermine her investigation. The 87-page Kinsey Institute "confidential" package mailed worldwide, and especially to those who might interview Reisman on the issue are available.

<sup>16</sup> Writing in *Our Sexuality*, (2nd edition), Menlo Park, California: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co. sexologists, Crooks & Baur, offer a sexological view of the term "direct observation:" A third method for studying human sexual behavior is direct observation. [Original emphasis.] This type of research may vary greatly in form and setting, ranging from laboratory studies that observe and record sexual responses to participant observation where the researchers join their subjects in sexual activity," (p. 64).

<sup>17</sup> Kinsey, Male Volume, p. 181.

- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 37. Moreover, as Lewis Terman pointed out in his critique of Kinsey, "The author lists (p. 39) "many hundred" persons who brought in "delinquent groups: male prostitutes, female prostitutes, bootleggers, gamblers, pimps, prison inmates, thieves and hold-up men. These, presumably, would have brought in others of their kind, but in what numbers they did so we are not told." Terman also notes "a dozen prison populations" included "a state school for feeble-minded, two children's homes, and two homes for unmarried mothers....plus "more than 1,200 persons who have been convicted of sex offenses." (Kinsey's "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male: Some Comments and Criticisms," Lewis Terman, *Sexual Behavior in American Society: An Appraisal of the First Two Kinsey Reports*, NYC: W.W. Norton & Co., 1955, p. 447).
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 37.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., pp. 160-161.
- <sup>21</sup> See Exhibit H: Letter to Judith Reisman from Lester Caplan M.D., Diplomate, the American Board of Pediatrics, reviewing the child data.
- <sup>22</sup> See exhibit E, Pomeroy's letter to Reisman, para 2, "Some of these sources have added to their written or verbal reports photographs, and, in a few instances, cinema." The Kinsey Institute is on record as possessing a selection of child pornography films and photographs.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 181.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 180.
- <sup>25</sup> "Was Kinsey a Fake and a Pervert?," *The Village Voice*, December 11, 1990, p. 41.
- <sup>26</sup> See Exhibit I: of an audio taped phone discussion between J. Gordon Muir, editor of *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, and Paul Gebhard on November 2, 1992.
- <sup>27</sup> See Exhibit D, Ibid.
- <sup>28</sup> In the Male volume, Kinsey describes the children's trauma (which he saw as orgasmic), claiming to also have data on "a smaller percentage of older boys and adults which continues these reactions throughout life," p. 161.

---

**Judith A. Reisman, Ph.D.** President, The Institute For Media Education, received her doctorate in Communication in 1980 from Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. In 1981, at the 5th World Congress of Sexology in Jerusalem, Reisman exposed the crimes against children involved in Kinsey's data on sexual behavior--data and their impact on sex education, sex laws and public policies. She was a member of the Sociology and Anthropology faculty at Haifa University, Israel; Visiting Professor of Education at American University in Washington, D.C.; and Adjunct faculty in Communications at George Mason University in Virginia. The British medical journal, ***The Lancet***, said: "***In Kinsey Sex and Fraud***, Dr. Judith Reisman and her colleagues demolish the foundations of the two [Kinsey] reports." Dr. Reisman provided expert testimony to parliaments and legislatures in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Israel and South Africa and USA federal and state courts. She is listed in *Who's Who in Science and Engineering*, *International Who's Who in Education*, *International Who's Who in Sexology*, *Who's Who of Women*, etc., and received the "Save Our Children Scientist of the Year Award" by the Save Our Children National Alliance. In 1994 Reisman assisted in two successful *Amici Curiae* briefs; *USA v. Knox* and *Steffan v. Secretary of Defense*, et al. She authored the Department of Justice, Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, "*Images of Children, Crime and Violence*" (1989); *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* (Reisman & Eichel, 1990) and *Soft Porn Plays Hardball* (1991), refereed scientific journals ***Ethology and Sociobiology***, ***the New Universities Quarterly*** (England), ***The New York University Review of Law and Social Change***, and chapters and citations in numerous academic texts, scholarly books and lay books.