

# **The Sex Industrial Complex**

**The Big Sexology, Big Pornography &  
Big Pharmaceutical Cabal**

**Judith A. Reisman, Ph.D.  
The Institute for Media Education  
Author, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* (2003)**

## **Report**

**For Cindy Noe  
The Indiana State Legislature  
Ways and Means Committee**

© Reisman, 2005, Revised 2015

*Use permitted only with attribution.*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. An Indiana University “Orgasmatron” .....	2
<b>KI Creates Perfume To Addict Women To Pornography</b> .....	2
“Science Catches Woody Allen After 30 Years” .....	2
II. Defining Our Terms: The Psychopharmacology of Pornography .....	3
III. President Bush Proclaims “Protection From Pornography” .....	3
<b>Sexologists: ASECT &amp; SSSS Pornography Traffing Sales and Production</b> .....	4
“Educational Learning Objectives: Participants Will Be Able To” .....	4
“Note: There will be no nudity or sexual activity among the participants.” .....	5
IV. Grants for Kinsey Institute Sex <i>Experimenters</i> .....	5
Bancroft, Graham, Janssen: Pornography Experimenters for Pfzier, Lilly, etc. ....	5
Frontline: Janseen Admits That KI Addicts Male Subjects to “Extreme” Sadistic Pornography .....	6
KI Subverts the ‘Human Subjects Review Board,’ Hiking “Dosage” .....	7
V. Increasing Female Pornography Addiction/Arousal .....	8
<i>Playboy</i> : Substituting Pornography For The ‘Beloved’ .....	8
Kinsey: Massive “Orgasms” As Life’s Goal to Happiness .....	8
NIH Scientists Tainted by Conflict of Interest Experiments.....	9
Congress OK’d Unmonitored Female/Male Pornography Experiments.....	9
VI. The Kinsey Institute: Epicenter of the Sex Industrial Complex .....	10
Sexology, KI Funded by <i>Playboy</i> : Kinsey Team Pornography Addiction .....	10
KI & IU Pornography Addiction Lawsuits In the Wings.....	10
The Institutional History: Alfred Charles Kinsey.....	11
Kinsey Lied: Seduced His Male Students, Tortured Himself, Made Pornography ....	11
Jones’ Confirmed by Gathorne-Hardy: Never Legally Challenged .....	12
Briefly: Kinsey’s Child Sex Abuse Research Protocol.....	13
VII. Cynthia Heiman Kinsey Institute Director Has Pornography Patrons.....	13
Heiman’s IASHS Collusion .....	13
Heiman’s Pornography as Ideological and/or Economic Collusion .....	14
About The Producers [Quoting Verbatim].....	14
Sexologists “On Our Advisory Council” .....	15
Heiman Supports Unapproved Condom for AIDS/Anal Sodomy and Criminal Child Lust .....	15
Heiman is a “Sinclair Select” .....	16
Heiman Supports Hazardous “Sex Toys” and Pornography Videos .....	17
Heiman’s S&M Equipment: Advertising Handcuffed Girl .....	17
Heiman’s Grants are 95% Sex Experiemnts, 5% “Cancer” .....	18
Heiman’s Official Kinsey Institute Website Resume .....	18
Heiman is “Designing Women” -- <i>The Washington Post</i> .....	20
VIII. Dr. Layden: Addiction and a Flow Chart--Sexology to the Public.....	24
IX. The <i>Brave New World</i> of Kinsey-Huxley and Child Sex .....	24
X. Kinsey “Experts” on <i>Childhood Sexual Development (Incomplete)</i> .....	25
“Over the Past 100 Years We Are More Often Wrong Than Right” .....	26

<b>Book Frauds: “\$750 million a year to abstinence-only sex education”</b> .....	26
<b>“I Got Around the Word “Normal”” -- We Can “Produce” Consensus</b> .....	27
<b>Introduction: John Bancroft</b> .....	28
<b>KI Hijacks Child Abuse “Studies”?</b> .....	28
<b>Bancroft Condemns Congress Rejecting Rind, Tromovitch, Bauserman Child Sex</b> ...	29
<b>Philip Jenkins Cleans Up Kinsey Institute for the History Books</b> .....	29
<b>Blames Bender and Blau for Tappan, NRC, Kinsey, etc. “No Harm” Abuse Claims</b> .	30
<b>Tappan Credits Kinsey, <i>Not</i> Bender/Blau for Model Penal Code Sex Changes</b> .....	31
<b>National Research Council Credit Kinsey <i>Not</i> Bender-Blau Harmlessness Charge</b> .....	32
<b>Kinsey, Pomeroy and Gebhard Make Incest Globally Harmless</b> .....	32
<b>Jenkins Hides <i>Penthouse</i> as KI’s Pomeroy’s “Normal” Population Claims for Incest</b> 33	
<b>Jenkins Hides <i>Penthouse</i> as KI’s Gebhard’s “<i>Random Sample</i>” Claims For Incest</b> ....	34
<b>“Suspected Or Detected, Fraud Needs Intensive Investigation”</b> .....	35
<b>Freidrich’s Expert Summary: “Children Are Sexual Beings”</b> .....	35
<b>Lucia F. O’Sullivan</b> .....	36
<b>Parents Hamper Study of Child Sexuality</b> .....	36
<b>Bribery Offsets Boys’ Distress at Sexual Questions</b> .....	36
<b>Anke Ehrhardt and the KI Icon, John Money</b> .....	36
<b>Supporting Children’s Sex Change Operations?</b> .....	37
<b>The Ehrhardt and Money Homosexual Research Bias</b> .....	38
<b>The “Experts” Disdain Child “Innocence” and Child Asexuality</b> .....	39
<b>Meredith A. Reynolds And Debra L. Herbenick – Kinsey Institute Study</b> .....	40
<b>Suzanne Frayser</b> .....	40
<b>Condemns Pre Kinsey Sexual Reticence And Procreative Values</b> .....	40
<b>Lies About Alfred Moll and Child Innocence</b> .....	41
<b>Gilbert Herdt: Pedophile Comrades Label Minors “<i>Gay and Lesbian Youth</i>”</b> .....	42
<b>When She’s Only About Six Or Seven Years Old.</b> .....	42
<b>Journal of Paedophilia, Statement of Purpose “Paedophilia [is] Legitimate”</b> .....	43
<b>Jeffry W. Thigpen, Elsie M. Pinkston, And Jay H. Mayefsky</b> .....	44
<b>Sexperts: Male Babies Have Erections And Female Babies Vaginal Lubrication</b> .....	44
<b>Pedophile Fellow Travelers See Orgasmic Responses in Five Month Old Babes</b> .....	45
<b>Michael Bailey: “We” Don’t Know That Child Abuse is “Harmful”</b> .....	45
<b>Michael Bailey &amp; the International Academy Of Sex Research</b> .....	46
<b><i>Pedophile Apologists</i>: Theo Sandfort, Vern Bullough, Bancroft’s Child Experts 29<sup>th</sup></b>	
<b>Annual Meeting, Kinsey Instiutte, July 16 – 19, 2003</b> .....	46
<b>SECRETARIAT: Michael Bailey [sex with transvestite patient, info w/o consent]</b> ....	46
<b>Bailey IASR lecture: told his book "is not science"</b> .....	46
<b>Heino Meyer-Bahlburg: We “Liberal Folk”</b> .....	47
<b>Fanatic \$500 Million Abstinence Educators</b> .....	48
<b>Meyer-Bahlburg would be free of “abuse”</b> .....	48
<b>Jany Rademakers: Americans are Afraid of Sex</b> .....	48
<b>Janet Hyde: “We” Must Define Normal Child Sexuality</b> .....	48
<b>Erick Janssen: Problems With “Normal”</b> .....	49
<b>Diane di Mauro: Use the SIECUS Foundation</b> .....	49
<b>Elsie Pinkston: All Sexual Behavior is Normal</b> .....	49
<b>Ed Laumann: Not “Normal” But “Age Appropriate”</b> .....	49

**APPENDICIES ..... 49**

**Appendix A. Federally funded study pays Women to watch pornography..... 49**

**Appendix B: SF State University’s “Kinsey At 50” Retrospective ..... 51**

**Boy Lovers Are Stigmatized Like Communists Were ..... 52**

**Bancroft Cannot Reveal “In House” Response to Reisman..... 53**

**Herdt and Gagnon Kiss Passionately on Stage..... 54**

**Conservative Grass Roots Attack Might Impact Legislation..... 54**

**Appendix C: Kinsey is Republished in 1998 Absent Apology or Correction ..... 55**

**Appendix D: Some Questions For The Kinsey Institute..... 56**

**Appendix E: Protection from Pornography Proclamation, 2003 ..... 61**

**Appendix F: "NIH: Questioned Kinsey Work" ..... 62**

**Appendix G: Ex-Kinsey Institute employee accused of sexual molestation ..... 63**

**Appendix H Big Pharma and the Ties That Bind: The Politics of Drug Promotion ..... 65**

**Appendix I: Conflicts of Interest and the Public Trust ..... 66**

**Appendix J: Harvard Approves Pornographic Magazine ..... 69**

**Appendix K: Organizing Committee..... 73**

**International Methodology Symposium ..... 73**

***The Journal Of Paedophilia*..... 74**

**XI Draft Endnotes To Draft Report..... 75**

# The Kinsey, Pornography, Pharmaceutical Cabal: Conforming Women to Pornography

## Executive Summary

Judith A. Reisman, Ph.D.

Pornographers and “sexologists,” two powerful fringe groups historically hostile to Judeo Christian morals, values and laws, have joined forces with the monolithic drug industry which commands more lobbyists and a greater ‘persuasion’ budget than any other industry.<sup>1</sup> This tripartite union is focused on finding the magic female “Viagra” pill. As women are roughly “58 percent of Medicare recipients at age 65 and 71 percent at age 85,”<sup>2</sup> should Medicare fund monies for impotence in women as well as men, a feminine libido pill promises meteoric profits. Hence, lifestyle drug manufacturers seek a female market for libido enhancing chemistry. Said one sexologist, “[W]e have what pharmaceutical companies need.... sex researchers are eagerly sought for help in commercial ventures.... Impotence drugs....a libido-enhancing drug for women - could all be covered under the new Medicare prescription drug plan.<sup>3</sup> ....Our dance cards are no longer empty.”<sup>4</sup> Sexologists nationwide now work for the drug industry. As women have been the major blockage to mainstreaming pornography and the permissive sex taught by sexology, all three industries now share a marketing goal to increase the eroticization of women and young girls. At a less sanguine time in our nation’s moral history this might have been called a corporate criminal conspiracy.

As 94% of NIH scientists were found in **lucrative conflict of interest** activities with **top officials** recently netting over \$2.5 million in fees and stock options from drug companies,<sup>5</sup> implicating some legislators as well, the coalition between sex “researchers,” pornographers and drug companies emerges as a major threat to national health and governance. This preliminary study of the Kinsey Institute “today,” finds that roughly 95% of the KI federal, state and corporate research funding is devoted to techniques to induce increased sexual arousal in women and men. Pornography is the causal agent used in most experiments to increase arousal of students and other subjects. Resulting addictions, obsessions and other disorders are, to date, not reported by compromised sexologist-experimenters. However, a legal opinion now states that legislators can demand access to names and addresses of all subjects, despite confidentiality agreements. By credentialing themselves as “health professionals” sexologists have accessed academic credibility, providing them with cutting edge technologies to test libido drugs and smells via fMRI brain scanners as well as more intrusive sexual arousal devices. On the evidence, a “lucrative conflict of interests” exists between pornographers, pedophile advocates, drug researchers and the Kinsey Institute now led by its Director, Julia Heiman. Heiman’s employment (paid or unpaid) by commercial “Sinclair Institute,” an Internet trafficker of pornography and “sex toy’s” (including AIDS efficient “anal fun” devices), fits the Kinsey Institute’s origin as a *Playboy* grantee with the KI team on record as pornography users, producers and addicts. Roughly 95% of Heiman’s grants focus on sexual enhancement, most via exposure to unexplained, anonymous, pornographic films. One small “cancer” experiment involves “Sexual Arousal after a Brief, Psychoeducational Intervention” while another 5% effort in 1999 on “Enhancing Recovery from Blood and Marrow Transplantation” was not found listed in the National Cancer Institute or the National Library of Medicine websites. This study may or may not also test sexual arousal.

Despite full knowledge of the origin of Kinsey’s criminal child sexual abuse “data”<sup>6</sup> in 1998 the KI boldly republished the Kinsey Reports (1948, 1953) as ethical and accurate science. Now, in 2003, the KI published *Sexual Development in Childhood*, using a score of tainted “sexperts” who either edit, support or cite for authority to pornographic and pedophile manuals.<sup>7</sup> These KI child “sexperts” almost uniformly condemn American morality and repudiate American standards of normality and childhood sexual innocence. An ongoing attack on puberty (as the normal hormonal basis for sexual awakening) underpins the KI child sex frauds and the KI-based permissive sex codes in 1955 that spawned the current Sex Industrial Complex. The Kinsey Institute libido experiments and its *Sexual Development in Childhood* are allies. Both would support childhood sexuality hence lowered age of consent as well as increased pornography and adult libido drug use. The cabal’s promotion of anal/oral sodomy to school children (and the cover-up of the anal condom as failing FDA tests) will filter down to children as HIV/AIDS, necessitating venereal disease and pregnancy immunizations, (HepB and HPV) and more in the wings. Should sexology trained health professionals control children’s “mental health” screening and diagnoses (as was the case in many Catholic seminaries) the future is ominous.

# To Market to Market: A Kinsey Institute “Magic Pill” for Pornographers to Addict Women, Paid for by Our Taxes


“Pornographers are eager to explore the female market...claiming to make women-centered pornography.”<sup>8</sup>

“[A] year ago 94% of the more than 5,000 scientists at NIH were engaged in **lucrative conflict of interest** activities, and...**top officials** had received over \$2.5 million in fees and stock options from drug companies over the past decade.<sup>9</sup> ... [A] deputy NIH director, said Tuesday that the agency had “moved actually quite fast” to carry out tougher restrictions. Yet he acknowledged that unless new rules were put into effect, perhaps in the New Year, the scientists were free to continue collecting stock options and consulting fees from drug companies.”<sup>10</sup>

“The sexology community is small and we have what pharmaceutical companies need....These are rapidly changing times for sex research. Commercial opportunities for sex-enhancing drugs have exploded, and sex researchers are eagerly sought for help in commercial ventures.... Impotence drugs such as Viagra, Cialis and Levitra - **and possibly a libido-enhancing drug for women - could all be covered under the new Medicare prescription drug plan.**<sup>11</sup> .... Our dance cards are no longer empty.”<sup>12</sup>

**THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS:** First; pornography, a billion-dollar business, logically seeks to recruit women and children as at-risk users. By credentialing one another as “health professionals” sex radicals have defended pornographic and pedophile magazines in courtrooms and legislatures. More recently, their “research” seeks to use drugs to increase female arousal to at risk pornography. On the evidence, a “lucrative conflict of interests” exists between pornographers, pedophile advocates, drug researchers and the Kinsey Institute, led by its Director, Julia Heiman’s (paid or unpaid) employment by “The Sinclair Institute,” an Internet Pornographic Trafficker in “hard” and “soft” core pornography and sex “toy’s” (including AIDS efficient pornography). Next; why would the Kinsey Institute (documented as using a criminal child sexual abuse protocol in 1948-1953<sup>13</sup>) publish *Sexual Development in Childhood* in 2003 with “sexperts” who edit, advise or appear in pornographic and pedophile manuals that advocate early, undifferentiated sex for American children?<sup>14</sup>

**POSSIBLE RESEARCH ANSWERS:** The Kinsey Institute’s claim of child sexuality underpins the permissive sex laws that launched a worldwide pornography industry.<sup>15</sup> The Center for Missing and Exploited Children reported pandemic child pornography increases since 1998 with 58,200 children kidnapped in 1999 most sexually abused by non-kin.<sup>16</sup> Pedophiles, pornographers and most sexologists argue that once children are immunized against venereal diseases and pregnancy, they may engage in bi/heterosexual, homosexual and other sexual relations.<sup>17</sup> Hepatitis B was the first STD vaccine federally mandated for infants and children. Moreover, as strange as it sounds, sexology-accrediting agencies are “**on record**” advocating free access to pornography and legalized prostitution—for (vaccinated) children.<sup>18</sup>



**MMVR13: “The Magical Next Becomes the Medical Now”** January 26 - 29, 2005  
In partnership with: TATRC  
Telemedicine & Advanced  
Technology Research Center  
US Army Medical Research &  
Materiel Command DARPA  
Defense Advanced Research  
Projects Agency METI  
Medical Education  
Technologies, Inc.

## I. An Indiana University “Orgasmatron”

Most people are aware that universities have problems with their investigators using the university facilities and income, and prestige, etc., to research for private industry, (drugs, tobacco, alcohol, etc.). Often the public trust is violated (See Appendix B) with the profit for the company and the investigator—not the nation--driving the investigation and sometimes invalidating all resulting data as flawed or fraudulent. “Sleeper,” a Woody Allen film introduced the “orgasmatron” where sexual ecstasy was only a click away without the need for any messy physical contact.

Considering the public concerns about sexual addictions and obsessions at the present time and the limited funds available for research, it is argued that tax funds should be directed toward those agencies working specifically on cures and/or means of aiding our innocent, ill population, especially focusing on children’s spiraling diseases: autism, diabetes, cancer and similar debilitating, life threatening illnesses.

### KI Creates Perfume to Addict Women to Pornography

The Kinsey Institute’s long history of bad and unapologetic child sexual abuse for their “research” means the KI is especially unqualified and ill-suited to address sexual issues. They are uniquely unseemly in their hijacking roughly \$711,000 from the National Institute of Child Health and Development (NICHD) to find ways to increase female responses to pornography (the only proven outcome of the tests proposed) or in their quest for the perfect “orgasmatron.” Anorgasms may be distressing for some, but even so it is hardly life threatening. Also, the evidence does not show that increased orgasms increase marital happiness or solvency. Philanderers, adulterers and rapists may have high rates of orgasms but such illicit orgasms disadvantage society.

### “Science Catches Woody Allen After 30 Years”

“It took 30 years, but science has finally caught up with Woody Allen, who in the 1973 hit “Sleeper” invented the “Orgasmatron”. Well, whatever the human mind can imagine, some sick scientist is sure to invent. Amazing to me it took 30 years....American researchers are investigating its potential for helping women who find it impossible to achieve orgasm. New Scientist magazine reports volunteers for the study are in short supply.”

The surgeon who patented the instant orgasm treatment expected many volunteers but absent a vulnerable student population he was “struggling to find people.”<sup>20</sup> Now the English press reported that “the Orgasmatron - an electrical device that, when connected to the appropriate nerves in the spinal cord, produces an automatic orgasm, just passed its

5TH ANNUAL NIGHT OF HONORS GALA  
TO RECOGNIZE CORPORATE LEADERS

### SEXUAL FANTASY, WOMEN AND FRAGRANCE

Cynthia A. Graham, Ph.D.  
Department of Psychology, Indiana University  
Erick Janssen, Ph.D., Stephanie A. Sanders, Ph.D.  
The Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction

There is very little in the way of scientific research on the role of fragrance in sexual response in women. The aim of our study was to explore the effects of fragrance on sensuality and mood in women at different phases of the menstrual cycle.

The study consisted of a laboratory-based experiment in which women wore scented “necklaces” as they observed a sexually erotic film, a sexually neutral film, or fantasized about pleasant sexual experiences. There were three different fragrance conditions: female perfume

(an aldehydic floral type), male cologne (a fresh fougere type), and a “blank” or control substance. Previous research had suggested that both sexual arousal and sense of smell might fluctuate over the menstrual cycle. We tested women at two different phases of their cycle: during the postmenstrual phase, and around the time of ovulation (mid-cycle). Both self-reported and physiological measures of sexual arousal and mood were used. Self-reported sexual arousal and mood were measured using brief  
*continued on page 6*



1997: The Kinsey Institute faculty uses dangerous and harmful pornography to discover the best “fragrance” for escalating female arousal to pornography. Magic and manipulation is redefined as “medicine” for tax and corporate funding.<sup>19</sup>

first set of clinical trials” with experimental subjects praising the automatic orgasm machine. Once the machine was returned however, said one woman, “climax is impossible without the Orgasmatron.”<sup>21</sup>

## **II. Defining Our Terms: The Psychopharmacology of Pornography**

Pornography is commonly defined as “Sexually explicit pictures, writing, or other material whose primary purpose is to cause sexual arousal.”<sup>22</sup>

*For our purposes we address only pictorial pornography.* Pictorial pornography is defined as the *display* of intimate “private” space conduct in risky public space. Commonly such images of females such as strippers, nude models, prostitutes consciously “provoke” and “arouse” lust in tandem with unconscious emotions of shame, fear and anger toward the displayed “female” gender (and often children) absent empathy or pity.

That children and illiterates instantly decode pornographic images proves that these stimuli subvert the cognitive tasks of (free) speech. Since viewers are untaught that right brain (emotion) pornographic images overwhelm left brain (cognition) such brain changes are non-consensual.

Pictorial pornography publicly and falsely displays women (and increasingly children) as primates in estrus—“in heat”—in seminude or nude animal postures of genital solicitation. These displays trigger discourteous, disordered and debasing attitudes and even conduct toward both sexual performers and proximate female and/or child victims.

Pornographic, endogenously produced lust, fear, shame and anger release; testosterone (brain steroid), sex-aggression endorphins (morphine like chemicals) oxytocin (bonding) nor epinephrine (adrenaline), glucose; dopamine, serotonin; phenylethylamine, etc.; an endogenous polydrug “high” mislabeled by the viewer as simple “sexual arousal” to displayed women, children, men, boys and/or animals, etc. Such confused states of lust with anger, fear and shame results in harassment, sex assault, rape, incest and the like.<sup>23</sup>

## **III. President Bush Proclaims “Protection from Pornography”**

### **Kinsey “Sexperts” Run Risky, Unscientific Pornography Experiments: Anticipate Big Tobacco Type Lawsuits**

*The Brave New World*, launched at the Kinsey Institute in 1948 with Alfred Kinsey and his team, is now financed by federal and state taxes as well as by Eli Lilly, Pfizer, Ford, Rockefeller and pornography traffickers like “The Sinclair Institute.” Senator Santorum noted that contemporary Kinsey research should be funded by pornographers not by taxpayers. Where does “child development” enter into such at-risk sex studies?

Some argue that exploiting university credibility to conscript trusting students as pornography “subjects” should be a criminal violation. Looking at President Bush’s



**“Protection From Pornography Week, 2003”** Proclamation, few normal people would risk being pornography test subjects were they aware they were being used for commercial purposes, or if they knew, said President Bush, of the “dangers of pornography”:

Pornography can have debilitating effects on communities, marriages, families, and children. During Protection from Pornography Week, we commit to take **steps to confront the dangers of pornography**.

### **Sexologists: ASECT & SSSS Pornography Trafficking Sales and Production**

Sex practitioners are “trained” by, hence often addicted, making pornography for sale.<sup>24</sup> The 1999 Joint Annual Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality and the American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists offered one of many accredited “courses” in pornography trafficking. As a “field” hostile to monogamous heterosexual marriage, they offer pornography as “sexual enrichment” for “couples.”

#### **Workshop X: "Couples" Sexual Enrichment: The Infusion of Instructional Erotic Videos Into the Marketplace (2.D Ces)<sup>25</sup>**

Presenter: *Patti Britton, Ph.D., Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality, Los Angeles, California*

If over 40% of women and 30% of men in America suffer from sexual problems, with lack of sexual desire ranking #1 among women, instructional erotic videos may be just what the doctor ordered! *Erotic videos may play a crucial role in the treatment of various sexual complaints*. Research shows they assist long-term, monogamous couples in their desire to renew their spark and to expand their sexual repertoire. Among the over 9,000 titles in the adult industry released annually, only a small number are designed for the purpose of couples' sexual enhancement. This workshop presents criteria for locating, selecting and evaluating potentially useful and valuable sexual enhancement videos from the barrage of materials available commercially today. By showing clips from 12 contemporary and newly released sexual enhancement videos, this will be a highly enriching and worthwhile workshop for directing and informing participants in their search for useful educational and clinical materials.<sup>26</sup>

#### **“Educational Learning Objectives: Participants Will Be Able To”**

Having desensitized and dehumanized love to robotic pornographic arousal, “Dr.” Britton of the IASHS (the ‘Harvard’ of the human sexuality field) follows up with a most outrageous falsehood, saying “[r]esearch shows” pornography use increases marital satisfaction. Hardly, unless the pornography “research” is conducted by pornography producers and marketers like the IASHS. The following pornographic marketing “Learning Objectives” for professional sexperts are outlined by Britton.

Educational Learning Objectives: At the conclusion of this workshop,

participants will be able to:

1. Name two resources for locating sexual enhancement videos.
2. Describe at least two criteria for selecting useful sexual enhancement videos.
3. Cite at least three videos in the sexual enhancement video genre and their main idea, or accurately describe their content and approach.
4. Identify those videos reviewed in this workshop which they believe will be most effective with target audiences served and why (page 20).

**“Note: There will be no nudity or sexual activity among the participants.”**

This conference, as have others of the sex training ilk, carries a warning that, “There will be no nudity or sexual activity among the participants.” One searches in vain among other medical or academic ‘professions’ to find such a warning embedded in their official brochures. This is the same pseudoscientific conference that warns its degreed participants that the SAR (a massive pornography show) is “not designed to provide cognitive information per se” but to fulfill the “values/attitudes training” needed to win accreditation. The SAR is designed for “sharing not intellectualizing.” Moreover, the conference brochure confirms the interviews I have had with SAR learners that during pornographic training, “students” have been known to strip and engage in sexual congress and sodomy.

#### **IV. Grants for Kinsey Institute Sex *Experimenters***

Having themselves undergone years of sexual desensitization and dehumanization, Kinsey Institute “researchers” are committed to training others as though these stimuli were proven harmless. Now we ask; how *and why* do sex “researchers” who groundlessly insist pornography is harmless, carry out brain studies and studies on “sexual development in children”? Following are some sex and drugs studies carried out by the Kinsey Institute. **Most subject students and other subjects to long term experimental exposure, claiming pornography is benign:** It is probable that all sex arousal studies have relied on pornography or “sexually explicit material” as their dependent variable. Since knowledge of its use could have caused the KI embarrassment, it is suggested that its use was hidden. Note I have suggested “[**Verify pornography use**]” throughout these experiments.

**Bancroft, Graham, Janssen: Pornography Experimenters for Pfizer, Lilly, etc.**

**1997, Cynthia Graham, Principal Investigator on research grant (\$33,803.00) Olfactory Research Fund, Ltd. [**Verify pornography use**]**

**1999, Co-investigator on research grant (\$65,664.00) Eli Lilly & Co. (Raloxifene study) [**Verify pornography use**]**

**2000, Co-investigator on research grant (\$25,000.00) Lilly Center for Women’s Health (Sexual inhibition and excitation study) [**Verify pornography use**]**

**“Drug Effects on Sexual Arousal in Women”**. Evaluate the effects of a new drug, in a **placebo-controlled study, on sexual arousal in women**. Principal Investigator: **Erick Janssen, Ph.D. Lilly-ICOS** Period: 06/01/00 - 06/01/01. [Verify pornography use]

“Sexual Inhibition and Excitation **as a Sexual Health Risk Factor**” S. A. Sanders, **Project Director**, with Cynthia Graham and Erick Janssen as co-investigators. **Funded by The Lilly Centre for Women's Health. \$25,000 Nov 2000-June 2003.**[Verify pornography use]

**"Predictors of Drug Utilization and Outcome in the Treatment of Male Erectile Dysfunction: A Pilot Study"** To investigate characteristics of the sexual relationship as possible predictor of therapeutic response to sildenafil in the treatment of **erectile dysfunction**. This study is being carried out together with three other centers. Principal Investigator: **John Bancroft, M.D. Agency: Robert Wood Johnson Medical School - UMDNJ**. Period: 01/01/99 - 12/30/00. [Verify pornography use]

**Evaluation of the Effects of Raloxifene on the Sexuality and Well Being of Women."** Principal Investigator: **John Bancroft, M.D. Agency: Eli Lilly & Co.** Type. Period: 02/01/99 - 07/31/00. Determine what benefits, other than prevention of bone loss, and any adverse effects, might result from use of raloxifene. [Verify pornography use]

**Oral Contraceptives, Testosterone, and Sexuality in Women."** Intercampus Research Grant in the amount of \$10,000. The investigators are: Teri Greco, MD, Internal Medicine Regenstrief Institute, IU; **Cynthia Graham, PhD**, Gender Studies and The Kinsey Institute, IU. Consultant on the project: John Bancroft, MD, The Kinsey Institute. [Verify pornography use]

**Study on Mood Arousal & Sexual Risk Taking (NICHD):** estimated \$470,000 over 2 years funding = estimated \$711,000 \$237,038 in FY03 [Verify pornography use] Title as of June 2003: Mood Arousal and Sexual Risk Taking Title in July 2003: Mechanisms Influencing Sexual Risk Taking Researcher: Janssen, Erik [Kinsey Institute] Grant Number: R13HD043068 Source: <http://silk.nih.gov/public/cbz2zoz.@www.fy2003.indiana.txt>

**Frontline:** Janseen Admits That KI Experiments Addict Male Subjects to “Extreme” Sadistic Pornography

**JAR NOTE:** This is a 2-year grant through 2005, assuming one more year of \$230,000 grants, this grant will receive another \$470,000. *Although we now know that Janssen and apparently Bancroft use pornography in their experiments, their use is found inadvertently throughout the KI website, while not commonly revealed in their grant requests.* For example, Janssen wrote of one of his joint experimental “studies,” apparently with John Bancroft, on men in Frontline:

**In a recent study at the Kinsey Institute** we found, rather surprisingly, that a group of highly sexually active men did not respond to porn clips that **had proven successful in eliciting sexual responses in earlier studies**. It was not until we provided them with a wide variety of porn clips to choose from, depicting **anything from group sex to sadomasochism (S&M), that we started to obtain clear signs of arousal**. We know little about why something may turn on one person, but not another....**Or why some like, or develop a liking for, more extreme forms of porn.**<sup>27</sup>

This is the addiction process at work, with the Kinsey Institute subjecting Indiana University students and others to pornography addiction, similar to that of Alfred Kinsey himself (who may have died due to self-inflicted urethra wounds). The KI researchers deny any potential harm to these “subjects” brains, minds, memories and conduct. If the “subjects” are not made aware of the absolute change of the structure of their brains by these stimuli, their subjects cannot give “informed consent” to their experimentation.

### **KI Subverts the ‘Human Subjects Review Board,’ Hiking Addiction “Dosage”**

Moreover, in order to increase the “dose” and reach the "more extreme forms of porn" the Kinsey Institute researchers would have not been able to be approved by the Indiana University human subjects review board. The HSRB would have to first approve the methodological research shift from the “earlier” “porn clips” to the “extreme” sadism (S&M) film clips. Hence, Janssen et al clearly violate their agreement with the HSRB, while not only does Janssen write of this in *Frontline*, but the KI former director John Bancroft approves of the article and announced it in their KI newsletter!

Abstract: [Yellow highlighting is provided by critic to identify the original grant proposal—sexual language was dropped in favor of more abstract terms.]  
DESCRIPTION (provided by applicant): Recommendations to study the role of mood and arousal in sexual decision making and risk taking have not yet been translated in much systematic research. This project focuses on the relationships between mood and arousal and investigates how these, separately and in interaction, influence sexual risk taking. The project will explore, in men and women, individual differences in these relationships, as well as underlying mechanisms. Mood is proposed to affect sexual risk taking in a direct manner, but also in interaction with sexual interest and arousal. Sexual interest and arousal themselves may be affected by positive and negative mood, but the degree and direction is proposed to vary from individual to individual, and to depend on a person's propensity for sexual excitation and inhibition. Negative mood (anxiety and depression) is hypothesized to lead to increased sexual risk taking, in particular in people whose sexual interest and arousability is not adversely affected by negative mood. In a series of laboratory studies, mood and sexual arousal will be induced and their individual and combined effects on sexual risk taking will be examined. A distinction will be made between positive and negative mood, sexual interest and arousal, and risk intent and behavior. A risk-taking paradigm is introduced that incorporates characteristics of established decision making tasks while increasing ecological validity for sexual behavior.

An additional objective of the research program involves the validation of a self-report measure (assessing the effects of mood on sexual interest, response, and behavior) that could be used to identify and target relevant populations in future prevention and intervention programs.

## V. Increasing Female Pornography Addiction/Arousal

34grant application. In reality, the Kinsey Institute study, like many other KI studies, would use a placebo and a neurochemical stimulant to try to heighten female arousal to pornography. **The only evidence of research success will be to find a drug that provably increases female arousal to pornography.**

“**Mood**” is not measurable—and further it is the causes for ones “mood” that are relevant and not the mood itself! While misleading the granting agencies, the tests would serve the pornography industry. *And indeed, on the evidence, a profitable arrangement exists between Kinsey researchers, pornographers and the sexual enhancement pharmaceutical industry* (p. 12).


### **Playboy: Substituting Pornography for a ‘Beloved’**

At right is one of hundreds of *Playboy*, “jokes”<sup>28</sup> identifying a too common role women now play in “the marital act.” Women have been the key firewall against pornography in hearth and home. Sex therapists often casually prescribe pornography for conflicted couples. A magic pill to arouse the female libido to pornography would let husbands fantasize centerfolds and others without guilt as their “partner” enters into and shares their disordered addiction.

Such pills could legally take the place of the spate of illegal “knock out drops” currently used to drug young boys and girls and women for sex. Instead, boys, girls and women could voluntarily and/or involuntarily ingest pills for joint pornography arousal to reach the ultimate big “O” of orgasm. That pornography leads many such vulnerable users into adult and child sexual abuse and child pornography is, despite sex industry noise to the contrary, fully confirmed by victim and perpetrator testimonies, research, common sense, empirical data and data on increased consumption.

### **Kinsey: Massive “Orgasms” As Life’s Goal to Happiness**

The commercialization of love is a known pathology. Kinsey, a recognized sexual psychopath who may have died due to his addictive orgasm quest, argued that the more orgasms the happier one is, independent of how one attains such orgasms. Already women nationwide are paying for surgery that dangerously tightens and resculpts their genital organs to resemble pornographic models in an effort to please their pornographically imprinted men.<sup>29</sup> That the Kinsey Institute could take the lead in malevolent “mad scientist” sex research is in keeping with its long history of abuse, including its mass child sexual abuse and its ongoing, defensive and unapologetic cover-up of its abuse record.



Millions of men, and even women are increasingly obsessed by pornography. Here a beautiful, young, wife/girlfriend asks her pornographically addicted lover, “Are you sure you still love me, Harry?” *Playboy*, circa 1972.

The Kinsey pornography research is fraudulent on its face. Any legitimate study of its alleged science would be sufficient to halt the work and recall test subjects for examination, decontamination and follow up. Moreover, the data strongly suggest that there are medications, stimulants, drugs used in these studies that are not specified in the grant proposal. Such fraud is especially liable under the “Qui Tam” provisions of the law.

### **NIH Scientists Tainted by Conflict of Interest Experiments**

I had wondered about the Kinsey claim to the federal committee investigating their funding that they were researching the effects of women's "mood" on sexual arousal to pornography since no scientific trial is adequate for such “mood” research. That such a bogus study passed the sexual critic’s “peer review” process is not surprising. Even legitimate science (which this is not) is too often tainted by bias, personal and special financial interest. Martin Sturman, MD reported:

University-based educators and researchers, as well as private practitioners, are in frequent contact with representatives from for-profit companies that provide "gifts" and financial support for teaching and research....Dr. Rosch also reports that a year ago 94% of the more than 5,000 scientists at NIH were engaged in lucrative conflict of interest activities, and that top officials had received over \$2.5 million in fees and stock options from drug companies over the past decade. In 2002, the pharmaceutical industry spent \$91.4 million on federal lobbying activities, and at least another \$50 million was spent to "influence Congress and others through advertising, direct mail, telemarketing, and grants. Drug companies had 675 registered lobbyists and 26 of these were former members of Congress."<sup>30</sup>

Since the entire “field” of sexuality was built on Kinsey’s fraudulent sex studies most human sexuality “peers” are irreparably compromised. That Congress approved giving tax money earmarked for children’s health to Kinsey Institute sex studies and that these pornography tests passed the Internal Review Board (IRB) for human experimentation is chilling.

### **Congress OK’d Unmonitored Female/Male Pornography Experiments**

There is no societal justification for tax paid "research" experiments using pornography. **Nor is there societal justification for taxpayers supporting the testing of pills or perfumes designed to pharmacologically increase women's and girls’ arousal to pornography or to create a Kinsey Institute “Orgasmatron.”**

Both the investigators and the sexual industry commonly profit from any “stimulating” discovery, a conflict of interest for any university. By definition the tax funded university is mandated to serve the health interests of the public. Instead, the Kinsey Institute at Indiana University experiments on girls and women, men and boys, unable to give informed consent to something neither the subject nor the researcher

understands. And, these are not experiments for commonly agreed upon “health” studies-- such as to eliminate breast or prostate cancer. One assumes that the Kinsey Institute researchers--mentally altered and tainted by their own long term pornography exposure-- do not warn their subjects of the Erototoxic/neurotoxic effects on their subjects’ brain structures, minds, memories and conduct.

## VI. The Kinsey Institute: Epicenter of the Sex Industrial Complex

The Kinsey Institute is the natural epicenter for the Sex Industrial Complex “research” using pornography to test new drugs that will covertly and overtly addict males and females, old and young to pornography and sex. The new drugs and scents are critical to cover up what is anecdotally found to be a massive increase in pornographically induced impotence. That is, young and healthy men who cannot achieve a sexual climax without “seeing” or fantasizing a pornographic image. The sexology profession has been using and prescribing such Erototoxins recreationally and medically for decades.

### Sexology, KI Funded by *Playboy*: Kinsey Team Pornography Addiction

The “field” of sexology was financed initially by pornographers (*Playboy* magazine was an early Kinsey Institute patron). Sexologists serve(d) as expert witnesses in obscenity trials and “advisors” (*Penthouse* Forum) while producing and selling their own ‘academic’ pornography (see *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* for full documentation).

Now the “field” of sexology is given tax dollars to use the toxic pornography to which many subjects are already addicted, to find the magic drug, smell, image that will truncate their impotence long enough for the victim attain some kind of sexual climax—to pornography with or without a partner. The Kinsey research would be critical to normalizing pornography as the gateway to the “virtual sex” of the “Orgasmatron.” Marketing full arousal and climax absent any other human will be reconstructed as a “medical advance.” The “Brave New World.” Shortly, I will identify the connection between these new psychotropic sexual training devices and the Kinsey Institute’s *Childhood Sexual Development* book and its effort to eliminate “child” and “abuse” from our vocabulary and to substitute Kinsey’s claim of children as “sexual” beings.

### KI & IU Pornography Addiction Lawsuits in the Wings

However, this is hardly what Indiana taxpayers should pay for. It is certainly not what Congress earmarked millions of tax dollars for. This is a lawsuit just waiting to happen. All Kinsey Institute grant information, from the 1960s to today, should be investigated immediately. Now the sex industry may already have covertly been funding the Kinsey Institute search for the female Viagra, or the magic bullet that will addict more females (young and old) to pornography. This would explain the quest for a powerful drug or sent that may stimulate sexual lust in girls and women.

After my expose in *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* (1998, 2000, 2003) the Kinsey Institute changed its subtitle for its stock photo from “Dr. Alfred Kinsey interviewing a respondent to his survey” to “A very common image associated with Kinsey” (elsewhere in the Wikipedia citation). Recently the Kinsey Institute included the name of the staff member who posed for the fake ‘Susie Homemaker’ photograph. Below is a leftist web encyclopedia entry for Kinsey.

This entry *correctly* credits Kinsey with “single-handedly” forming “the academic field of sexology,” as I fully document both in *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* and in *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*. Hence, all “experts” in the sexuality field are Kinsey trained by definition and are therefore compromised by Kinsey’s crimes and the pseudo-science that was passed off as science to the world.

### **The Institutional History: Alfred Charles Kinsey**

Kinsey was 62 years old when he died in 1956, apparently of complications from “orchitis” a sexually transmitted disease commonly associated with multiple male partners. Kinsey, a gall wasp specialist, officially began “studies” sexuality in the mid-1930s and founded the Kinsey Institute at IU in Bloomington in 1947—the Kinsey Institute has had several names. The leftist encyclopedia, “Wikipedia” reported:

Kinsey single-handedly created the academic field of **sexology**. ....Articles about him appeared in magazines such as *TIME*, *Life*, *Look*, and *McCall's*. His reports were regarded by many as a trigger for the **sexual revolution** of the 1960s. **Conservative** groups, especially **Christian** and **right-wing** groups attacked Kinsey for what they saw as his immoral and dangerous **research**.

### Kinsey Lied: Seduced His Male Students, Tortured Himself, Made Pornography

The KI has a long and well recorded history of lying to IU, other scientists, their funders and the entire world—even of using known pedophiles to collect “data” for the KI on what was passed off to the world as child sexuality. Kinsey admirer, James H. Jones's biography *Alfred C. Kinsey: A Public/Private Life*, documented Kinsey as a bisexual sadomasochist. Wikipedia even states he:

....reportedly seduced his [graduate students](#) and his staff, inserted a [toothbrush](#) into his [urethra](#), tied [rope](#) around his [testicles](#) and pulled, and once gave himself an [unanesthetized circumcision](#). He is also reported to have encouraged [group sex](#) among his staff and to have coerced his wife, his staff, and his staff's wives into making [pornographic films](#) in the family attic.

Jones states that Kinsey's wife had sex with other men, but that the couple remained married for 35 years, in a relationship that remained sexual until Kinsey became ill near the end of his life. None of these accounts of Kinsey's own sex life are supported by official statements from the Kinsey Institute. While a few of them



have been confirmed by other biographers, such as [Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy](#), others are of doubtful veracity.<sup>31</sup>

Child sexual abuse is fully confirmed as conducted under the auspices of the Kinsey Institute and exploited by Kinsey as a witness as “truth” and fact in both *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953). The above Kinsey friendly biography was cited to briefly summarize some of the pathological data revealed by Kinsey hagiographers, Jones and Hardy, and to identify the pro Kinsey Institute position on these charges.

Jones’ Confirmed by Gathorne-Hardy: Never Legally Challenged

None of the statements in Jones’ very laudatory book on Kinsey have been legally challenged by the Kinsey Institute. Nor has any documentation emerged to disprove Jones’ statements; most were actually begrudgingly confirmed by Gathorne-Hardy. Moreover, the Indiana University Chancellor, Gross Louis (sp) confirmed that after viewing the film, Kinsey, the son, Robert Kinsey admitted that the description of his parent’s marriage as orgiastic was correct.


Note that both authors are enamored of Kinsey and celebrate his “contributions” to sexuality. Despite their admissions of foul play, neither hagiographer has called for any investigation of Kinsey’s child sexual abuse protocol, a public apology, or a publicity release seeking any surviving of Kinsey’s young victims. Jones and Gathorne-Hardy revealed Kinsey’s sexual disorders in the British, Yorkshire Television documentary, “Kinsey’s Paedophiles.” Given kudos throughout Great Britain, the documentary has been censored from the US mainstream media. There is unparalleled mass media protection of the Sex Industrial Complex and its plans for child sex in the *Brave New World*.

AGE WHEN OBSERVED	PRE-ADOLESCENT EXPERIENCE IN ORGASM					
	TOTAL POPULATION	CASES NOT REACHING CLIMAX	CASES REACHING CLIMAX	CUMULATED POPULATION	CUMULATED CASES TO CLIMAX	PERCENT OF EACH AGE REACHING 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.”

Briefly: Kinsey's Child Sex Abuse Research Protocol



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**

Before proceeding to look at the alleged experts in the Kinsey Institute book, *Childhood Sexual Development*, let us close this discussion with a brief look at the new Kinsey Institute Director, Cynthia Heiman.

**VII. Cynthia Heiman Kinsey Institute Director Has Pornography Patrons**

Pornography creates a dependence on pictures for sexual climax. Hence pornography induces impotence (“without power;” the inability to perform sexually without using fantasy stimuli). Now, impotence pills via Pfizer, Vivus are all or soon will all be covered by Medicare—so impotence has become a billion dollar industry. Cynthia Heiman, employed by Pfizer, Vivus and the Sinclair Institute (a pornography trafficker) has headed a series of pornography-based studies for the pharmaceuticals in both her last position and at the Kinsey Institute.

Heiman seeks the female Viagra pill and via her contact with Sinclair, independent wealth. Her "clinical" and "reproductive" history at the University of Washington hospital in Seattle was focused on the search for the female Viagra pill, using pornography to try and recreate intimate “relationships” among couples, a ludicrous and wholly unscientific theory. As documented below, Dr. Heiman was a “Distinguished lecturer” at the Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality--a pornographically obsessed sex “training” agency--and an employee of The Sinclair Institute, a rather bland name for a major Internet pornography marketing business selling “anal fun” kits, a painful, AIDS efficient and disembodied conduct restructured by pornographers as a “sex” act.

**Heiman's IASHS Collusion**

Some of the official statements on The Kinsey Institute webpage follow for Julia R. Heiman, Ph.D. “Curriculum Vita.” Dr. Heiman does state that she provided “New

directions in sex therapy (1981, October)” in a “Lecture for the Advanced Institute of Human Sexuality, San Francisco.” However, the IASHS lists her as one of their “Distinguished Lecturers” -- a more extensive affiliation than one lecture.

### **Heiman’s Pornography as Ideological and/or Economic Collusion**

By exposing students and others to high doses of pornography at the Kinsey Institute she and her aides are creating some number of pornography addicts with a variety of sexual and sociosexual disorders, dangerous to women and children. Dr. Heiman forcefully denies any possibility of harm from pornography exposure. However, as she is in the pay and/or the arms of the pornography industry, such protests must be viewed as self-serving meritless. In her resume of “**Responsibilities Special National and International Responsibilities,**” Dr. Heiman sandwiches her 1993—and current commercial pornography ties, in between two NIH advisory committees.

National Institute of Mental Health IRG Study Section, Member of Violence and Traumatic Stress Research Review Committee, 1992

### **Heiman’s Sinclair Institute, Professional Advisory Council, 1993-present**

National Institutes of Health, Special Reviewer, 1992-present

NIH committees are unpaid or token paid appointments that do not usually indicate a conflict of interest unless a member’s paid associations are hidden. However, The Sinclair Institute is a pornography/“sex toys” (implements) business.

Some of the pornography videos Dr. Heiman uses in her tax funded “research” would perhaps *still* qualify as “obscene” or at least “indecent” under the law. Malpractice would be an appropriate charge as Heiman via Sinclair pornography recommends various consumers engage in various acts that induce dysfunctions, including AIDS productive acts like anal sodomy.

Dr. Heiman and other “sexologists” on the “Sinclair Institute” advisory committee are also on faculty at the IASHS. Schoen, the Sinclair director, was the distributor of FOCUS videos, the first “academic” pornography. Sinclair’s pornography website announces:

### **About The Producers [Quoting Verbatim]**

---

“The Sinclair Institute is dedicated to producing educational products under the guidance of professionals. The Sinclair Institute Professional Advisory Council helps guide the company's product development to ensure each video reflects the concerns and needs of healthy, monogamous couples who want to enhance their sexual intimacy. The council reviews products for accuracy, usefulness, lay language, ethic/cultural sensitivity, topic necessity and production value, especially concerning explicit scenes that are inherent to an education topic of this nature.

Council members throughout the U.S. include respected sex therapist, researchers, clergy, educators and professional association representatives who advise the company in the best interests of the consumer.”

### **Sexologists “On Our Advisory Council”**

**“The Sinclair Intimacy Institute is proud to be affiliated with the following professionals who serve on our Advisory Council.”**

The following professionals serve on the Professional Advisory Council

Dr. Clive Davis, University of Syracuse

Dr. Julia Heiman, University of Washington Medical Center

Dr. Joseph LoPiccolo, University of Missouri – Columbia

Dr. Mark Schoen, Focus International

Dr. Richard J Cross, Princeton, NJ

Dr. Marian Dunn, State University of New York – Brooklyn

Ms. Isadora Alman, San Francisco, CA

Dr. Beverly Whipple, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Dr. William Stayton, Th.D., University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Sandra Cole, University of Michigan

Dr. Howard Ruppel, Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality

Dr. Shirley Zussman, Editor of "Sex Over 40" Newsletter

Ms. Pamela Boyle, Consultant in Sexuality and Disability, Holbrook, NY.

### **Heiman Supports AIDS/Anal Sodomy and Criminal Child Lust**

The Sinclair catalogue opens with “soft” pornography, the side bars offering the harder (what was once called obscene) Erototoxins. Sinclair’s <http://www.bettersex.com> sells both homosexual and heterosexual pornography as well as “bondage,” that is sadistic pornography training kits, anal sodomy “play kits” and various instruments for insertion in various places. Documentary filmmaker and professor, Chung Sun reported recently:

Pornography encourages people to disregard others' pain for one's own pleasure. Many people I interviewed acknowledged that, based on their own experience and knowledge of the human body, certain sex acts they've watched in films likely would have been painful for the female performers.... [A]s pornography becomes increasingly mainstream, it is not surprising that women's use of pornography is rising. Pornographers are eager to explore the female market, with some claiming to make women-centered pornography. However, looking at the repetitive content, whether male-centered or female-centered, the essential message is the same: All women want sex all the time, in whatever fashion men want them.<sup>32</sup>

Sinclair advisors like Dr. Heiman avow these painful and dehumanizing plastics improve the intimacy and joy of human sexual “relationships.” Yet, *receptive* anal sodomy (and women are commonly “receptive” in anal sodomy) is notably painful while the damage to the anal walls and fecal leaks as reported by AIDS research, leads

to a broad spectrum of debilitating sexual diseases, including AIDS. In the face of its fatal effects, the Heiman/Sinclair “anal play kit” encourages women to engage in high risk sex acts to please their pornographically addicted men. The fallout to children (boys and girls) both violated by pornographically stimulated predators and imitating these predators (“copy cats”) would not be lost on the Sinclair “advisors.”

Heiman/Sinclair also sell anal sodomy as film videos for those needing added instruction. They never reveal that the condom is unapproved for anal sodomy, despite millions of dollars invested by the government to create a condom for anal use. This opens up Sinclair and all of their “experts” to a massive class action lawsuit for anyone who was infected by a sexually transmitted disease, including HIV/AIDS.<sup>33</sup>

[A] [blog published last month by Dr. Judith Reisman](#), a conservative pundit, calls for a “class action lawsuit by AIDS victims and their loved ones” against groups such as “AIDS Healthcare Foundation, Planned Parenthood and a myriad of teachers and school systems, too many to count.”<sup>34</sup>

No roses, no candy, no wine, no reading of Shakespeare here, not *As You Like It* or *Twelfth Night*, not even a *Taming of the Shrew* (and surely not the Bible) to learn about intimacy and love. Instead, the following are chosen by the Heiman/ Sinclair “professional staff.” Heiman/Sinclair would have couples share “Anal Play” and other devices, all of which are symptomatic of pornography addiction.

1. [O'My Clitoral Stimulating Gel](#)
2. [Liberator Shapes Combo](#)
3. [Double Dolphin](#)
4. [Sinclair's Satiny Smooth Lubricant](#)
5. [Clone-A-Willy "Do-It-Yourself Vibe"](#)
6. [Cyberskin Twin Teaser](#)
7. [Optimum Power Stroker](#)
8. [Perfect Pleaser](#)
9. [Better Sex Gel Lubricant](#)
10. [Anal Play Kit](#)

**Beads, Balls & Bullets**

Looking for that extra special accessory to make your sex life that much better? [Use these](#) for anal, vaginal, or any type of stimulation that you desire. Have a ball!



see all >>

**Anal Play**

Many couples partake in anal sex. We have the [tools \(and toys\)](#) to explore anal play and help dispel negative myths.

**Heiman is a “Sinclair**



**Select”**

**Anal Play Kit**  
~~\$49.99~~ \$34.93

We've created a filtering process called [Sinclair Select](#) to find the best sex-positive movies. Every adult movie we sell is reviewed by a sex therapist, sex educator or psychologist to ensure compliance with our story, technical and sex criteria...

### Staff Picks

Watching adult movies is a normal activity and can be a healthy choice within relationships. Our staff carefully hand-picked [these movies](#) because we understand that people who don't quite know what they are looking for may need our professional recommendations."

## Heiman Supports Hazardous "Sex Toys" and Pornography Videos



Heiman's pornography patron also sells "wrist and ankle cuffs" (~~39.90~~ \$29.90 at right) designed for "bondage play." Let us translate. This is a sadistic activity, tying one up and acting out forms of abuse due to the person being bound. This is called "S&M" (pain) and often involves whips and other forms of abuse. Women and children nationwide are increasingly forced into harmful and debasing acts taught here at the Sinclair market. Sinclair sells a pornography video called "shaved pleasures," (right). With child pornography illegal, "legitimate" pornographers have long resorted to the "pseudo child," an adult with shaved pudenda, often in a child's clothing.

## Heiman's S&M Equipment: Advertising Handcuffed Girl

Those in the child protection field are fully aware that this is in imitation of the child's hairless pudenda. The ad copy reads: "Nude pubes put a fresh twist" on sex. It is a highly pornographic text, concluding with "don't be surprised if you never go back!" (reduced to \$14.95). Go back to what, or to who?

The dildos sold shaped like the phallus are now fairly common knowledge; lesbian and male homosexual videos speak for themselves. The image on a video "pillow talk" is another cue for anal sodomy as is the "ball" advertised above. Below right is another "bondage" film by Heiman's pornography marketers.

Here is a very young woman? Handcuffed as a sexual victim. Law enforcement has seen thousands of victims tied in this manner, commonly by pornography addicts, who let loose their violence on their "willing" victim. Some women, girls and boys have been killed after they have been tied in this manner and



sodomized and raped for days. Although the ad copy uses the standard cover about "willing" partners, a close look at this young girl who is allegedly having "fun," discovers an expression not of joy or fun but of fear, shame and coercion.



This is "academics" in the sex field. As Kinsey Institute

pornography marketers it is impossible for them to be truthful about the harm of their current “research” activities. These advertisements remember are for Julia Heiman’s “Approved Product Sales” at the Sinclair “institute.” A review of her lecture credits finds that the Kinsey Institute’s Heiman is paid—and trusted—to teach others about better relationships between husband and wife and about AIDS Prevention. Yet, her business partners sell “gay” pornography “balls” to insert in one’s private parts and “anal play” “toys” to “dispel negative myths”!!!

### **Heiman’s Grants are 95% Sex Experiments, 5% “Cancer”**

Heiman has scores of grants from NIH. Her grants from Pfizer are largely to seek the female equivalent of Viagra (below). It’s as though you gave carte blanche to university researchers (and remember, the tax payer has paid for their education to serve in the public interest) to work for Big Tobacco. No surprise to find these researchers claim that tobacco is harmless although the “scholars” research how best to manipulate the public into tobacco consumption—while the tax payer foots the bill.

The Kinsey Institute pornography collusion is much worse.  
[95% sex arousal studies versus 5% cancer studies]

### **Heiman’s Official Kinsey Institute Website Resume**

Teaching Responsibilities: [She widely teaches, I included only the first cite here]

Human sexuality lectures for medical students, co-director of sex therapy practicum for graduate students, didactics in sexual dysfunction for residents, tutorials in psychophysiology, supervision of marital and sex therapy for students and residents, post-doctoral seminars in sociobiology and sexuality, CME lectures: all at SUNY Stony Brook, 1976 1980.

#### **Research Funding Active (2000-2003)**

Heiman, J. - PI, 10% effort 03/31/99 - **07/31/03 Pfizer, Inc.** \$322,636 A Double-Blind, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Two-Way Crossover Study to Determine Effect of A Single Dose of Sildenafil on the Vascular Component of the Sexual Arousal Response Measured Using Vaginal Photoplethysmography in **Patients with Female Sexual Arousal Disorder** [Verify pornography use]

Dager, S. - PI, Heiman, J. Co-Investigator - 25% effort 07/01/00 - 06/30/05-start delayed until 07/01/01 National Institute of Mental Health - 2ROI MH 50579-04A2 \$2,117,503 Brain Metabolism and Treatment Outcome in Panic Disorder.

**George, W. -- PI, Heiman, J. Co-PI - 10% effort 09/01/01 - 11/30/06 National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism \$1,250,000 Alcohol Myopia, Sexual Arousal & HIV/AIDS Risk-Taking. [On point, conflict of interest, see Sinclair sales of anal kits for “fun.”] [Verify pornography use]**

Aubin, S. PI, Heiman, J. Research Mentor/Co Investigator, 5% effort (Fellowship Training Grant) 09/01/2001-08/31/03 (no cost extension to 03/01/04 Ford Foundation/Social Science Research Council \$88,000 The Impact of a Combined Treatment Approach on the Quality of Sexual and Marital Life in Couples Presenting with a Diagnosis of Erectile Dysfunction. [Verify pornography

use]

Heiman, J - PI-5% effort 03/01/03 - **03/01/04 Vivus, Inc.** \$37,520 Randomized, Double-blind, Placebo-controlled Evaluation of Topical Alprostadil Administered at Home for the Treatment of Premenopausal Women with Female Sexual Arousal Disorder (FSAD) (FSD 08) [**Verify pornography use**]

Heiman, J - PI-5% effort 10/01/02 - 12/31/03 **Pfizer, Inc. \$48,563** A Randomized, Double-Blind, Double-Dummy, Placebo-Controlled, Fixed Dose, Multi-Center Study to Evaluate the Efficacy, Safety and Toleration of Oral Sildenafil [**VIAGRA**] Administered for 12 Weeks to Premenopausal Women Who have been Diagnosed with Female Sexual Arousal Disorder [**Verify pornography use**]

Heiman, J - PI-5% effort 10/01/02 - 12/31/03 **Pfizer, Inc. (contained in above protocol amount)** A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Fixed Dose, Multi-Center Study to Evaluate the Efficacy, Safety and Toleration of Oral Sildenafil Administered for 12 Weeks to Post-menopausal Women Who have been Diagnosed with Female Sexual Arousal Disorder [**Verify pornography use**]

Brotto, L.--PI, Heiman, J. Research Mentor/Co Investigator,5% effort (Fellowship Training Grant) **07/01/03-06/30/05 Ford** Foundation/Social Science Research Council \$88,000 Sexual Arousal in Women with Cervical Cancer following Hysterectomy: **Understanding Subjective and Physiological Sexual Arousal after a Brief, Psychoeducational Intervention** [**Verify pornography use-what intervention?**]

Heiman, J - PI-5% effort 5/1/03 - 12/31/04 **Pfizer, Inc. \$44,100** A Multicenter, Randomized, Parallel Group, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Flexible Dose Escalation Study to Evaluate the Sexual and Relationship Satisfaction in the **Female** Partner of Men with Erectile Dysfunction Treated with Viagra (sildenafil citrate) in the United States [**Verify pornography use**]

Nurnberg, G - PI, Heiman, J - Co-Investigator-5% effort 7/01/03 - 12/31/04 **Pfizer, Inc.** \$40,000 Double-Blind, Placebo Controlled Study of Sildenafil for Serotonergic Antidepressant Associated Sexual Dysfunction in Women. [**Verify pornography use**]

Is Dr. Heiman testing [Sinclair?] pornography on women for Pfizer at the Kinsey Institute? Do they test sex “toys” sold by the Sinclair institute??? If Not, Why Not? If The Former Is Ok, Why Not The “Anal Play” And “Shaved Pleasures” Etc.?

Maravilla, K - PI, Heiman, J - Co-Investigator-5% effort 10/15/03 - 10/15/04 **Pfizer, Inc. \$99,920** A **Double-Blind, Placebo Controlled 2-way Cross-over Study to Assess the Clitoral Engorgement Response as Measured by Non-contrast Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) in Women with Female Sexual Arousal Disorder (FSAD) When Administered a Single Dose of Sildenafil (100mg) Followed by Audio/visual Sexual Stimulation** [**Verify pornography use**]

**Completed (1999-2003)**

Maravilla, K., - PI, Heiman, J. Co-Investigator -5% effort 05/01/99 - 06/30/01 **Pfizer, Inc.** \$132,040 A Phase 1 Methodology Study Assessing the Use of AngioMARK Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging to



**Demonstrate Genital Response to Visual/Audio Sexual Stimulation in Healthy Women** [Verify pornography use]

Maravilla, K., - PI, Heiman, J. Co-Investigator -5% effort 09/99 - **06/01 Pfizer, Inc.** \$27,000 Brain Functional MRI Study to Identify Sites of Brain Activation in Response to Sexual Arousal in Normal Pre-and Postmenopausal Women [Verify pornography use]

Heiman, J - PI,-5% effort 4/30/99 - 6/30/02 **Pentech Pharmaceutical** \$76,537 Double-Blind, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Multi-Center, Parallel, Safety And Efficacy Study Of Apomorphine SI Tablets For The Treatment Of Female Sexual Dysfunction [Verify pornography use]

Heiman, J - PI-5% effort 02/01/01 - 01/31/02 **Vivus, Inc. \$74,388 In-clinic** Evaluation of the Safety and Efficacy of Topical Alprostadil (PGE1) for the Treatment of Female Sexual Arousal Disorder [Verify pornography use]

Heiman, J - PI-5% effort 04/01/02 - 03/31/03 **Vivus, Inc. \$76,833 Prospective**, Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Evaluation of Topical Alprostadil Administered at Home for the Treatment of Women with Female Sexual Arousal Disorder (FSAD) (Vivus FSD 06) [Verify pornography use]

Heiman, J - PI-5% effort 12/01/02 - 7/01/03 **Vivus, Inc. \$20,525 Collection of Sexual Information in a Four-Week Outpatient Study in Normal Women (Vivus FSD 07)** [Verify pornography use]

Heiman, J - PI-5% effort 05/01/01 - 12/31/01 **Pfizer, Inc. \$23,740 Testing the Feasibility and Reliability of Sexual Response Measurement in Women** [Verify pornography use]

Sryjala, K. - PI, Heiman, J., Co-Investigator - 5% effort 01/28/99 - 05/31/03 National Cancer Institute - RO1 CA 63030-05A \$1,650,000 Enhancing Recovery from Blood and Marrow Transplantation [what there?]

**Heiman is “Designing Women” -- *The Washington Post***

Note below excerpts from washingtonpost.com, “Designing Women,” article on the Kinsey Institute’s Cynthia Heiman. Congressman Souder said the Kinsey Institute should be funded by the pornography business. According to *The Washington Post* article<sup>35</sup> Heiman worked for the Sex Industrial Complex, testing drugs to increase women’s arousal to pornography. Heiman has continued this effort at the Kinsey Institute, where she has the Indiana University prestige to cover her/their involvement in the search for a female Viagra, pill or odor, or “hotter” female focused pornography.

I said earlier, one assumes Heiman and the others have good financial arrangements with the sex industry for their "studies." This has been confirmed since. The suggestion to let the pornography and pharmaceutical industries fund the KI instead of the taxpayer, seems wise.

Writing in "Designing Women,"<sup>36</sup> an apt title considering the aims of the Heiman studies, reporter Cynthia Gorney observes that "Scientists and capitalists dream of finding a drug that could boost female sexuality." Gorney reports that Heiman ran the lab at the University of Washington hospital in Seattle, giving volunteers a placebo or one of several female arousal pills, to see if any increased the woman's sexual arousal to pornography. Gorney followed one young woman "subject," and noted that she appeared "cooperative but dubious" as she was put into the MRI machine to be measured while she watched pornography. Again:

Scientists and capitalists dream of finding a drug that could boost female sexuality. . . In the research departments of certain pharmaceutical companies around the country, there is a wondrously clinical name for scenarios of this genre; they are called **Visual Sexual Stimulation** . . . .They had told me about . . . .medical conferences. . . .with **researchers and business people** mingling in the friendly cutthroat way of **colleagues who understand that staggering sums of money are almost certainly at stake. . . . The goal, the anticipated source of these staggering sums of money, is a women's equivalent to Viagra. . . .**

Heiman signed "confidentiality agreements" that prohibit her from disclosing details about what products they're testing and how they're conducting the tests.<sup>37</sup> The studies use a photoplethysmograph—a blood flow device shaped like a tampon wired to measure the woman's degree of pornography arousal. Gorney reports that female researchers picked the pornography for the Heiman's test subjects.



photoplethysmograph


Considering the exposure of these vulnerable subjects, it is especially relevant that these women, professional researchers, claim that viewing the "stacks of explicit videos" was traumatic; "**the worst two weeks of my life,**" said one woman. How do they think these "subjects" felt after leaving the laboratory? Heiman said, "You sell things off insecurity. And I think women are so subject to this." Yet, she continues to do so.

In the presence of these products, if some of them work the way they're supposed to, what will "normal" be? Who will define it? How hard might it become for women to distinguish among what they want, what the men with them want, and what glossy product marketing seems to be suggesting they should want?

The Sex Industrial Complex claims it has all the answers for sexual satisfaction.

## The Sex-Industrial Complex

The pornography industry is a part of a much larger sex-industrial complex that likewise includes pharmaceutical companies and the field of professional sexology. Each constituent helps feed the other, resulting in billion-dollar profits for all.




Revealing either the naiveté of a child, wishful thinking, or a scientific denial designed to hide the truth from herself, Heiman solves this psychopharmacological attack on normality by saying women should “have a conversation about it.” Gorney’s conclusion follows. It is worth pondering as these “studies” push the sexual dehumanization envelope, launched with *Playboy* magazine in 1954 forward, farther and farther. Young girls, raised with *Playboy* in the house, longed to look and act like the centerfold. As they grew, they would ask--as did scores of *Playboy* cartoons with several versions of a man having sex with a centerfold opened up on top of his “partner’s” body -- “Are you sure you still love me, Harry?”

Women, including tough, professional women, will do almost anything to win their man's attention and love, over that of paper and celluloid dolls. This insecurity, this fear of loss and of becoming married in name only, is not missed by Heiman and her Sinclair pornography and her pharmaceutical arousal funders. But Gorney, perhaps intuiting that orgasms are hardly proofs of "love" notes the following:

Gorney reports that the experimental "subject" reported she hoped she was given a placebo. No one told her and if it was the drug, she feared nothing could be done to help save her marriage. She left, "looking again as though she was about to cry."

I now knew nothing about her at all, not her detailed physical and psychological history, nor the private anatomy of her marriage, nor how willing she might be to risk the side effects of an ingested medication.... She had spoken to me for a little more than half an hour, which is longer than many medical consults are permitted to run these days; surely enough time, though, for a sympathetic physician to look in a supply cabinet for the samples left behind by the last pharmaceutical company rep...and somebody's investment comes a little closer to paying off. Is that a good thing, or not?<sup>38</sup>

Indeed, "is that a good thing or not?" *Rapists and child molesters have "orgasms" as do mad rapist murderers—that is their reward.* Kinsey to the contrary, an "orgasm" does not testify to the health of a relationship. Many dysfunctional relationships make amends by multiple orgasms. Many loving married couples do not have multiple, ongoing orgasms. As all couples want the "best" marriage, the expert's insistence on



orgasms as a measure of love is highly destructive to couples and the civil society. A loving, honoring relationship involves a much different set of phenomena.

## **VIII. Dr. Layden: Addiction and a Flow Chart--Sexology to the Public**

In fact the “orgasm pill,” normalizing both obsessive “orgasm” quests and pornography, is surely a very bad thing for women, children, men and the civil society. In her expert witness testimony before the US Senate looking at pornography effects Dr. Mary Anne Layden Director of Education, Director Center for Cognitive Therapy Social Action Committee for Department of Psychiatry Women's Psychological Health University of Pennsylvania summarized her findings said:

1. I treat sexual violence victims, perpetrators, and sex addicts.
2. Every case of sexual violence that I have treated has involved pornography.
3. Sexual violence and pathology involves distortions called permission-giving beliefs.
4. Many psychological problems and social problems show traces of these distortions.
5. The media spreads the distortion called Pornography Distortion.
6. Research finds that pornography spreads these distorted beliefs including the belief that children are not harmed by pornography.
7. Visual images are mentally stored facts, events.
8. Visual images are stored permanently.
9. Children are especially vulnerable to images.
10. The Internet contains the three factors that produce antisocial behavior in children.
11. Sexual violence and pathology are frequent.
12. We cannot accept a society where the factors that hurt children are spread in the schools and libraries.<sup>39</sup>

Now, before proceeding to examine the Bancroft text book, *Childhood Sexual Development*, it is informative to re-read Aldous Huxley's report of the erotic training of children and the views of child sex in his *Brave New World*.

## **IX. The *Brave New World* of Kinsey-Huxley and Child Sex**

After giving us a tour of the hatcheries where designer babies are produced, Huxley introduces us to the *Brave New World*, sex education program that has been the target for Kinsey Institute sexologists for decades. The pornography (“sexually explicit images”) currently shown to young children world-wide as sex instruction and “AIDS Prevention” desensitizes and conditions children to separate sexual conduct from the civilizing expectations of privacy, love, marriage and parenthood. The following excerpt is from *Brave New World*, Chapter Three:

Outside, in the garden, it was playtime. Naked in the warm June sunshine... [the children played] a rudimentary sexual game.... From a neighboring shrubbery emerged a nurse, leading by the hand a small boy... What's the matter?" asked the Director.

.... "Nothing much," she answered. "It's just that this little boy seems rather reluctant to join in the ordinary erotic play..." "I'm taking him in to see the Assistant Superintendent of Psychology. Just to see if anything's at all abnormal."

\* \* \*

For a very long period before the time of Our Ford, and even for some generations afterwards, erotic play between children had been regarded as abnormal (there was a roar of laughter); and not only abnormal, actually immoral (no!): and had therefore been rigorously suppressed.

..... Poor little kids not allowed to amuse themselves? .... "Even adolescents," the D.H.C. was saying, "even adolescents like yourselves ... " "Not possible!" "Barring a little surreptitious auto-erotism and homosexuality - absolutely nothing."

"Nothing?" "In most cases, till they were over twenty years old." "Twenty years old?" echoed the students in a chorus of loud disbelief. "Twenty," the Director repeated. "I told you that you'd find it incredible." "But what happened?" they asked. "What were the results?"

"The results were terrible." A deep resonant voice broke startlingly into the dialogue.

**“The results” are in now. Based on the rates of juvenile suicide, crime, sex offenses, venereal disease, illegitimacy, depression and so on, the results of allowing Kinseyan sexologists to train our youth are “terrible.”**

## **X. Kinsey “Experts” on *Childhood Sexual Development (Incomplete)***

As noted above, several of the contributors to the Kinsey Institute conference on *Childhood Sexual Development*—John Bancroft, Erick Janssen, Cynthia Heiman, Stephanie Saunders and Cynthia Graham are implicated in a conflict of interest between the pansexual Kinsey Institute and the public right to a civil society. Since there is no other “field” of human sexuality except that which was founded by Kinsey, all sexuality experts, as I said, are, by definition, Kinseyans (see the graph at right).

This flow chart identifies how Kinsey’s fraudulent sexuality “training,” begun at IU, evolved as sexual dogma for psychologists, psychiatrists, anthropologists, teachers, clergy, police, law, medicine, education, sex education, etc., kindergarten to post doctorate.

Due to lack of time, I will cite only a few of the key contributors here: John Bancroft, Philip Jenkins, J. Michael Bailey, Anke A. Ehrhardt, David Finkelhor, J. Dennis

Fortenberry, Julia R. Heiman, Gilbert Herdt, Erick Janssen, Edward O. Laumann, Stephanie A. Sanders and Cynthia Graham.

Originally *John Marshall* of Canada was identified as on the contributors list, but in my phone conversation with Dr. Marshall (January 27, 2005, ~ 4:00 PM) I found that Dr. Marshall never agreed to join the conference due to a prior commitment. Marshall is a well-known child protection advocate and has identified the significant harms of pornography exposure to adults.

WT Grant Foundation Radical Left Political Funding:<sup>40</sup> According to the Kinsey Institute, their Childhood Sexuality Conference was funded by the WT Grant Foundation. The Foundation funds sex “research” that supports a *Playboy* sexual lifestyle for children, as outline by their key grantee; the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States, (crafting “a new poll on parents' attitudes about sex education”) and the [Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S.](#) at large.

**The fraud background continued.** None of the “experts” at the conference are on record in this book on *Childhood Sexual Development* as questioning Kinsey’s sexual child abuse protocol, even after reading Philip Jenkins’ “history” of child sexuality in the USA. As the book “historian,” Jenkins censored the role of Kinsey’s fraudulent “data” on child “orgasms” in order to hide Kinsey’s foundational claim that children were unharmed by sex with adults. I discuss that in detail elsewhere.

### “Over the Past 100 Years We Are More Often Wrong Than Right”

No “expert” in this book is on record anywhere as condemning the fully documented child sex abuse “methodology” or any other aspect of the bogus Kinsey Institute “studies” on human sexuality. Two of the five child sexual abuse Tables (reprinted above) are directly copied from Kinsey’s Male volume. These are represented as scientific proofs, not as the claims of pedophiles raping children. As such, these rapist records are even repeated in the book under discussion as though these may be accurate data!!! Moreover, none are on record as asking that the child victimization be publicized so that those victims still living might seek redress, or that the victims be found and offered compensation or therapy.

Reading *Sexual Development in Childhood* one encounters a group of writers who express a committed hostility toward traditional Judeo Christian American sexual life. Only one attendee, Dennis Fortenberry, rejected the group’s “sexual positivism.”

I'm not sure that I think it's appropriate to...speak with professional authority and wisdom...on the basis of what we know and how we know it and the likelihood that whatever we say will be wrong. Our history as professionals over the past 100 years has been to be wrong more often than we've been right. I'm just very nervous about succumbing to the temptation to speak as arbiters of normalcy.<sup>41</sup>

### Book Frauds: Congress Gave “\$750 million a year to abstinence-only sex education”

Fortenberry's warning fell on deaf ears. John DeLamater was indignant that "people don't listen to social scientists." He argued that this was proven when congress allotted (he said) "\$750 million a year to abstinence-only sex education" that he opined, "we know" doesn't work. Mr. DeLamater was not challenged by anyone in the group, although he misled everyone on both counts. First, depending how you examine the figures, "abstinence-only sex education" received not \$750 but \$55 million dollars in 2003, when this book was published.<sup>42</sup>

Second, based on the increase in every hard measure of sexual disorder, it is strange that Mr. DeLamater would suggest that the 30 some years of Kinseyan sex education did "work" or the few years of abstinence education did not work. DeLamater says everyone asks him and the other sexperts "what's normal." Since almost every participant had said at some point that homosexuality and all other sexual "varieties" were "normal" DeLamater ignored Fortenberry's counsel and said:

Alternatively, if we don't like the word "normal," we should take on the task of educating people that that's not the right word and we should be prepared to tell them what is the right word and view it as an educational challenge for us. Our big mistake would be to ignore the word "normal." I think we need to either appropriate it and redefine it or we need to educate people about why it's not a reasonable term to use in this [sexual] context.

#### **"I Got Around the Word "Normal"" -- We Can "Produce" Consensus**

**Bill Friedrich:** The way I got around the word "normal" ... was to use the term "developmentally related: 464

**Cynthia Graham:** I'm going to disagree with Dennis. I've been thinking a lot about the consensus and there are many different kinds of consensus that we could produce. (464-5)

It cannot be sufficiently stressed, that none of the alleged experts revealed any outrage or called for any corrective procedures for the Kinsey crimes. None condemned the team and none corrected the bogus DeLamater claim that abstinence educators got \$700 million dollars more grant money than was true and that such programs do not work

Thus, this body of child development "experts" is significantly tainted. Beyond this, an examination of the vitae for several "experts" in this book confirms that most, if not all, are either wholly ignorant of Kinsey's actual research—yet defend it and build on it—or they share Kinsey's distorted sexual belief system. To be ignorant of the kind of child abuse that formed their "field" and that hosted their meeting and book is like being ignorant of the crimes of Joseph Mengele, the Beast of Buchenwald and yet writing under the auspices of the Mengele Institute on Jewish identify. It is obvious that the sexuality "training" of such experts is deeply flawed.



My preliminary examination of their biographies finds information on their sexual training largely absent. This is amazing since the “field” was founded, and has been based on Kinsey’s fraudulent data. The dominating, Kinseyan bias that informs this group--overt and covert--is a condemnation of American, Judeo Christian moral values and “normality.” For example, less masturbation and oral sex reported by “African American men,” Ed Laumann says is based on “the conservative upbringing that they have with these kinds of women that are being studied by Jeffry and Elsie.” (:463)

### **Introduction: John Bancroft**

Although Kinsey is mentioned throughout the book on childhood sexuality, nowhere is there any question about the children sexually abused for Kinsey’s child sex “data.” One woman, “Esther White” testified on the Yorkshire television documentary “Kinsey’s Paedophiles,” broadcast throughout the United Kingdom, that she was incestuously victimized for Kinsey’s data. Her charge was dismissed by Dr. Bancroft, saying he searched the files and could not find her records. As “Esther” pointed out, that was impossible. Dr. Bancroft did not have her real name, and he had earlier claimed that these files were not searchable.

Claiming we “cannot find any record” in our archive of the charge that her father was reporting his abuse to Kinsey, Bancroft then muses “I’ve been rather expecting more children to respond.” (See Appendix A -- my review below of the 1998 conference at San Francisco California State College). Bancroft frankly admits that he recognizes that a widespread call for those damaged children is in order. It is certainly not the responsibility of Kinsey’s damaged victims to seek redress but of the Kinsey Institute to seek the victims out that they might confirm their experiences and the Institute might aid in what is left of their lives. This brings us to the new child sexuality book published by the KI.

### **KI Hijacks Child Abuse “Studies”?**

How does an institution responsible for, *and named for*, the most unconscionable child sex abuse team in scientific history, escape from discredit and criminal investigation only to hold itself out now as the “experts” on child sexual abuse? Such is the case at Indiana University’s Kinsey Institute. Kinsey Institute Director, John Bancroft sanitized the history books by selecting the “experts” for and editing the results of his KI conference on *Sexual Development in Childhood*. Bancroft had Philip Jenkins fashion a child sexual abuse history to absolve the KI of its role in the brutal sex crimes inflicted on 317 to 2,035 infants and children for Kinsey’s two books that launched the sexual revolution; *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953).

As the then KI Director, Bancroft stated that, “Over the past 50 years,” (that is, post Kinsey) children became substantially more “sexually active and aware” at much “younger ages.” Bancroft dodges the fact that children’s increased sex activity and “awareness” is traced to Kinsey’s fraudulently wrought revolution and its unprecedented role in hijacking our values, media, laws and education by the “sexology” profession.

Bancroft insists that post Kinsey is “a less sexually inhibited environment” for

children but admits to a downside. Roughly “one million [single?] teenagers” are annually pregnant; “twenty-five percent of sexually active [read promiscuous] teenagers” get an STD, while most of the roughly 20,000 AIDS dead every year were infected “during adolescence.” Sexual assault on teenagers is widespread he says and “74% of women who had sexual intercourse before age 14 and 60% of those before age 15 were coerced.” Some critics argue that these are not children who are sexually “aware” or “positive.” He also notes that even more “teenage women” are “sexually active” which should increase the negative data in the coming years.

Since “woman” is defined as “an adult female human,” and a teenager is “between the ages of 13 and 19; an adolescent,” Bancroft, like Kinsey, would blur the difference between a mature, decision making adult and a vulnerable juvenile. This view will dominate the experts’ opinions in the book itself. Bancroft also notes other “problems” associated with the sexual license he calls “positive.”

### **Bancroft Condemns Congress for Rejecting Rind, Tromovitch/Bauserman on Child Sex**

Still purging the causal role of Kinsey and Co., in the debasement of children’s innocence and freedom, Bancroft notes other “factors influencing this picture.” However, none of these factors could have occurred absent the sexual revolution’s youthful induction into a false “positive” sexuality dogma. Bancroft says experts should dispel the “moral panic” about child sexual abuse and reject the notion that ““normal” children are asexual.”

In his three-page Introduction, an angry Bancroft condemns Congress for its formal censure of what its critics call a pro-pedophile paper by Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman in the *Psychological Bulletin*. Despite the pre Kinsey history of even adult chastity until marriage, Bancroft states that because “age at puberty” is lower, this had a “considerable impact on the age of sexual debut.” The conference sought to create a “Consensus Document, helpful to health professionals, teachers, and parents.” The question is: Why would Americans continue to rely on the “consensus” of a field grounded in lies about child sex abuse and one that is on record as allied with pornographers and pedophiles?

### **Philip Jenkins Cleans Up Kinsey Institute for the History Books**

Jenkins’ “The Historical Context” of child sexual research builds on Bancroft’ outraged defense of the Rind, Bauserman, & Tromovitch report that was censured by Congress as bogus and as promoting pedophilia (2000, 2001). Jenkins hides the Rind and Bauserman pedophile conflict of interest. Both authors first published pro-pedophile diatribes for the pedophile magazine “*Paidika, The Journal of Paedophilia*” to a cheering readership of potential and active child molesters. And this is just ‘Page One’ of Jenkins’ “history.”

Freud’s ‘seductive child’ ideas of the 1920s dominated liberal academicians. Nonetheless, Jenkins blames a “1937 article by Loretta Bender and Abram Blau” for the 1940s and 1950s “liberal-minded scholars” insistence that adult sexual abuse of children was harmless.

Jenkins either knew better or he should stick with writing theology since he is on record as recommending the “research” of those with a documented bias toward both pedophiles and pornography.<sup>43</sup> Look through any human sexuality book post 1948 and you will always find Kinsey’s child sexuality “data” but rarely a mention of Bender and Blau. Even the KI’s own Male volume has no reference to Bender and Blau.

#### Blames Bender and Blau for Tappan, NRC, Kinsey, etc. “No Harm” From Abuse Claims

No, the truth is that the alleged hard science of American Alfred Kinsey’s “sacred writ” displaced the notably soft science of European Freud’s “latency period” to become the foundation of a new, global, sex “field.” The KI would change vocabulary, education, law, everything. Jenkins hides the past KI team’s criminality for his current KI patrons. Whom else does Jenkins protect? Jenkins says that based on the obscure writings of Bender and Blau, children were said to be seductive and unharmed by sex with adults.

Without blush, having admitted the “outrageous” ignorance of “the greatest [sex] scholars of the time,” Jenkins et al brazenly ignore Fortenberry’s admission that “over the past 100 years [we’ve been] wrong more often than we’ve been right” so how do we come to be the “arbiters of normalcy”?<sup>44</sup> The following quotes are typical of Jenkins’ false and sanitized history about sex “scholars”:

Based on this absolute knowledge, the greatest scholars of the time made statements that today look outrageous. Typically, Paul Tappan rejected the view "That the victims of sex attack are 'ruined for life'" as one of the pernicious myths diverting social policy. He argued that little lasting harm need be caused by the experience of "rape, carnal abuse, defloration, incest, homosexuality or indecent exposure."

In some instances the individual does carry psychic scars after such an experience. Characteristically the damage is done far more, however, by the well-intentioned associates of the victim or by public authorities than by the aggressor....danger has been grossly exaggerated....traumatizing ....is almost always a product of cultural and individual responses ....than....that experience itself. . . . the young individual in our own society who has not been exposed to an excess of parental and community hysteria about sex can absorb....sexual assault without untoward consequences.  
(Cohen, 1980, pp. 669-670)

Shame, shame, shame Mr. Jenkins. You know that Paul Tappan was a long time Kinsey friend fellow traveler.<sup>45</sup> You would be aware that he was merely repeating Kinsey’s “findings” and that Cohen repeated Tappan repeating Kinsey’s “findings,” else how could Tappan (a mere lawyer) make such claims about child sexuality? No, Tappan lied, based on Kinsey’s lies. So, Cohen lied, based on Tappan’s lies that were based on Kinsey’s lies and now Jenkins repeats this falsehood based on Cohen’s lies that are based on Tappan’s lies that are based on Kinsey’s lies.

## **Tappan Credits Kinsey, Not Bender/Blau for Model Penal Code Sex Changes**

This pattern of quoting Kinsey disciples without crediting their source as Kinsey is repeated throughout Jenkins' "history." But, before leaving Tappan, note that all of our sexual attitudes were changed because the "the greatest scholars of the time made statements that today look outrageous." These statements would also decriminalize adultery, fornication, abortion, homosexual sodomy, anal/oral, etc.

[T]he American Law Institute MPC authors--Wechsler, Ploscowe, Guttmacher, **Tappan**, and Schwartz--used Kinsey's aberrant population to frame the 1955 model code on sex offenses. The MPC was designed to be sent to state legislatures and especially to influence judges. (p. 211), On the fourth page of the code (page 207), the authors—Wechsler, Ploscowe, Schwartz, Tappan, Guttmacher, *et al*, sounding rather like Kinsey's law students, provide two "scientific" citations. First, citing Kinsey, they declare, "Pre-marital intercourse is also very common and widely tolerated, so that prosecution for this offense is rare."<sup>101</sup> And, on the same page, the authors cite Kinsey to support their argument:

[I]n a heterogeneous community such as ours, different individuals and groups have widely divergent views of the seriousness of various moral derelictions....<sup>102</sup> The immorality of the extra-marital fondle or kiss may have to receive legislative concern once we embark on the task of enforcing morals.

Finally, on the next page of the MPC, the legal community reads Kinsey's finding that "*in an appreciable number of cases an experiment in adultery tends to confirm rather than disrupt the marriage....*" [Emphasis added]

To further insulate themselves from full-scale condemnation at these and myriad other boldly ignorant falsehoods, Jenkins tosses in a small and well-cleaned bone to admit that even "the Kinsey researchers agreed." Really? "Agreed"? They wrote the script on child sexuality and provided the phony "data" to support their conclusions! Nonetheless, Jenkins repeats the current sexuality dogma that the KI team just read Bender and Blau saying adult sexual abuse was perhaps overrated as harm and they "agreed." Jenkins:

The emotional reactions of parents, police officers and other adults who discover that the child has had such a contact may disturb the child more seriously than the sexual contacts themselves.

Jenkins is too revealing for those who know their business. He diligently cites "Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953, p. 121" when he should have cited all of Chapter 5 in Kinsey's 1948 Male volume. Here, Kinsey provided the fraudulent Tables to "prove" that but for the "inhibited" society that stops all such exchange with adults and "older persons" a 2

month old might have rewarding orgasms.


### **The National Research Council Credits Kinsey *Not* Bender and Blau for Harmlessness Charge**

In an especially disingenuous reprimand, Jenkins explains the need to study the past, saying “How often social scientists assume that little of use is to be found in the older journal literature, and there is little need to cite literature more than 10 or 15 years old. What treasures we are missing.”

A 1989 assessment by The National Research Council stated that Kinsey (not Bender and Blau) had “established, to some degree, social standards of what was acceptable common practice.”<sup>46</sup> His crimes have indeed had consequences. The NRC says we shifted from a Judeo Christian era to “the Kinsey era.” To further hide the truth, Jenkins quotes Jenkins (without mentioning that he is really quoting Kinsey) saying that the danger was all the worse given “the current hysteria over sex offenders” (Jenkins, 1998, pp. 98-106). I

Jenkins study of the “older journal literature” carefully obscures the brutal crimes that resulted in the malevolent sexual exploitation of children in the present. Jenkins dismisses as “past” the KI propaganda that mis-shaped the sexuality profession, including those writing in the Bancroft book. But he and most of the other participants, conclude today as the KI did in their years, that children are sexual, apparently from birth, trivializing the overwhelming media, criminal and “education” assault on children’s right to asexual development.

### **Kinsey, Pomeroy and Gebhard Make Incest Globally Harmless**



With few pre-Kinsey incest promoters, Jenkins has sparse data saying incest is harmless. So, he grasps a 1955 report claiming "incest is very rare" the better to ignore Kinsey’s earlier 1953 “finding” that children desire incest. Below is a chart of Kinsey’s 1953 claims that incest and child abuse are

partnerships between the predators and the children; the rapist is a “partner” to his little victims.

	% OF ACTIVE
ADULT "PARTNERS"	SAMPLE
Strangers	52
Friends/Acquaintances	32
Uncles	9
Fathers	4
Brothers	3
Grandfathers	2
Other Relatives	5
Cases Reporting	609

Many persons responded to Kinsey's call to begin to systematically record their legal and illegal sex activities as diaries and calendars. The public was "solicited" and "urged" to keep records of any future or on-going sexual "outlets." 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.<sup>47</sup>

Kinsey co-author and part time lover, Wardell Pomeroy "scientifically" reinforced what the reader of had just learned about the benefits of incest and adult sex with children in his article in *Penthouse Forum Variations*. Having to admit *some* additional blemishes on his icons, Jenkins cites Kinsey-co-author Wardell Pomeroy's telling pornography users of *Penthouse Forum Varieties* in 1977 (no month, it was a "special" edition) that their lust for children, including their own, is normal and can be great for all.

Jenkins Hides *Penthouse* as KI's Pomeroy's "Normal" Population Claims for Incest

To do *that* trick, Jenkins repeats his pattern of falsehoods. He credits a secondary source in order to *hide the real source of the quote*. Pomeroy, says Jenkins, argued that incest between adults and children could be "a satisfying and enriching experience: giving rise to "many beautifully and mutually satisfying relationships between fathers and daughters. . . . they have no harmful effects" (Russell, 1986).

Jenkins pulled several tricks here. It was important to hide the first part of Pomeroy's quote. It was also important to avoid admitting Pomeroy was writing in a sadistic, incest and sodomy promoting pornographic magazine, Jenkins cites the feminist writer, Diana Russell for Pomeroy's quote. But Jenkins knew Russell was quoting Pomeroy in the *Penthouse Forum*, alongside alleged "letters to the editor" claiming to report harmless, delightful incest experiences with fathers and daughters. This is when scholarship is only propaganda.

*Pomeroy's article*, "Another Look at Incest," graphically described a five-year-old girl, deserted by her mother. Having sex with dad since age 5, she is described as healthy and loved. Indeed, the text for the alleged "writer" says that after sleeping with a number

of boys, she plans to marry someone wonderful like dad. Below is the full quote where the KI author, Pomeroy, told the incest pornography readers that not only was incest a very healthy choice, he could say that based on the KI “cross-section of the normal population” etc. Jenkins censored that statement since there was no “cross-section” and there was no “normal population” interviewed for the KI. Moreover, Pomeroy states in his biography of Kinsey that they certainly did get most of their incest “data” from prisons:

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.

Of course the KI team, Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard never had a “cross-section of the normal population.” So, the KI team did not provide *any* reliable data, just propaganda, confirming that “we find many beautiful and mutually satisfying relationships between fathers and daughters... [that] have no harmful effects.”

### **Jenkins Hides Penthouse as KI’s Gebhard’s “Random Sample” Population Claims For Incest**

That same year, 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 Paul Gebhard who had incest data from many who did “write to us for instructions.” Nobile:

*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]*.<sup>48</sup>

Interestingly, that was presumably the same “incest material” that Gebhard, in his March 11, 1981 letter to this author, claimed entailed “too few cases [so that] we omitted incest, except for one brief mention” in the *Female* volume.

Note that Wardell Pomeroy stated in his very popular sex education text used worldwide, *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].”<sup>49</sup> This is dangerously false of course but just as revealing is Jenkins hiding the fact that Gagnon & Simon were KI researchers when they wrote in 1970, based on the primary Kinsey data that, “Irrationality about sex led to the original offense; it is important that parents and other adults keep their own irrationalities from doing any further damage to the child”<sup>50</sup>

### **“Suspected Or Detected, Fraud Needs Intensive Investigation”**

Jenkins claims in *Childhood Sexual Development* to demonstrate how the nation came to view incest, child sexual abuse and rape as harmless—it was Bender and Blau. However, doctors, lawyers, psychologists, sexologists are on record basing these harmful beliefs on the primary KI data. Absent the original KI “data” none—not Abrahamsen, Mohr, Turner, and Jerry, sexology/psychiatrist Abraham Karpman, Kempe & Kempe, McCary & McCary, etc., could say, “Early sexual contacts do not appear to have harmful effects on many children unless the family, legal authorities or society reacts negatively.”

Instead of promoting the fraudulent KI “data” as they do in this KI book, the past and present activities of the KI require serious investigation by State and Federal agencies. On page 16 in my first book, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* I cite Stephen Lock, Editor, *British Medical Journal*, (February 6, 1988, p. 377). Addressing fraud in science, even at the smallest level, Lock states:

[O]nce *suspected* or detected, fraud needs *intensive investigation* with publicity given to the results and retraction in the journals concerned and in the bibliographical databases [emphasis added].

### **Freidrich’s Expert Summary: “Children Are Sexual Beings”<sup>51</sup>**

William Friedrich: Friedrich claims in his “studies of nonabused children” that “[r]esearch clearly indicates that children are sexual beings, and will exhibit a broad range of sexual behaviors in the absence of sexual abuse.” Indeed, sexologists seem to avoid noting that if children are “sexual beings” then they are even more “reproductive beings,” since the latter assures survival of the species while the former only secures pleasure (or depression and despair) of the individual.

Freidrich says “elevated sexual behavior and sexual abuse in children” has overshadowed “non-pathologic” child sexual conduct. The latter, he says is “quite varied.” Sexually intrusive behavior in children is more typically seen in young, hyperaroused children who tend to act out rather than act in, and who live in families that have more relaxed sexual beliefs and practices.” Friedrich does not explain what are “more relaxed sexual beliefs and practices.” That, rather than “children's sexuality,” seems to this



researcher to be “a relatively uncharted terrain and further research is needed.”

## **Lucia F. O'Sullivan**

### Parents Hamper Study of Child Sexuality

O’Sullivan complains that the “empirical study of child sexual behavior has been seriously hampered by...parents, school authorities, and granting and community agents.” This is annoying since, she says, these people often think “studies of sexual behavior will cause distress or spur sexual curiosity and experimentation.” O’Sullivan opines that no “evidence” exists for such concerns. Yet, this has restricted child experimentation dramatically. The arrogance, bigotry, bias and sheer ignorance of such statements stuns. Ms. O’Sullivan clearly ignored Fortenberry’s admission that “Our history as professionals over the past 100 years has been to be wrong more often than we've been right.”<sup>52</sup>

Demonstrating her and her colleagues callousness and the reasons that parents would never want “scientists” to have access to their children, O’Sullivan explained that they proved children could be exposed to sexual questions. Her team interviewed 98 boys between 7 and 13 years, primarily minority youths from rough backgrounds. While the boys answered the less provocative questions, at the “sexual knowledge” questions they were “markedly reticent.” The boys “responded slowly with long silences.” Why? These sexologists could not even contemplate that children sensibly prefer not to talk about sex with strangers. The team would “help them overcome internalized prohibitions and assure them that no repercussions would follow.”

### Bribery Offsets Boys’ Distress at Sexual Questions

Since O’Sullivan could not think the children were right and the researchers wrong, she says “The boys' reluctance” was due to lack of information and lack of a “vocabulary for the sexual anatomy.” The sexologists then used "dick" for penis and promised the boys their mothers would not know what the boys had said. This standard technique undercuts parental authority and connection—just what these mothers did not need in their difficult environment. Boys who answered got “candy and access to games” (bribery).

The lack of scientific and moral skills cannot be understated here and the rest O’Sullivan’s report thoroughly reflects this staggering ignorance. After explaining that bribery obtained some cooperation, despite the boys obvious distressed at the sex questions, O’Sullivan reports, “No strong adverse emotional reactions were noted.” Really? “In sum, even though some boys commented about their discomfort with or dislike of some of the sexual questions, these reactions did not have a clinically significant degree of severity.” This exploitation of the vulnerable with no long term follow up allowed O’Sullivan to conclude “the sex knowledge interview” did not expose the children “to significant emotional risk.” Just as important, none of the conference attendees criticized the obvious abusiveness and arrogance of the O’Sullivan team activities.


## **Anke Ehrhardt and the KI Icon, John Money**

Anke Ehrhardt, begins her “Discussion Paper” by recalling that she and Jenkins wrote a paper “25 years ago” where they “summarized the Kinsey data.” Ehrhardt explains that there were two sources of Kinsey data, recall data from adolescents and actual reports by prepubertal children.” After studying the Kinsey data (remember these included the screams and cries and collapse of the tiny victims) she and Jenkins concluded that “girls and boys clearly reported a high incidence of sociosexual behavior.”<sup>53</sup> Without blush, Ehrhardt didn’t notice 25 years ago nor did she care today that these 317 to 2,035 children were being sexually tortured by admitted child molesters.

This author on the Childhood book cannot be discussed without addressing her mentor, John Money. Ehrhardt purged her years with the discredited John Money of John Hopkins (circa 1999) from her short bio without explanation yet she was famous as Money’s aide, supporting his claims that one is not born male or female; that any gender can be made into the other if parents and surgeons cooperate.

### **Supporting Children’s Sex Change Operations?**

John Money has a room named for him and his “research” at the Kinsey Institute. As Ehrhardt’s mentor, they worked together during the period when Money negotiated sex change operations on children, the most infamous victim being David Reiner. Reiner exposed his boy-to-girl surgery as a failure and Money as having lied to the world about the healthy and positive results of this “sex change” for decades. Reiner, now a suicide, also disclosed his forced participation in incestuous homosexual pornography with his twin brother at the insistence of Dr. Money.<sup>54</sup>



**PAIDIKA, The Journal of Paedophilia states all its editors are “paedophiles.” John DeCecco is on the “Editorial Board.” John Money is an interviewee advocate in the issue above and Gilbert Herdt is one of the pedophile advocates in the Winter 1994 cover issue below.**

Money encouraged Bruce's parents to have their son castrated and reassigned as a girl. He assured them that, with appropriate parenting, she would grow up as a feminine, heterosexual woman.... Brenda became a poster-child for the idea, seized on by social scientists and feminists, that gender and sexual orientation are culturally imposed.

Money knew all along that the transformation was not a success. Brenda resisted from the start...[but] her parents and a succession of therapists, goaded by Money, attempted to break her will. Eventually the parents descended into depression and alcoholism, and both twins made suicide attempts.

Money's extreme ideology comes across in one extraordinary facet of his treatment of the twins. Money believed that "sex rehearsal play" was vital to normal psychosexual development. He claimed to have learned this during a two-week stay with an Australian aborigine group called the Yonglu in which, he said, children are encouraged to engage in sex play. As a consequence, Money claimed, there is no homosexuality or gender

confusion among the Yonglu. (All of this has been denied by experts on Yonglu culture.) Therefore, starting when the twins were 6 years old, he allegedly forced them to engage in simulated sex with each other, with Brenda in the receptive role. Money even photographed the sessions, which took place without the parents' knowledge or consent. Both twins were deeply embarrassed and hurt by this "therapy."<sup>55</sup>

**Yet, Bancroft still celebrates Money's alleged "science" in his *Kinsey Today* newsletters, while he is cited as a childhood expert in this collection.** In her bizarre essay, Suzanne Frayser celebrates Money's expertise, quoting Money's warning that unless children engage in some sexual play they are liable to be disordered as adults.

### The Ehrhardt and Money Homosexual Research Bias

Ehrhardt has tried to hide her connection with Money in her biographical information although her homosexual preference/bias is self-evident throughout her resume. Briefly, what she admits is:

[She received] the First Research Award for the National Lesbian and Gay Health Foundation. She was a member of the NIH Office of AIDS Research Advisory Council, from 1995-97 and also served from 1995-99 on the Board of Trustees of the Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender and Reproduction.

The Kinsey biased [\*Journal of Sex Research\*](#), [Feb, 2001](#) includes the observation that "the Judeo-Christian religious tradition" strongly influenced "sex and sexuality" *until science "took the lead in defining sex categories and what was normal with regard to sex, gender, and sexuality (Dreger, 1998; Herdt, 1996).*

\* \* \*

[A]n influential rationale for contemporary surgical [sexual] technology was provided by the work of the Hampsons, Money, and *Ehrhardt*. These scholars claimed that human sexuality was highly malleable. Money and his colleagues...claimed that...all children could be raised as either a boy or a girl, provided the sexual assignment was done within the first two years and adequate genitals could be constructed surgically. This research has provided the epistemic basis for the guidelines used by the American Association of Pediatricians over the past four decades.

"[I]t took more than thirty years to discredit Money's [and Ehrhardt's] central ideas... [It took] Reimer's (Money's subject in the John/Joan case) decision to go public and refute Money's fraudulent claims regarding the success of his case (Colapinto, 2000). Nevertheless, the American Association of Pediatricians still recommends surgical intervention and sex reassignment for infants born with ambiguous genitalia."<sup>56</sup>

Anke Ehrhardt cannot erase her decades of collusion with John Money and her appearance on scores of papers with him as a second author. She should therefore share in his recent exposure and his disgrace. His innocent child sex change victim has recently

committed suicide. John Bancroft and the Kinsey Institute however, still eulogize Money as they have Kinsey!

### The “Experts” Disdain Child “Innocence” and Child Asexuality

Most of the contributors disdain the reality of childhood sexual “innocence” and asexuality. Due to limited time I am unable to record all such statements in this book and their authors as a category but I urge that this be done. Just briefly, in her following remarks, Ehrhardt ridicules parental concerns regarding their child’s “so-called” excessive masturbation. Ehrhardt wants to be clear—among her peers, her equals--that the problem is not really the child’s compulsive public masturbation but the generic “parents” in “the U.S.” who, she concludes, think this is “sin” and “terrible” and perhaps “an indication of serious behavior pathology.”

I can give you one example about which I am periodically consulted: so-called excessive masturbation. You might think that doesn't exist but it does exist. I saw a child years ago in Buffalo, a little girl who was masturbating everywhere, in the waiting room, waiting for me, anywhere, in a kind of compulsive way. Parents in the U.S. typically see that as something sinful, terrible, an indication of serious behavior pathology.

It is “kind of” compulsive for a little girl to be masturbating “everywhere” “anywhere” “in the waiting room” and such. Indeed, most “parents in the U.S.” would be concerned that their child was molested or somehow tampered with since public masturbation “everywhere” is uncommon conduct for children. This “expert” gives this advice:

I advised the parents (who were often foster parents) not to be punitive, but to use a very simple behavioral approach; whenever your child does this just take her on your lap and hold her and cuddle her. For the most part, if they followed the recommendations, the masturbation disappeared.

Anke wants “systematic studies of sexual behavior problems like that.” Please note that in accordance with her biases, Ehrhardt ignored the possibility of molestation, a recognized cause of such sexually obsessive conduct. Nor did she suggest parents examine the child’s hygiene; the common infestation with pinworms or long worms; antibiotic use causing a vaginal PH imbalance or any other irritants known to trigger excessive child “masturbation.” That “cuddling” helped some children may or may not be true. However, were a medical doctor to ignore these several probable causes for “rubbing” an area of the body excessively, s/he would be properly considered incompetent.

Instead of challenging or even noting Ehrhardt’s serious missed diagnoses, David Finkelhor concludes “risky childhood sexual behavior” may really only be called this because it disturbs other people. Finkelhor dismisses this obsessive child masturbation and argues that if the child has some “stigma as a result, then they might decide that that is a problem.” Yet, he muses, the conduct “may be entirely appropriate.”

John Bancroft also ignores the blatantly missed diagnoses and adds that the question is

what “taboo behavior” is “appropriate to be done privately.” Bancroft says children need to know how to deal “with their sexuality.” That is “one of the yardsticks that we’re looking for.”

Julia Heiman joins the missed diagnoses cadre to ponder teaching “sexual manners,” an “etiquette...that changes over time, about what one expects to be done in public.” The book participants are so wholly wed to a belief in “childhood sexuality” and a rejection of childhood “innocence” that they absolutely refuse to entertain physiological or predatory causes for the “excessive masturbation” of little girls.

### **Meredith A. Reynolds and Debra L. Herbenick – Kinsey Institute Study**

These authors reported on a computer-assisted self-interview (CASI) in 1998-99 at The Kinsey Institute asking 303 students with a mean age of 20 years about their childhood and young adult sexual experiences and development. Students came twice to the Kinsey Institute to fill out the survey of demographics, and sexuality, including “autoerotic/self-stimulation activities, childhood orgasm, and sexual fantasy.”

Students were asked about their sexual lives in pre-elementary, elementary, and middle school/junior high school--their sexual play and the sexual experience they remembered best. The latter asked about the activity, the students’ participation, the “number, gender, and relationship of the peer(s) involved,” why they did it and if an adult knew. The questions also asked about “unwanted sexual experiences with adults.” Since children are often told and believe, that they “wanted” such abuse these Kinsey data would skew real reports of child sex abuse.

Additional distortions of the child sexual abuse data involved telling the students to report “sexual experiences with an adult or child who was more than five years older than them, and that occurred prior to the subject age of 16.” That the Kinsey Institute thus reduced age of consent information from 18 to 16 would additionally distort the knowledge these invasive questionnaires were supposed to clarify. (The students were asked about “oral sex, anal sex” and “their first post-childhood same sex sexual experience involving genital contact.”) No criticism of these failures, the general intrusiveness of this “study” and its behavioral effects on young people was voiced by any conference attendees.

### **Suzanne Frayser**

#### **Condemns Pre Kinsey Sexual Reticence and Procreative Values**

In her paper on “*Cultural Dimensions of Childhood Sexuality in the U.S.*” Suzanne Frayser condemns pre Kinsey sexual reticence and rejection of nonprocreative “[m]asturbation, oral sex, and sexual desire or activity.” Frayser objects to the older cultural “idea of childhood innocence” and was pleased Freud “at least acknowledged that children had sexual desires.” She clearly disagrees with restricting child sexual exposure, knowledge or activity. For support, she cites to a 1929 book by Albert Moll.

## Lies About Alfred Moll and Child Innocence

Frayser claims “Moll (1924) suggested that no harm resulted from children's sexual behavior or knowledge, these results fell on deaf ears (:266).” This is brazen slander. In the page cited by Frayser, Moll specifically talks about the American practice of school “coeducation” *and not* about sexual education. He says, “no such undesirable results of coeducation were ever observed. Indeed, I received numerous assurances regarding the customary sexual abstinence of American young men who had been educated in common with American girls.” Moll was pleased to say that one lad who had sex “was immediately ostracized.” In fact, Moll writes in *The Sexual Life of the Child*:

[T]here are adult males whose impulse is especially directed towards boys still possessing the milk-white face of the child, and his encounter with such a pervert may make all the difference to a sexually premature boy.... [B]oys upon whom such relationships are imposed will sometimes tend to grow up as male prostitutes, just in the same way as little girls prematurely seduced in consequence of an early awakening of sexuality often adopt a life of prostitution.

Children in whom sexuality has awakened are especially dangerous to their associates, since they readily seduce others to sexual malpractices....A great danger attendant on sexual acts in which one child is led astray by another is, of course, the moral harm which threatens the other associates of such children. Girls and boys are equally exposed to such seduction, and the seducer also may be of either sex. In cases of an altogether exceptional character, danger threatens in this respect from a child's own brothers or sisters.<sup>57</sup>

Frazer objects to “the innocence of childhood” saying “there is definite research to substantiate normal childhood sexual behavior in this society” citing for proof to pedophile advocate Martinson and Mayo Clinic’s William Friedrich, who defines anything associated with primary or secondary reproductive characteristics as “sexual.” In fact, such normal childhood activities can be viewed as children’s reproductive interests. Resistance toward reproduction as the “worst” part of sexual life is evident throughout this book and summarized by Frazer.

Despite the efforts of groups such as Planned Parenthood and SIECUS, a reproductive model of sexuality prevails in sex education, informing children about reproductive anatomy and physiology without including information about sexual response, pleasure, and intimacy. As Krivacska points out (1990), we have been educating our children in the worst aspects of the sexual experience. (:269)


Frazer says such education denies the “pleasures of sexual activity” and adds to children’s sexual confusion. Frazer is upset that sexual language is restricted. Here Frazer reaches for her highest authority on childhood sexual health, John Money, saying “Money

warns of the paraphilias that can result from lack or punishment of juvenile sex play (Money, 1986).”

Significantly more can be said about Ms. Frazer’s pedophile advocacy writings but we will move on to Dr. Gilbert Herdt who is a participant in Bancroft’s book as well as in scores of other events and press productions involved with the KI.

## Gilbert Herdt: Pedophile Comrades Label Minors “Gay and Lesbian Youth”

San Francisco State University professor Gilbert Herdt co-authored the 1996 book *Children of Horizons: How Gay and Lesbian Teens Are Leading a New Way Out of the Closet*. In an interview with *Paidika*, a Dutch journal advocating pedophilia, Herdt argued, “The category ‘child’ is a rhetorical device for inflaming what is really an irrational set of attitudes.”



### When She’s Only About Six Or Seven Years Old.

Herdt supports the unscientific and wholly disproven idea that children are born homosexual, transsexual, bisexual and the like. He enthuses that “gay culture [has] begun to institutionalize “socialization” techniques for the transmission of its cultural knowledge to a younger generation.”<sup>58</sup> As Bancroft’s child “expert,” Herdt advocates for his pedophile hosts in the Winter 1994 issue of *Paidika*, *The Journal of Paedophilia* (above) a pseudo academic magazine *by and for pedophiles*. Herdt celebrates Kinsey throughout the pedophile magazine, saying:

Think of a woman who, as she grows up, gradually comes to realize that she’s attracted sexually to other women. She experiences it very early in life, when she’s only about six or seven years old. (:6).

#### CONTENTS

Interview: Gilbert Herdt	2
Graham Ovenden	18
Introduction	Laurence A. Stanley 18
Guest Editorial: The Fall from Grace	Graham Ovenden 20
Poems and Drawings	Graham Ovenden 22
A Shrine to Love and Sorrow: Jacques d’Adelswärd-Fensen (1880-1923)	Will H.L. Ogrinc 30
The Sexual Experience of Children, Part II	Theo Sandfort 59
Book Notes	79
Book Review: <i>Childhood and Sexuality: A radical Christian Approach</i>	85

#### EDITORIAL BOARD

Bill Andriette, *Editor*, NAMBLA Bulletin, *Writer*; USA  
 Dr. Frits Bernard, *Clinical Psychologist, Author*; NL  
 Dr. Edward Brongersma, *Former Senator, Author*; NL  
 Dr. Vera L. Bullough, *Dean, Faculty of Natural and Social Science, State University College at Buffalo*; USA  
 Joel Crawford, *Management Consultant*; NL  
 Prof. Dr. John P. DeCecco, *Department of Psychology, San Francisco State University*; *Editor, Journal of Homosexuality*; USA  
 Sjuul Deckwitz, *Feminist Writer and Poet*; NL  
 Dr. Wayne Dymal, *Department of Art, Hunter College (CCNY); Editor-in-Chief, Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*; USA  
 Joseph Geraci, *Rare Book Dealer; Editor-in-Chief, Paidika*; NL  
 Hans Hafkamp, *Writer*; NL  
 Dr. Gert Hekma, *Lecturer, Gay Studies, University of Amsterdam*; NL  
 Piper R. Hollier, *Systems Analyst*; NL  
 Dr. Hubert Kennedy, *Research Associate, Center for Research and Education in Sexuality, San Francisco State University*; USA  
 Dr. Thijs Maasen, *Author; Psychologist with the AIDS Team, Gay and Lesbian Health Organization, the Schorer Foundation, Amsterdam*; NL  
 Theo van der Meer, *Research Fellow, Faculty of Law, Vrije Universiteit; Associate Editor, Journal of Homosexuality*; NL  
 Dr. A.L. von Naerssen, *Department of Clinical Psychology, Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht*; NL  
 Will H.L. Ogrinc, *Mediaevalist, Author; History Department, Hogeschool Rotterdam & Omstreken (H.E.O.) in Rotterdam*; NL  
 Benjamin F. Rossen, *Psychologist, Writer*; NL  
 Dr. Theo Sandfort, *Gay and Lesbian Studies Department, Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht*; NL  
 Marjan Sax, *Feminist Sex Activist, Political Scientist, Writer*; NL  
 Jan Schuijjer, *Economist*; NL  
 Lawrence A. Stanley, *Esq., Attorney at Law; Manuscript Editor, Paidika*; USA  
 Frank Torrey, *Writer, Editor*; NL  
 Daniel Tsang, *Social Sciences Bibliographer; Writer*; USA

By making claims for a childhood libido, Herdt logically advocates age of sexual activity for children from “six or seven” to “nine-and-a-half.” (:13). On the pedophile

Editorial Board is Bill Andriette, Editor of NAMBLA, the North American Man Boy Love Association as well as other Kinsey Institute “sexperts” such as Theo Stanford, John DeCecco and Vern Bullough. Herdt’s words in the Kinsey Institute *Sexual Development in Childhood* text is a paraphrase of his following words to his pedophile partners:

I hesitate to use the term child or childhood. It’s such a terrible misrepresentation and could be resisted at all costs. If you look closely at the discourse on childhood sexual abuse, as soon as the category “child” is invoked, everything is completely slanted and biased....inflaming what is really an irrational set of attitudes.<sup>59</sup>

**Journal of Paedophilia, “Statement of Purpose...Paedophilia [is] Legitimate”**

**The Journal of Paedophilia “Statement of Purpose.”**

“The starting point of Paidika is necessarily our consciousness of ourselves as paedophiles....the opposition of paedophilia is part of the larger repression of sexuality....paedophilia has been, and remains, a legitimate and productive part of the totality of human experience. The Editors.”

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

The starting point of **Paidika** is necessarily our consciousness of ourselves as paedophiles. It is our intention to publish an intellectual journal which will examine paedophilia within its cultural context, with emphasis on the humanities, history and social sciences. We shall be speaking, therefore, not only to paedophiles seeking a greater understanding of their identity, but also to members of the academic community open to objective investigations of the phenomenon.

The ground on which we stand is the emergence and evolution of paedophile consciousness and identity in history. We point back to the writings of J. A. Symonds and members of the early German sexual emancipation movement such as Benedict Friedländer and John Henry Mackay, where views of paedophilia as an identity and subculture were proposed. The contemporary development of this consciousness is found in the work of Frits Bernard, Edward Brongersma, Tom O’Carroll, René Schérer and others. We intend to be a forum for the shaping of this consciousness.

But to speak today of paedophilia, which we understand to be consensual intergenerational sexual relationships, is to speak of the politics of oppression. This is the milieu in which we are enmeshed, the fabric of our daily life and struggle. There is no country where there are not proscriptions against even the most innocent consensual paedophile relationships. In the English-speaking countries, in particular, the facts of this politics are worsening, and these countries appear determined to impose their reactionary moral values on other nations. In the United States, for example, prison sentences of a century or more are not uncommon for consensual man/boy relationships, and in the state of Florida the paedophile can receive the death penalty for such relationships. Visual images that are part of a paedophile sensibility are also being assailed: in many places all nude images of minors are legally defined as pornography. Not only are our lives and culture under attack, but proposals are afoot in the United States and Canada to criminalize even discussions of lowering of the age of consent or the reporting of research that does not characterize paedophilia as child abuse.

It is our contention that the oppression of paedophilia is part of the larger repression of sexuality, and that this repression in general represents an irrational expression of authority in government. The oppression of paedophilia is therefore dangerous in a wider sense than simply to paedophiles. We must address the reality of this oppression, and while we do not advocate behaviour that violates these laws, we shall attempt to counter the hysteria with calmness and reason.

We wish then to welcome and invite our readers’ participation. Through publication of scholarly studies, thoroughly documented and carefully reasoned, we intend to demonstrate that paedophilia has been, and remains, a legitimate and productive part of the totality of human experience.

The Editors.

**Note**—“The Editors” last paragraph of the pedophile journal as all pedophile Editors—see page 1 Statement of Purpose left.

**Gilbert Herdt, John Money, Vern Bullough, And Theo Sandfort (now employed by Columbia University) appear regularly in Kinsey Institute conferences, books and Papers.**



**Jeffrey W. Thigpen, Elsie M. Pinkston, and Jay H. Mayefsky**

One would think “experts” in childhood sexual behavior who rely on men like Floyd Martinson have a hidden agenda antagonistic to child welfare. Thigpen, Pinkston and Mayefsky cite Martinson as an expert while Martinson writes positively of series of groups working to end the age of consent, one of which is The Rene Guyon Society. Describing this pedophile organization, Martinson says only, “Based on some ideas they have taken from developmental psychology, the Society has as its slogan, “Sex by eight or else it’s too late.” One awaits Martinson’s explanation as to exactly what “ideas” this pedophile group has “taken from developmental psychology” that support adult sex with eight year old children.

Thigpen, Pinkston and Mayefsky then cite the “empirical studies” on “sexual behavior of children... and the capacity for sexual response are believed to be present at or before birth (Goldman & Goldman, 1982<sup>60</sup>; Martinson, 1981).” See below for my remarks about the pedophile biases of the Goldmans’.

**Sexperts: Male Babies Have Erections and Female Babies Vaginal Lubrication**

Next, Thigpen, Pinkston and Mayefsky cite a favorite pedophile advocacy citation, first articulated in Kinsey but here cited to Martinson, “For example, male babies have penile erections and female babies are capable of vaginal lubrication (Martinson, 1981).” Are the Bancroft authors ignorant of the fact that as *all bodily passages* are lined with mucosa, the female baby is not “capable” of vaginal lubrication, she *must be* vaginally lubricated (via the mucus membrane) for survival:

**mucus**-secreting membrane lining all body cavities or passages that communicate with the exterior [syn: [mucosa](#)] **mucous membrane**: a membrane rich in mucous glands; *specifically* : one that lines body passages and cavities which communicate directly or indirectly with the exterior (as the alimentary, respiratory, and genitourinary tracts), that functions in protection, support, nutrient absorption, and secretion of mucus, enzymes, and salts, and that consists of a deep vascular connective-tissue stroma which in many parts of the alimentary canal contains a thin but definite layer of nonstriated muscle and a superficial epithelium which has an underlying basement membrane and varies in kind and thickness but is always soft and smooth and kept lubricated by the secretions of the cells and numerous glands embedded in the membrane called also *mucosa*.<sup>61</sup>

Pedophiles and pedophile fellow travelers regularly cite this biological fact to create a “sexual” baby. The male baby erection is similarly distorted to sexualize infant boys. Erectile tissue is found in the penis, clitoris, and nose. An erect penis is merely filled with blood or urine. *Erection*: “The firm and enlarged condition of a body organ or part when the erectile tissue surrounding it becomes filled with blood, especially such a condition of the penis or clitoris.”<sup>62</sup>

The internal structure of the penis includes the urethra (*tube for expelling urine and ejaculate*); erectile tissue surrounding the urethra; two main arteries; and several veins and nerves....The opening at the tip of the glans, which *allows for urination and ejaculation*, is the meatus.<sup>63</sup>

### **Pedophile Fellow Travelers See Orgasmic Responses in Five Month Old Babies**

Having reduced normal physiology to the possible sexual desire of small children, the authors cite Rutter (1971), also identified as a pedophile support system. Not surprisingly, Rutter sees “orgasmic-like responses in boys as young as five months” as well as a series of other allegedly sexualized signs “by the age of 4 years.” The authors cite to Martinson who writes on “Infant and Child Sexuality” in *Love and Attraction* that “repression present in the child’s environment” can lead to serious problems. Martinson bewails our “strong taboo” against the adult “caress” of the child’s genitals. Why? He claims that Cobeco Indian “mothers caress the child’s genitals during nursing.” Hence, in “respect” for the child’s emotions “we cannot consider sexual interactions involving children a crime.”<sup>64</sup>

So says the author’s expert Floyd Martinson.

After several more bows to Martinson’s child sex expertise, Thigpen, Pinkston and Mayefsky cite for credibility, the findings of the founder of the Kinsey Institute--that children are sexual at birth. To do this, TPK must hide the entire criminal and barbaric foundation of Kinsey’s fraudulent child sex abuse protocols. Still, the Bancroft authors equivocate for they say Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin, “suggested” infants masturbate from four months. Since when are Tables in which the number of children are listed alongside their speed of “orgasm” regarded as a “suggestion?”

However, masturbation in male infants as young as five to seven months, and in female infants from four months, has been suggested (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948).<sup>65</sup>

No. The KI team did not “suggest,” they stated it was so in five Tables and in pages of description. Let us see who is next in the pantheon of Bancroft’s sexuality heroes.

### **Michael Bailey: “We” Don’t Know That Child Abuse is “Harmful”**

With little time left, note that Michael Bailey states: “We, including me, have the intuition that child sexual abuse is harmful. But, we haven’t done the right research to know that it is, because we haven’t examined alternatives to the causal model.” (:424) This suggests that we don’t know that being beaten is harmful, or being run over by a car is harmful, unless “we” do the “right research” to know it is. He adds that “highly sexual children are more likely to be highly sexual with adults” and that the Rind report showed “the effects of childhood sexual abuse are at most modest.” (:423)

## **Michael Bailey & the International Academy of Sex Research**

Here note Pedophile Apologists: Theo Sandfort (Chair) and Vern Bullough (Presenter) are Bancroft's Child Experts at the Federally Funded, Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting, Kinsey Institute, Bloomington, Indiana July 16 – 19, 2003

HOSTS: John Bancroft, Cynthia Graham, Erick Janssen, and Stephanie Sanders

- SCIENTIFIC: Theo Sandfort, Chair (NETHERLANDS/USA) [Editorial Board, Dutch pedophile journal]
- PROGRAM SECRETARIAT: Michael Bailey [sued for sex with transvestite patient, info used w/o consent]
- PRESENTATION: Vern Bullough: "The importance of Kinsey from a historical point of view" [Editorial Board, Dutch pedophile journal]

At the above conference, Dr. Bancroft condemned Michael Bailey's work. Bailey was being sued for unethical sexual activity by and with a transvestite "subject." Bancroft ignored Bailey's sex with a subject but condemned his bad science. The following was taken from a report on the conference proceedings:

### **Bailey IASR lecture: told his book "is not science"**

Even though Bailey is supposed to be featured in Bancroft's upcoming book, Bancroft had little good to say about *The Man Who Would Be Queen* before they shut down their internal leaks. The IASR 2003 Conference was held at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana July 16-19, during the 50th anniversary of the Kinsey Institute.

Lynn Conway received the following [first-hand report](#) from an IASR member in attendance:

Obviously shaken from the recent events, Bailey offered a nearly-unintelligible 30 minute outline of Blanchard's theory of transsexualism. He then briefly mentioned the transgender "attack" on science. He also tried to get sympathy from the audience by showing pictures of his children. Bailey ended his talk abruptly by walking away from the podium, stating there was not time for the scheduled question-and-answer period. The audience, however, was not in agreement with him.

[John Bancroft](#), director of [The Kinsey Institute](#) and one of the most respected sexologists in the world, was the first to cross-examine Bailey. His words (which I directly quote) were:  
**"Michael, I would caution you against calling this book**

**'science' because I have read it ... and I can tell you it is NOT science."**

Complete silence fell over the room. It was obvious that, indeed, a new era has finally dawned on sexual science and the study of transsexualism. While several people in the room at the meeting, including Ken Zucker, support Bailey and his "scientific" speculations, I can tell you that the vast majority of the scientific community does NOT.

Responding to Dr. Bancroft's comment that the Bailey book was not science, Anne Lawrence stated:

Bancroft's remark was followed by utter silence in the room, as though no one could believe that anyone would say something so tactless. It was as though Bancroft had stood up and loudly farted -- people looked at each other in embarrassment for him. Certainly no one clapped or said a word of agreement. Bancroft stepped down as Kinsey Institute Director in 2004.

That no one at the "inner circle" conference appears to have supported Bancroft--as the prestigious "scientist" in this alleged field--is chilling. That Bancroft still elevated Bailey as an expert in *Sexual Development in Childhood* is even more chilling.

The argument for investigation is powerful when data have been derived from the abuse of human subjects—and especially the abuse of children. Can the reader begin to imagine what such an investigation of the KI frauds could mean for society and its understanding of human sexuality and Judeo Christian values? I will not continue with this analysis of the ongoing fraudulent child sexuality history promoted by Jenkins in this book except to say that all of Jenkins subsequent quotes lend themselves to similar deconstruction, not possible in this short paper. We noted Cynthia Heiman's candid economic ties to pornographers as well as Cynthia Graham's pornography arousal perfume research.

The Graham, Janseen, Sanders "Olfactory Research Fund, Ltd." grant is identified as directly associated with "Corporate Leaders" who now have the credibility of Indiana University to increase the standing of their sexual arousal products. KI book contributor Graham "AIDS Prevention Studies" does not appear to offer an abstinence until marriage message for true AIDS prevention or condom failure rates. I was unable to locate information in Bancroft's, Heiman's or Graham's biographies as to where either of these KI leaders received their "sexuality training."

### **Heino Meyer-Bahlburg: We "Liberal Folk"<sup>66</sup>**

Our field consists mostly of liberal folk .... it may actually be quite useful to apply our respect for tribal cultures to the fundamentalists and to look at fundamentalist childrearing principles and the like as cultural expressions of their own, from a distance, without

immediately resorting to reflexive liberal responses, and to study them in contrast to nonfundamentalist principles. I wonder whether the anthropologists could help us with ... [w]hat is usually referred to as the Christian Right....It is usually addressed from a pejorative perspective, and I am troubled by that.

### Fanatic \$500 Million Abstinence Educators

Anke Ehrhardt disagrees: While I completely agree with you that we should respect the principles of other groups, in this country the problem is that this minority wants to dictate and has successfully dictated what the educational policies should be for the entire country...and abstinence-only education got the increase, as you all know, to \$500 million. The problem that comes with it is that there is no mutual tolerance of diversity; that's how everybody should be and that's how federal dollars should be spent. Another example is the Commission against Teenage Pregnancy....a very noble agenda....in contrast to the abstinence-only people who are much more fanatic. This group has tried to hammer out some differences in how best to approach childrearing issues.

### Meyer-Bahlburg would be free of "abuse"

"I am struck by the emphasis on "abuse" and "exploitation." What I would really like to see is a text that is free of "abuse" and "exploitation" and, then, a separate discussion of how the meaning of abuse is acquired by researchers, by the public, and especially by the affected children, adolescents, and adults themselves... [W]e should get rid of this prejudgment of adult-child contact and look at it separately in terms of acquisition of meaning. The same applies to the question of sexuality. When is child sex, sex? How do we conceptualize, even for adolescents and adults, what sex is and what it isn't?"

Jenkins agrees: "I have two problems with the concept of child abuse; one is the word "child," the other is the word "abuse." One of the things I would most like to see in this document is some striking back against the tendency to make everyone under 16....a child.

### Jany Rademakers: Americans are Afraid of Sex

"In the Netherlands they are more laid back, they don't get so excited over such things... [as adults having sex with their children]. But [as] Dutch parents reported more sexual behavior in their children [it seems like] American parents are more afraid of it and they just turn away and don't look, so it doesn't happen."

### Janet Hyde: "We" Must Define Normal Child Sexuality

"I think we would do a great service to the nation to have a general, broad-based, science-based, well-thought-out statement about what constitutes normal sexual expression in childhood....If we don't do it, we continue to make sexual development in childhood unmentionable by not being able to state that there is normal sexual development in childhood."

### **Erick Janssen: Problems With “Normal”**

“I have some problems, and I'm sure several of us do, with the use of the word "normal." If you look at sexual abuse in children, the problem with defining it is, to what extent are we talking about aspects of behavior that we would call wrong, the ethical aspects, versus the potential for harm?... Because we've not done the right research, we don't know really how harmful those experiences are. What we can say is that many people think that many of those experiences are wrong...We have to understand more about society's values and adults' values.”

### **Diane di Mauro: Use the SIECUS Foundation**

I would like to support our taking on such a task. I'd like to offer a model that many of you might be familiar with: the SIECUS curriculum guidelines. I was very instrumental in the early stages of creating them....there are a lot of benchmarks and a lot of framework and developmental progression that's very clearly outlined. That process brought together a wonderful panel of people that spent two years hammering it out...If you look at that document, it's an incredible achievement...SIECUS...focuses [not] an authoritative statement on development. But there's a lot of groundwork that's been done.

### **Elsie Pinkston: All Sexual Behavior is Normal**

“In my particular perspective all sexual behavior is normal because it's reactive to the environment it comes from, so it can't be abnormal. So I'm most concerned with how we're going to deal with children who come from non-normal or serial non-normal environments....I'd like to see the values of the culture being more tolerant of a wider range of behavior than they have been heretofore.

### **Ed Laumann: Not “Normal” But “Age Appropriate”**

“I would endorse the need for statements about age appropriate behaviors. Rather than say "normal," which labels it in a certain way, we can think about the height and weight charts that we have; we have big-boned, middle-boned, and thin-boned people and we have different ranges there....For example, you get much lower rates of reported masturbatory behavior by African American men....[or] oral sex, and I would trace that to the conservative upbringing that they have with those kinds of women that are being studied by Jeffrey and Elsie.”

## **APPENDICIES**

---

### **Appendix A. Federally funded study pays Women to watch pornography**

(Michael Bailey -- Not the Kinsey Institute)

---

Robert Stacy McCain

*The Washington Times*, December 23, 2002

**A federally funded study has paid women as much as \$75 to watch pornographic videos to determine "what types of audiovisual erotica women find sexually arousing."**

Women participating in the \$147,000 study at Northwestern University - funded through the federal National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) - were paid to "watch a series of commercially available film clips, some of which will be sexually explicit, while we monitor your body's sexual arousal," according to a flyer seeking volunteers for the study.

Funding for the research comes from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) budget, which has more than doubled in the past five years. The two-year study began in September 2001 and is intended to "assess the subjective and genital arousal of 180 lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual women as they watch erotic video clips of lesbian, gay, or heterosexual interactions," primary researcher J. Michael Bailey explained in a description of the project.

"We have some really great results on it, and I think it's going to make a big splash," Mr. Bailey said of the research, which he said he hopes to publish soon. In 1991, Mr. Bailey made headlines as one of the first researchers to say homosexuality is "substantially genetic," a conclusion based on studies of twins. Previous studies have shown that male sexual arousal is "target specific" - that is, that heterosexual males respond to depictions of females, while homosexual men respond to images of males, Mr. Bailey said.

"There has been inadequate attention to the question of whether female sexual orientation is target specific," Mr. Bailey wrote in a grant proposal. "However, some research ... including our own preliminary data, suggests that target specificity is much weaker for women than for men."

Early reports of the study, including in Northwestern University's daily newspaper, indicate that women's responses to the pornographic videos did not differ whether the images were of male-female couples, lesbians, or homosexual men. Rep. Dave Weldon, Florida Republican, cited the Northwestern study as an example of misplaced research priorities, saying he asked NICHD three years ago to study whether the measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccine was associated with autism.

"The NIH couldn't find the money to look into this relationship between kids with regressive autism and the mandatory MMR vaccine, but they can pay people \$150,000 to watch pornography," Mr. Weldon said. "This is disgusting, and is a clear example of distorted priorities at the NIH. The NIH message to parents of autistic children: Don't look to us for help."

Funding for NIH has increased from \$13 billion in fiscal 1998 to \$27.2 billion sought by the Bush administration for the current fiscal year. The White House proposed raising NIH funding by \$3.7 billion a year, which would be a 16 percent increase. That increase is reflected in the \$27.2 billion NIH budget that has been approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee, but House appropriators have yet to mark up the appropriations bill.

A spokesman for NICHD said the agency "covers all aspects of human development." "Our institute does things that are not directly involved with children's health. ... So it's a misnomer to say that it's just child health." Reports of Northwestern's video sex research have prompted some ridicule, landing the study a spot in the nationally syndicated "News of the Weird" feature, but Mr. Bailey said it's no laughing matter.

"I think it's extremely important research, and I think it's pathetic how skittish the government is about funding research about sex," Mr. Bailey said.

---

## **Appendix B: SF State University's "Kinsey at 50" Retrospective**

Reported by  
Judith Reisman, Ph.D.

Below are my notes transcribed from my eye witness account of this conference. I sat in the rear of the auditorium, which turned out to be a wise decision.

"Biography has become a battleground" as moral conservatives like Dr. Judith Reisman strive to discredit Alfred Kinsey in order to revisit another America era, warned anthropologist, Carole Vance.

On November 6, 1998, San Francisco State University hosted a seminar at the McKenna Theatre on the SFSU Campus. The seminar, "Kinsey At 50: Reflections On Changes In American Attitudes About Sexuality Half A Century After The Alfred Kinsey Studies," was designed as a tribute to Kinsey, as a celebration of the republication of Kinsey's two books and to announce the elite's plans for the nation's new sexual future.

### **"Biography has become the battleground"**

Kinsey's 50th year of influence was sponsored by The SFSU Program in Human Sexual Studies--which came under fire a few years ago when its Chairman, Dr. John DeCecco was "outed" as a pedophile. DeCecco served both as an Editor of *The Journal of Paedophilia* and the *Journal of Homosexuality*. A SFSU student group, protesting the conference, provided a copy of DeCecco's "class reader" to me, including the brochure, "A Child's Sexual Bill of Rights," which urges adult-sex with children of any age, providing children with contraception to allegedly prevent the transmission of STDs. While DeCecco's pedophile program may be said to underpin the tone of the SFSU conference, vocal student protests regarding the SFSU pedophile indoctrination program was felt by the speakers, none of whom revealed their pedophile writings.



For the purpose of this paper let me just note that one of the key “experts” for Dr. Bancroft’s book *Sexual Development in Childhood* was **Gilbert Herdt**, SFSU program Chairman. Herdt, who spoke about Kinsey’s contribution to tolerance and diversity, is the editor of *Gay and Lesbian Youth* (1989). Like his mentor, DeCecco, Herdt has elsewhere argued for tolerance of adult-child sex--as did the first speaker, Kinsey researcher, John Gagnon. Carole Vance followed Gagnon after which a depressed and haggard John Bancroft stepped on the stage to deliver his own “emotional” plea for himself and Kinsey.

### **Boy Lovers Are Stigmatized Like Communists Were**

Gilbert Herdt and all academicians sought tolerance of *all* sexual orientations—leaving out none. Especially cited as a key organizer of the conference was “academician,” Gayle Rubin, Rubin wrote on “cross-generational” encounters in *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*.” Dan Flynn quotes Rubin who cites Kinsey for scientific authority on infant and child sexuality:

Like communists and homosexuals in the 1950s....boy lovers are so stigmatized that it is difficult to find defenders for their civil liberties, let alone erotic orientation....[police organized] a witch hunt.... to wipe out the community of men who love underaged youth....[Says Rubin, opponents to pedophilia have] more in common with ideologies of racism than with true ethics.

**Alfred Kinsey approached the study of sex with the same uninhibited curiosity he had previously applied to examining species of wasp....His scientific detachment gave his work a refreshing neutrality.<sup>1</sup>**

**“Biography has become the battleground” as moral conservatives like Dr. Judith Reisman strive to discredit Alfred Kinsey in order to revisit another America era, warned anthropologist, Carole Vance.**

Kinsey Institute Director, Dr. John Bancroft took the stage, emotionally shaken, decrying “Dr. Judith Reisman’s” attacks on Kinsey and the Kinsey Institute. Complaining that “my first day as director” of the Kinsey Institute Reisman’s book, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, and, he said, its video production offshoot, **“The Children of Table 34,”** were waiting on his desk.

Maybe Carole [Dr. Vance, the previous speaker] doesn’t know about Judith Reisman’s recent book, and the English documentary, “Kinsey’s Pedophiles” [which] makes *The Children of Table 34* look amateur. It [the documentary] is horrific. I hope and pray that it will not come to this country.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dan Flynn, *Accuracy in Academia*, Washington, DC, 1998, article in press.

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.
	{ 11	65 min.		{ 9	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.		{ 3	70 sec.
9 yr.	7	68 min.	13 yr.	{ 11	8 hr.
10 yr.	9	52 min.		{ 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.

### Bancroft Cannot Reveal “In House” Response to Reisman

Bancroft announced that the British documentary “also included a woman who apparently responded to the appeal” to come forward if you are a Kinsey Institute victim. Bancroft said the woman said that she was abused by her father and grandfather. **“I have no reason to discount that.”** However, Bancroft adds we “cannot find any record” in our archive of the charge that her father was reporting his abuse to Kinsey. Bancroft then muses “I’ve been rather expecting more children to respond.”

He adds, “Judith Reisman’s new book is called *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences*. I didn’t intend to talk about it.” Kinsey was Bancroft’s “role model” as a young student. Bancroft assigned someone to prepare “a rebuttal” to Reisman’s charges. However, when asked by several individuals to see that rebuttal, Bancroft claims it is an “in house” copy and he cannot release it.

Bancroft wonders why Reisman’s new book includes the finding that Kinsey reported no data regarding the alleged sexual conduct of “fathers” or “mothers,” but he is especially scornful of her theorizing about where Kinsey obtained the hundreds or thousands of experimental children. Bancroft sarcastically observed that her last chapter theorized about Kinsey as a Nazi collaborator.

Having ridiculed the Nazi connection posited by Reisman, Bancroft then conceals its factual proofs, revealed in “Kinsey’s Paedophiles”. There, we meet Dr. Fritz von Balluseck, a Nazi pedophile who raped hundreds of children while serving as the commandant for a Polish Jewish ghetto. On trial post WWII for child sex abuse and child murder, von Balluseck was uncovered as one of Kinsey’s pedophile “experts” whose small WWII victims were killed in the gas chambers of Treblinka. The Nazi pedophile, like

other mass rapists, was directed onward in his child sex crimes by his close colleague and secret correspondent, Indiana University's Dr. Kinsey.

### **Herd and Gagnon Kiss Passionately on Stage**

Diverting the audience as much as possible from Kinsey's child sex abuse protocol, past Kinsey researcher, University of Chicago's John Gagnon (who called for introducing children to sexual experiences early, and who warns "sex researchers" they must hide the etiology of sexual orientation) warned, "we've *privileged* childhood too much." Fair minded listeners must question what these "scholars" are hiding when Gagnon insists we "mustn't care too much about Kinsey's childhood."

*Herd gave Gagnon a passionate kiss on the lips as he quit the stage, drawing a gasp even from the urbane SFSU audience for what was at best, unprofessional conduct.*

Vance, who preceded Bancroft, spent the substantive part of her speech scoffing at Reisman and "**The Children of Table 34.**" She cautioned that Reisman led "moral conservatives" with a much more "original" approach in her 1990 book on Kinsey, the Table 34 video and the proposed 1996 Children's Protection and Ethics Act.

**This growing grass-roots attack, said Vance, could have a "big potential impact on changes in legislation" schools and the like. For Reisman notes that the Kinsey studies established children with sexual interests and rights, which allowed the construction of school sex education. Ominously, Vance noted that this "well-funded" strategy, could sway progressives and moderates to overturn the 50 year advance of sexual rights.**

### **Conservative Grass Roots Attack Might Impact Legislation**

Vance concluded by saying that "Biography has become a battleground" as moral conservatives attempt to undermine Kinsey in order to restore traditional American morality. A quick look at some of the cardinal characters in mainstreaming "affectional orientation" or legalized sex between adults and children is in order as they are presenters at Bancroft's SFSU program.

**Dr. John DeCecco**--as noted, DeCecco is chairman of the Human Sexuality Department at SFSU, he is a self-confessed pedophile according to the Statement of Purpose of *The Journal of Paedophilia*—on the Editorial Board of that pedophile publication. He is also an editor of the *Journal of Homosexuality*. He distributes a "Children's Sexual Rights" statement to his students which proclaims the "right" of children of all ages to sex with whom they wish, and calling for contraceptive procedures to protect them from infection and pregnancy.

**John Gagnon**--University of Chicago, past Kinsey researcher. Gagnon, cites Herdt in his writings on boy-man sex. He implicitly is concerned that early sex abuse or neglect, that

is, environmental factors be concealed, if found to be a predominant feature of orientation. Therefore, Gagnon publicly called for “sex researchers” to massage their data by refusing to accept any information about the etiology of one's homosexuality in his article in *The Journal of Sex Research*. Moreover, Gagnon states in his 1977 book, *Human Sexualities*.

**[W]e may have to change the ways in which [children] learn about sex. We may have to become more directive, more informative, more positive--we may have to promote sexual activity--if we want to change the current process of sexual learning and their outcomes (Kinsey, *Sex and Fraud*, p. 209).**

**Gayle Rubin**--Rubin is a major advocate for lesbian sexual sadism. She is supposed to speak to the students at SFSU on something relating to “leather” in sexuality--a euphemism for sexual sadism.

**Anke Ehrhardt**--as the key colleague for Dr. John Money at Johns Hopkins University. Money distinguished himself as, to date, the most virulent academic pedophile advocate on record. In his *Journal of Paedophilia* interview, Money, the most prominent leader in the current human sexuality field, advocates for adult-child sex, an end to the age of consent and even for legalizing homicide resulting from “consent” -- with no special protection for children.

Were we to obtain the writings of the other SFSU participants (Bonds, Cohen, Grewal, Kaplan, VanDer Meer, Dimauro, Diaz and Herrel) we should expect similar positions advocated therein.

I believe it is not too much to say that the flag being planted academically and in the expert field is for a move toward full public and legal acceptance of the last taboos, “affectional orientation,” i.e.: pedophilia/pederasty and sexual sadism. Appendix C of my first Kinsey book, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* includes the April 14, 1980 *Time* article on sex researchers “Attacking the Last Taboo” (“Incest”). The backlash in the 1980s against these pedophile advocate sex researchers was profound, and I would argue, it has taken 18 years for the-incest academic lobby to publicly reappear flying under the “enlightened” academic colors of the Kinsey Institute and allied institutions.

### **Appendix C: Kinsey is Republished in 1998 Absent Apology or Correction**

Further answering the “what now” and “why is Kinsey important, in 1998, Indiana University and the Kinsey Institute released a joint publication of Kinsey's books, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953). Both books and Kinsey's allegedly scientific questionnaire (see below) answers were published without apology by IU and the KI.

No admissions of wrong doing were included in the 1998 edition, sold worldwide, and the “Introduction” by John Bancroft continued to smear those who drew attention to Kinsey's frauds as the modern equivalent of Neanderthals. A full analysis of the Bancroft Introduction is available upon request.

## Appendix D: Some Questions For The Kinsey Institute

The President of the United States, George W. Bush on October 25 declared “Protection From Pornography Week, 2003.” In his first paragraph he stated, “Pornography can have debilitating effects on communities, marriages, families, and children. During Protection From Pornography Week, we commit to take steps to confront the dangers of pornography.”

The Kinsey “questionnaire”

1. Question: Since the Kinsey Institute exposes vulnerable students to pornography in their sexual experiments, what scientific proofs can the Kinsey Institute provide to Indiana taxpayers that refute any portion(s) of the President’s proclamation on pornography harms and dangers? (See Addendum A)
- 
2. How do you justify using funds to test men or women’s sexual responses to pornography that the United States Congress has specifically designated for child welfare?
3. Please provide the names of the politically “conservative” or Judeo-Christian professing-professors and researchers employed by the Kinsey Institute?
4. What politically “conservative” Judeo-Christian professing speakers have addressed the KI?
5. When and who and what were the subjects?
6. Who is doing “conservative” Judeo-Christian professing sexuality research at the KI?
7. What is the precise pornography being shown to the subjects under “mood” study?
8. Where was this pornography obtained; do you pay for this material, if so to whom and have you permission to use it in “scientific” studies?
9. Please give us the grant request used to solicit funds for any sex studies.
10. Please provide us with a precise explanation of your research thesis, your research methodology, your evaluation and follow-up procedures.
11. Who on the staff was trained with the SAR (sexual attitude restructuring) as part of their sexuality education: when, where, how long. Please describe.

12. Is the KI receiving funds from any pharmaceutical companies to conduct clinical trials that may benefit the company in terms of a “female” Viagra or any other sexual enhancement product?
13. Do any of the KI faculty, staff, present or past, have any pecuniary interest in such sex studies – any possible stock arrangements with a company should a wonder female sex drug be found, etc.?
14. Are informed consent forms being signed by all subjects? Please provide these consent forms and their signatures.
15. Please supply the records of all sex studies being conducted by the KI and any sex studies over the last decade, working backward: how many subjects were/are used, their gender, ages, race, religion, personal history, family data, (married, how long, children, what ages), any battery in their history, incest, any sexual or other problems, any history of child sexual abuse, rape, etc., any history of health problems.
16. Do you have a decompression procedure following exposure, and if so what is it and how has it worked with the subjects?
17. Please document the follow-up employed (2 months, 6 months, one year, two years, five years) to assure the health and welfare of all subjects used in any KI experiments. Provide actual proofs of follow-up so that these may be verified.
18. Please send your IRB approvals and reports for any studies involving sex or pornography, nudity, masturbation or any other such nontraditional kinds of investigations.
19. Please send a copy of the videotape of John Bancroft’s Power Point presentation on the *Kinsey Funding Controversy* to the Library Sciences school in October or November 2003.
20. As part of their informed consent, do you explain to all subjects that their brains are structurally altered by any pornography viewed in the course of the experiments, and that you cannot guarantee the fallout for them of this exposure to pornography?
21. Why are the KI files not opened to critics of the KI? Andrea Dworkin, Judith Reisman, Michael Jones and others?
22. Do you claim that you and the other pornography “researchers” are not sexually aroused by the pornography you are showing to your subjects?
23. Will you all submit to an MRI to see if your “non arousal” claim is true or false?

24. Please provide all information on the several Kinsey Institute “researchers” / employees that were arrested for child molestation.
25. Please provide all information on any Kinsey Institute associates or employees that were arrested for any crime.
26. Please provide scientific proof that the pornography you are using at the Kinsey Institute is a harmless, non-addictive or disruptive stimuli for any psyche and that these stimuli never cause copycat crimes (involuntary acts upon others).

Dr. **Erick Janssen**, Kinsey Institute Associate Scientist said that in 2002 you found some pornography was not stimulating enough for some people and that you had to increase the ‘dose’ to sadistic pornography. Janssen said it was “surprising,” which would mean the men’s responses were counter predictive to your expectations. He said these:

...highly sexually active men did not respond to porn clips that had proven successful in eliciting sexual responses in earlier studies. It was not until we provided them with a wide variety of porn clips to choose from, depicting anything from group sex to sadomasochism (S&M) that we started to obtain clear signs of arousal (*Frontline*, 2002).

27. Please document the non-addictive properties of pornography based on this “surprise” and also the names of these exposed men and the follow-up studies on their lives since exposure.
28. Were these same men responsive to the pornography of “earlier studies”?
29. Please explain how you are “Testing the Effects of Exposure to Virtual Child Pornography on Viewer Cognitions and Attitudes toward Deviant Sexual Behavior” as offered by Paul Bryant, last year--and include statements by discussant Erick Janssen of The Kinsey Institute.
30. Please explain how Kinsey obtained the five “orgasm” charts in *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and the description of “orgasm” on pages 160 and 161.
31. Please explain why the Kinsey Institute has never attempted to find the children abused for these two reports.
32. What proofs can you provide that your own training with and ongoing use of pornography has not altered your own brains/minds/and memories and wholly disrupted your ability to carry out objective sexual research?

Janssen also said in his *Frontline* essay:

**At the Kinsey Institute we currently are exploring the effects of negative mood (stress, anxiety, depression) on sexual desire and arousal....**We believe that this paradoxical increase in sexual interest and activity in some people when they feel bad may not only be important to explaining why (or when) people use porn, it may also increase our understanding of the causes of compulsive, or "addictive," patterns of sexuality.

33. What are the placebo treatments and what are the pharmaceutical products being used to test the possibility of “enhanced” sexual “mood due to pornography use?
34. Was Professor Jerome Cerny involved in any of these sex experiments?
35. If yes, which ones?
36. If no, what sex experiments was Cerny conducting at the Kinsey Institute, when, with whom, and please forward his informed consent forms and all relevant data including his subjects’ names and means of contacting them.
37. Please send all of your Janssen and Cerny research studies information.
38. Please explain precisely how Dr. Kinsey himself collected “sperm count in early–adolescent males” as was stated by his co-author and intimate colleague, Wardell Pomeroy in his Indiana University approved book, *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research*, (Harper and Row, NY, 1972, p. 315).
39. Please explain why Kinsey deliberately misled the legislators, saying his was a random “nationwide” population of 161/2 thousand histories...better than public opinion samples, that represented the American male population in his testimony to the California Subcommittee on Sex Crimes in **1949**.



40. Please explain why Kinsey deliberately misled the legislators--saying his data confirmed that sex offenders do not re-offend, and why then he called for full parole for all sex criminals without exception?

41. Please explain why Kinsey deliberately misled the legislators that only “5 to 10%” of those imprisoned did anything different than the rest of the population when he knew full well that his male population was aberrant?

42. Please explain why Kinsey deliberately misled the legislators, that, knowing his elderly pedophile demonstrated ejaculation faster than any other human, he told the legislators “50% of the older men, are incapable of sexual performance anyway,” suggesting that parole was in order for most if not all elderly child sex offenders?

43. Please explain why Kinsey deliberately misled the legislators stated that “the child is not a good witness” to their abuse and that it is the “public hysteria” over child sexual abuse and not the sexual abuse of the child that is a problem, and to “scare it” is as damaging as sex abuse?

44. What is the Kinsey Institute’s position regarding those leaders in the sexology field who work or have worked for the pornography industry as consultants, on editorial boards, appearing as “interviewees” and/or serving as expert witnesses in courtroom in the defense of pornography as harmless?

The other side of the question is one that has disturbed a good many of us who have been working with children. As part of our own study, we have done work with, so far, about 500 children under seven years of age very extensively, trying to determine the beginning of attitudes and of sexual patterns which ultimately determine the patterns of adults. The leading child psychiatrist in the country is Dr. David Levy of New York City, and he and I have been in conference, and we have had conferences with various people who have worked with children, and we are all agreed that there is no greater damage that can be done to a child than to scare it concerning any situation; and we are also agreed that the parent's reaction to the child who says that a man "stopped me and kissed me" in more cases has done more damage than the man himself had ever done. Right now you have in many of the cities of your own state, school teachers who are under orders to warn every child when it leaves school in the afternoon to go home directly and not allow any man to touch it, and I can see tens of thousands of maladjusted marriages coming out of that simple procedure. It is out of that sort of thing that you get the estrained woman, who never lets herself go freely. She hasn't as a

Statement above is from Kinsey's testimony before California legislators

## Appendix E: Protection from Pornography Proclamation, 2003



### **Protection From Pornography Week, 2003**

By the President of the United States of America  
A Proclamation

Pornography can have debilitating effects on communities, marriages, families, and children. During Protection From Pornography Week, we commit to take steps to confront the dangers of pornography.

The effects of pornography are particularly pernicious with respect to children. The recent enactment of the PROTECT Act of 2003 strengthens child pornography laws, establishes the Federal Government's role in the AMBER Alert System, increases punishment for Federal crimes against children, and authorizes judges to require extended supervision of sex offenders who are released from prison.

We have committed significant resources to the Department of Justice to intensify investigative and prosecutorial efforts to combat obscenity, child pornography, and child sexual exploitation on the Internet. We are vigorously prosecuting and severely punishing those who would harm our children. Last July, the Department of Homeland Security launched Operation Predator, an initiative to help identify child predators, rescue children depicted in child pornography, and prosecute those responsible for making and distributing child pornography.

Last year, I signed legislation creating the Dot Kids domain, a child-friendly zone on the Internet. The sites on this domain are monitored for content and safety, offering parents assurances that their children are learning in a healthy environment. Working together with law enforcement officials, parents, and other caregivers, we are making progress in protecting our children from pornography.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GEORGE W. BUSH, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim October 26 through November 1, 2003, as Protection From Pornography Week. I call upon public officials, law enforcement officers, parents, and all the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate programs and activities.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-fourth day of October, in the year of our Lord two thousand three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-eighth.

GEORGE W. BUSH



## *Research News Updates*

### *"NIH: Sex Research, Including Questioned Kinsey Work, Is Valid"*

#### **Appendix F: "NIH: Questioned Kinsey Work"**

National Institutes of Health Director Dr. Elias Zerhouni told his advisory committee earlier this month that an internal review of about 190 NIH-funded grants concluded that all of them – including work at Indiana University's Kinsey Institute – are valid and in the public's interest.

"When we looked at the public-health relevance, there was no question that these projects should have been funded and should continue to be funded," Zerhouni said, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education. Some conservatives have questioned the value of the sexual studies. Rep. Mark Souder (R-Ind.) objected to a Kinsey Institute-sponsored conference on sex research methods, as well as grants to other groups to investigate women's reaction to pornography, older men's sexual fantasies, and HIV among prostitutes.

Later, the US House fell two votes short of amending a Department of Health and Human Services funding measure to cut money for the Kinsey study and other projects. In October, a Congressional staffer sent Zerhouni the list, furnished by the Traditional Values Coalition, of 190 projects deemed objectionable. John Bancroft, director of the Kinsey Institute for the Study of Sex, Gender and Reproduction, credited Zerhouni's position to an organized effort by scientists to back the peer-review system that funded the research.

"The tendency has been for the religious right to be very well-organized and everyone else to be somewhat in disarray," Bancroft said. "Here we're seeing a well-organized, coordinated response from the scientific community." Martin Green, Souder's press secretary, said the representative "supports research into HIV, sexually transmitted diseases and drug abuse if the intention is to cure, treat, or prevent them." In a statement, Souder said, "It is upsetting that tax dollars are misused like this, but it is infuriating that the agency defends the continued funding of such dubious research...." Associated Press, Date forthcoming

## Appendix G: Ex-Kinsey Institute employee accused of sexual molestation

By Adam Aasen Indiana Daily Student

Published Tuesday, November 18, 2003  
<http://www.idsnews.com/story.php?id=19884>

A former Indiana State University professor and researcher at the Kinsey Institute may have his psychologist license revoked for allegedly sexually harassing his research subjects.

**This summer, four ISU students filed a complaint with the Indiana attorney** general's office, alleging professor Jerome A. Cerny, 59, inappropriately touched their genitalia and made sexual comments during research. The complaints contain four counts of inappropriate conduct between September 1994 and June 2002.

Cerny will defend his license in front of the Indiana State Psychology Board at a hearing Nov. 21. The Board suspended his license in an emergency session May 16. ISU closed Cerny's lab in 1996 following **two similar student accusations**. From September 1998 to August 1999, Cerny went on sabbatical where he did research on psychophysiological processes of sexual behavior at the Kinsey Institute.

**Jennifer Bass, spokesperson for Kinsey**, said no one was aware of any past complaints against Cerny when he was accepted to the Institute. She said there were no complaints made during his time at the Kinsey Institute. Michael Morse, an ISU student from 1992 to 1997, discussed his contact with **Cerny in 1996**.

Morse, a psychology major, said he was eager to be a research subject to add to his resume. He showed up at Cerny's lab, but was turned down because he didn't meet the criteria. In 1997, Cerny allegedly approached Morse, then a senior, and asked if he was still interested in being a subject. Morse said it was typical of his style of recruitment.

Most of the subjects were enrolled in his courses and were not paid. Instead, they received "massive amounts" of extra credit -- a half-hour in the laboratory in exchange for almost a grade higher in some cases, Morse said. Morse said he was told by Cerny, both verbally and in a written consent form, that his **genitals would only be viewed once during the ejaculatory latency research. Morse said Cerny asked him to masturbate to a pornographic movie while he talked** to him over an intercom. For almost three hours, Morse unsuccessfully tried to ejaculate wearing the plethysmograph. Cerny then told him to use his hand and then Morse ejaculated. Cerny then allegedly grabbed Morse's penis.

**During the procedure, Morse said Cerny touched his penis at least eight times during a two-day period, for "vague and ambiguous reasons." Morse said he felt uncomfortable, but didn't say anything at that moment.**

"I didn't even realize that anything was wrong until he tickled my sides at the water fountain outside of class," he said. "Then, I realized something terribly wrong went on."

Cerny did not wish to comment when called at his home Monday night.

In the complaints, the counts detail Cerny's relationship with ISU students, including accusations Cerny massaging, pinching and tickling. The complaints also claim **Cerny suggested that he stay in the room with the subjects and watch them masturbate. In his lab, students also claim Cerny asked them to help him design a more ergonomic chair. One student agreed and took his pants off so Cerny could trace his legs, buttocks and testicles on paper.**

Shelly Mazo, director of the Indiana State Psychology Board, said a board of seven members will vote on whether or not to revoke Cerny's license. Bass said regardless of the outcome of Cerny's hearing, **situations like these are always detrimental to the sexual research field.** "Doing sex research is a very, very sensitive topic," she said. "We need to provide more protections for people involved, both researchers and subjects."

Bass said researchers should never touch a subject or be in the room when they **are performing personal sexual acts. Most of all, she said subjects need to know what will actually occur in the study and their rights to privacy.**

**"Most subjects don't know they can back out at any time," she said.** Morse said he felt the same way.

**"I was just in terror of him," he said. "I literally felt that I could not get out of there unless I finished the project. It had nothing to do with science."**

The public hearing will begin at 9:15 p.m., Friday at the Indiana Government Center South, Room 1, in Indianapolis.

-- Contact campus editor Adam Aasen at [aaasen@indiana.edu](mailto:aaasen@indiana.edu) .

Some comments JAR: I think it is important to try to find this boy and to see what happened to all six students and where. Teachers in general have a higher rate of sexual abuse of their students than do priests. SESAME is a recovery organization of students abused by educators---and these are not "educators" using pornography for "research."

Jennifer Bass says the students often don't know they can back out!!! That is stunning!!! So their disclosure and informed consent forms are largely nonexistent. Even I am shocked. Her claim that he wasn't at the Kinsey Institute during his molestations I am sure can be refuted—that is hardly possible. Do they use pornography now all over the IU campus on the students—who cannot give informed consent since they are vulnerable and unaware of its effects, as are the researchers apparently. jar



Volume 2 Number 1 January 20, 2005

# Second Opinions

## Big Pharma and the Ties That Bind: The Politics of Drug Promotion

The relationship between medical journals and the drug industry is "somewhere between symbiotic and parasitic," according to the editor of the Lancet, Richard Horton, who testified recently to the House of Commons select committee on health. Dr. Horton described some of the financial incentives that could influence a commercially run medical journal to publish a paper. For example, many of the research papers published in the Lancet are reprinted and bought in bulk by drug companies to use for marketing purposes. It does not require imagination to realize that companies regularly exert pressure on the journal to publish certain papers by arguing that doing so will earn the journal more money.

Dr. Horton gave another example of the parasitic relationship of Big Pharma to medical journals: he disclosed that when the Lancet raised questions with the authors of a paper on Cox-2 inhibitors, (Vioxx © one of these drugs has already been withdrawn, the other, Celebrex © may soon follow), the drug company sponsoring the research called Dr Horton, asking him to "stop being so critical," threatening to pull the paper "...and that means no income for the journal." That this is an international and not a British problem is well-known among medical journal editors who continue to struggle with conflict of interest questions involving their contributors.

An editorial in the Annals of Internal Medicine (141:1, 6 July, 2004) admits that conflicts of interest "are pervasive in biomedical research, that such conflicts cause harm, and "that conflicts can undermine the public's trust in the medical profession." Yet, later the same editorial states "While we prefer to avoid commentary from authors with potential conflicts, we have to weigh the possible harm against the benefits of their expertise..." This statement is not surprising in view of the paucity of unbiased researchers who are not already on the payroll or receiving research grants from drug companies. Last June, editors of the New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM) made a startling announcement: They declared they were dropping their previous requirement that authors of medical review articles could not have financial ties to companies whose drugs they were reviewing. While this standard only applied to reviewers, the actual authors of scientific studies in medical journals are often bought and paid for by private drug companies with an obvious stake in the scientific (read "favorable") results. Moreover, while the NEJM and some other journals disclose these conflicts, others do not. In many cases data is often collected, discussed and analyzed by the drug maker. An independent 1996 study found that 98 percent of scientific papers based on research sponsored by corporations promoted the effectiveness of a company's drug. This corruption reaches from the doctors prescribing a drug to government review boards to university research centers.

The problem extends to financial ties with medical experts setting nationwide professional guidelines for treating conditions ranging from asthma to heart disease. Surveys reveal that nine out of ten experts writing such guidelines have financial ties to the pharmaceutical industry, yet those ties are almost never disclosed in consensus statements and other official or semi-official treatment guidelines, which are often published in medical journals and endorsed by medical societies. The Food and Drug Administration, routinely allows researchers with ties to the industry to sit on drug approval advisory committees. In many cases, half the panelists on such committees have a financial stake in the outcome.

**On January 17th, The New York Times carried a lead article in their business section on a dispute between the BMJ, a leading medical journal, and Eli Lilly & Company, makers of Prozac. On New Year's Day, the BMJ had published a news article suggesting that "missing" documents from a decade-old lawsuit indicated that Lilly had minimized data about the drug's risks of causing suicidal or violent behavior. While Lilly has not taken legal action, it's lawyers consider the article to be "inaccurate and defamatory." What we do know is that the article's appearance follows the recent controversy over whether drug makers adequately disclosed the risks that antidepressants like Prozac, Paxil, and Zoloft (called "SSRI's") posed to pediatric patients, and whether the FDA ignored or played down potential risks of Prozac over 14 years ago when the agency panel decided not to issue any additional warnings. As a result of the recent controversy about the potential suicide risks posed by antidepressants to children and teenagers, the F.D.A. last week sent out final new labeling language about those dangers to all makers of such drugs, including Lilly. The British, on the other hand, actually [banned the use of Paxil for kids](#) last June, and went on to ban all the other SSRI's for the pediatric group.**

Dr. Paul Rosch, President of [The American Institute of Stress](#), discusses Big Pharma in his outstanding publication, [Health and Stress](#). He documents multiple examples of "misleading drug promotion, overpricing, and the corruption of the medical and Governmental establishment by the pharmaceutical industry in a pattern of widespread abuse." Dr. Rosch also reports that a year ago 94% of the more than 5,000 scientists at NIH were engaged in lucrative conflict of interest activities, and that top officials had received over \$2.5 million in fees and stock options from drug companies over the past decade. In 2002, the pharmaceutical industry spent \$91.4 million on federal lobbying activities, and at least another \$50 million was spent to "influence Congress and others through advertising, direct mail, telemarketing, and grants. Drug companies had 675 registered lobbyists and 26 of these were former members of Congress." This, according to other articles quoted by CNN and appearing in The New York Times, The New Yorker, Time, The Nation, and other publications, is only the tip of the iceberg.

The science fiction writer, Neal Stephenson, author of *Snow Crash* (1992), the three part trilogy *The Baroque Cycle*, and other philosophical-historical novels, offers an intriguing name to current medical economics. He describes how the political system has always been subject to "power disorders," sudden deviations or disequilibria in which "certain groups or persons suddenly concentrate a lot of power and abuse it." Does this phenomenon describe what is happening to medicine today? Or is it perhaps only one of many pathologies afflicting our present system of health care?

Stay tuned.

[Martin F. Sturman, MD, FACP](#) Copyright 2005, *Mathemedics, Inc.*

EasyDiagnosis is an automated online subscription service that analyses existing medical symptoms and predicts likely causes and conditions. [Click here](#) to find out more about this unique service and [click here](#) to subscribe.

## Appendix I: Conflicts of Interest and the Public Trust

### Conflicts of Interest and the Public Trust

#### Journal of the American Medical Association November 1, 2000

Catherine D. DeAngelis, MD, MPH; Editor, JAMA

**University-based educators and researchers, as well as private practitioners, are in frequent contact with representatives from for-profit companies that provide "gifts" and financial support for teaching and research.** The enticement begins very early in a physician's career: for my classmates and me, it started with black bags.

Dr Kassirer's colleague (1) is not alone in remembering which pharmaceutical company provided them. The timing of presenting the black bags early in our first year was wonderfully strategic, as was the inscription of our names on each. I must admit I was very happy to finally have a real symbol of the medical profession after so many hours of what seemed like year 5 of college. It took me a few days to come back to reality and store the bag in my closet. I'm not sure what happened to it, but I never carried it after that first day. On the other hand, at that time I did not have the courage to publicly state my unease with the unearned "gift."

Subsequently, offers came for "free" lunches, dinners, and tickets to various events followed by offers to serve as an "expert" with the usual lineup of speaking engagements and serving on advisory panels and boards, for an "honorarium" of course. **There should be little question about the expected effects of accepting free food, tickets, and even black bags. It has been shown that clinicians' decisions are affected by their interactions with pharmaceutical companies.** (2) This is no revelation; why else would anyone provide these "free" gifts except ultimately to assist in the selling of a product? The public is well aware of this problem, and it has become a favorite subject of recent newspaper articles.(3,4)

The issue of receiving reimbursement for providing time and expertise, as a speaker (teacher), advisor, or researcher, is more complex. Persons asked to provide expertise as teachers or researchers generally are selected from a pool of those best prepared and experienced in the field. Who is better equipped to teach or perform the studies, and why shouldn't they be rewarded for their work? The problem lies in the conflict of interest that results from these relationships. It is vitally important to understand that a conflict of interest does not necessarily result in

an outcome different than the result would have been without such conflict. The potential for differing results is the problem at hand.

Balance must be maintained between the need for research projects to be reasonably funded and performed by the best possible investigators and the relative paucity of public funds for clinical research. In 1999, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) provided \$17.8 billion for research, and the major proportion was expended for basic research; the top 10 pharmaceutical companies spent \$22.7 billion, primarily on clinical research (Hamilton Moses III, MD, The Boston Consulting Group, personal communication, 2000). The likelihood that a clinical investigator would be funded by private vs public funds is substantial. Furthermore, a recent study by USA Today revealed that **more than half of the advisors** to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have financial relationships with pharmaceutical companies that have an interest in FDA decisions. (5)

**When an investigator has a financial interest in or funding by a company with activities related to his or her research, the research is:**

- **lower in quality (6,7)**
- **more likely to favor the sponsor's product (8-11)**
- **less likely to be published (12,13)**
- **more likely to have delayed publication (14)**

Institutional safeguards can substantially mitigate the negative effects of funding from companies with a vested interest in the results.

Boyd and Bero (15) provide a case study of the University of California, San Francisco faculty's financial relationships with industry. By 1999, 225 researchers (almost 8% of total faculty investigators) had been involved in 488 disclosures. One can only postulate the results from other institutions that accept private funding for research, and it is an unusual institution that does not do so. Therefore, all research universities should emulate Boyd and Bero's study to determine the extent of their faculty members' involvement with industry and to institute proper oversight.

Cho et al (16) report on the content of conflict of interest policies at 89 biomedical research institutions receiving the most NIH funding in 1998. Their results show that while there appears to be a lack of specificity about the exact nature of the relationships of their faculties with industry, the vast majority (89%) at least had mechanisms for disclosure to the institution. However, **only 19% had specific prohibitions or limitations of activities related to research or teaching, and 38% had institutional committees to review conflicts of interest.** As the amount and proportion of funding from private corporations for research increase, it is vital that all institutions that accept these funds develop methods for disclosure and oversight.

In a Commentary, Korn (17) addresses the complexities of ensuring that academic medical centers preserve the confidence and support of the public and government agencies while maintaining the funding necessary to remain on the cutting edge of research. He discusses how the inevitable conflict of interest issues must be managed by academic centers.

Finally, Kahn and colleagues (18) illustrate what can happen when disagreement occurs between the funding sponsor and the investigators when the sponsor has a proprietary interest in the findings. **The investigators report that some data were not made available to them by the sponsor.** The integrity of the research process rests on a sound study design and the disclosure of all pertinent results, whether positive or negative, based on analysis of all necessary data.

In this case the data set is incomplete, but the investigators, peer reviewers, and editors believe it to be of sufficient merit to warrant the conclusions. Our decision to publish this study is based on the belief that the integrity of the research process must be protected and preserved. The authors have provided the best research possible under the circumstances. If further data are or become available that refute or alter the conclusion of this study, I welcome submission of such material. Science is a dynamic and ongoing process, and we must allow it to continue.

Unlike the majority of, if not all, for-profit businesses in our capitalistic society, managed health care corporations have not provided funding for research and development (education). This is true despite the advantages they derive from the research and education provided primarily by academic medical centers. Furthermore, there is little chance that sufficient funding for important clinical research, especially expensive clinical trials, will be forthcoming from sources other than sponsors with a vested interest in the results. Those best prepared and experienced to carry out such complex studies generally are faculty in academic institutions. Therefore, **it is vitally important that these**



**institutions develop conflict of interest policies, have oversight mechanisms in place, and continuously monitor the relationships of faculty with sponsoring companies and agencies.**

Without these policies and procedures, the academic institutions where most clinical research is based and their faculty members who perform the research are in grave danger of losing the support and respect of the public. Without this support and respect, trust in new medical discoveries and their applications will not be forthcoming. **Without trust, medical research is doomed.**

---

## References

1. Kassirer JP. Financial indigestion. JAMA. 2000;284:2156-2157.
2. Chren MM, Landefeld CS. Physicians' behavior and their interactions with drug companies. JAMA. 1994;271:684-689.
3. Peterson M. What's black and white and sells medicine? New York Times. August 27, 2000;sect 3:1.
4. Cohen R. Conference call. New York Times. September 24, 2000: Magazine section: 30-32.
5. Cauchon D. FDA advisers tied to industry. USA Today. September 25, 2000:01A.
6. Rochon P. Evaluating the quality of articles published in journal supplements compared with the quality of those published in the parent journal. JAMA. 1994; 272:108-113.
7. Bero LA, Rennie D. Influences on the quality of published drug studies. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 1996; 12:209-237.
8. Bero LA, Galbraith A, Rennie D. The publication of sponsored symposiums in medical journals. N Engl J Med, 1992; 327:1135-1140.
9. Rochon P, Gurwitz JH, Simms RW, et al. A study of manufacturer-supported trials of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in the treatment of arthritis. Arch Intern Med, 1994; 154:157-163.
10. Cho MK, Bero LA. The quality of drug studies published in symposium proceedings. Ann Intern Med 1996; 124:485-489.
11. Stelfox HT, Chua G, O'Rourke K, Detsky AS. Conflict of interest in the debate over calcium-channel antagonists. N Engl J Med 1998;338:101-106.
12. Blumenthal D, Campbell EG, Anderson MS, et al. Withholding research results in academic life science. JAMA 1997;277:1224-1228.
13. Rennie D. Thyroid storm. JAMA. 1997;277:1238-1243.
14. Friedberg M, Saffran B, Stinson TJ, et al. Evaluation of conflict of interest in economic analyses of new drugs used in oncology. JAMA. 1999;282:1453-1457.
15. Boyd EA, Bero LA. Assessing faculty financial relationships with industry: a case study. JAMA 2000;284:2209-2214.
16. Cho MK, Shohara R, Schissel A, Rennie D. Policies on faculty conflicts of interest at US universities. JAMA 2000;284:2203-2208.
17. Korn D. Conflicts of interest in biomedical research. JAMA 2000; 284:2234-2237.
18. Kahn JO, Cherng DW, Mayer K, Murray H, Lagakos S. Evaluation of HIV-1 Immunogen, an immunologic modifier, administered to patients infected with HIV having 300 to 549 106/L



## Appendix J: Harvard Approves Pornographic Magazine

### Center For Reclaiming America

Monday, January 17, 2005

By Sam Kastensmidt

While much of our nation's resistance to sexual temptation has been dismissed in exchange for today's permissive culture of entitlements, irresponsibility, and moral relativism, fringe groups and sexual deviants have been tremendously successful in advancing their perverted view of sexuality. Today, in American universities, tenured professors are hired to promote the advancement of various sexual lifestyles — including gay, lesbian, bisexual, transsexual, transvestite, bestiality, and even pedophile interests.

#### Course Catalogues Reveal University Agendas

To determine the priorities of a major university simply look at the courses offered each semester. For instance, Yale University employs dozens of professors in its English Department, but one would be amazed to see how these teachers are dispatched. For example, fourteen of the professors specialize in "gender and sexuality" (gay & lesbian writing) — far outnumbering professors trained in fiction, poetry, medieval, Renaissance, contemporary, romantic, African-American, or Old English literatures.

Read through the University of Michigan course catalog, and you will find courses like "How to be Gay: Male Homosexuality and Initiation," "Introduction to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transsexual Studies," "Sex and the City," "Sexuality in Western Culture," "Rethinking American Culture," "Queer in America," and many others.

#### The Promotion of Debauched Sexual Agendas

This morally relative and sexually reckless mindset has all but conquered many of our nation's most prestigious universities. However, these disturbing courses pale in comparison to a newly emerging threat in our universities — the advocacy of pedophilia. Incredibly, many universities are not only hiring professors who blatantly and unapologetically espouse these views, some actually devote entire courses to promoting the legalization of pedophilia.

### Cornell University

Cornell University professor Pat Califa teaches a course called "The Sexual Child." Califa, well known for her outspoken support of pedophilia, once wrote, "Culturally induced schizophrenia allows parents to make sentimental speeches about the fleeting innocence of childhood and the happiness of years unbroken by carnal lust — and exhaust themselves

policing the sex lives of their children. Children are celibate because their parents prevent them from playing with other little kids or adults... Even though many prominent sex researchers have documented the existence of sexual capacity in children (for instance Kinsey verified the occurrence of orgasms in girls and boys at less than six months of age), our society is fanatically determined to deny it.”

### **John Hopkins University**

John Money, director of the Psychohormonal Research Unit of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, believes that America’s fear of pedophilia stems from a “self-imposed, moralistic ignorance.” In the introduction to his book, *Boys on Their Contacts with Men*, Money writes, “It surely should be self-evident that we need a basic science of pediatric sexology, so as to have the actual data on which to base a sound policy of rearing children to be sexually healthy... Most adults enjoy cuddling and caressing children, and children respond to this type of intimacy by getting sexually and erotically aroused.”

### **University of Minnesota**

The University of Minnesota published Judith Levine’s book, *Harmful to Minors: The Peril of Protecting Children from Sex*. The book features a foreword by Dr. Joycelyn Elders, the Clinton administration's Surgeon General, openly advocating for the repeal of sexual age-of-consent laws. Levine wrote, “The research shows us that in some minority cases of young—even some quite young—people can have a positive [sexual] experience with an adult... Sex is not harmful to children. It is a vehicle to self-knowledge, love, healing, creativity, adventure, and intense feelings of aliveness. There are many ways even the smallest children can partake of it... America’s drive to protect children from sex is protecting them from nothing. Instead, often it is harming them.”

### **University of Missouri–Kansas City**

Dr. Harris Mirkin, associate professor and chairman of the political science department at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, wrote a column in the *Journal of Homosexuality*. Mirkin labels pedophilia as the “last great sexual forbidden.” His column, “Sex, Science, and Sin: The Rind Report,” noted the progress made in the movement to sexualize American children. Mirkin wrote, “Children are the last bastion of the old sexual morality... Like all arguments against deviants, the condemnation of pariahs allows the non-deviants to identify with each other as the moral protectors of Western Civilization.”

### **San Francisco State University**

San Francisco State University professor Gilbert Herdt co-authored the 1996 book *Children of Horizons: How Gay and Lesbian Teens Are Leading a New Way Out of the Closet*. In an interview with *Paidika*, a Dutch journal advocating pedophilia, Herdt argued, “The category ‘child’ is a rhetorical device for inflaming what is really an irrational set of attitudes.”

## New York University

New York University Press's published an article in the *Lavender Culture*, actively promoting the repeal of all "repressive, ageist legislation." Translation: legalize pedophilia. Calling the innocence of children an "archaic" notion, the article encourages young gay people to "get out of their families as soon as they can." Otherwise, the author warns that there will be "future generations of gay people who wait until their twenties before they start to live."

## Princeton University

Princeton University professor Peter Singer, who also believes that women should be able to murder infants up to 30 days after birth, also believes that all sexual prohibitions will eventually be lifted. Professor Singer, who also chairs the Princeton bioethics committee, wrote an article titled "Heavy Petting." In it, he argued, "Sex with animals does not always involve cruelty. Who has not been at a social occasion disrupted by the household dog gripping the legs of a visitor and vigorously rubbing its penis against them? The host usually discourages such activities, but in private, not everyone objects to being used by her or his dog in this way, and occasionally mutually satisfying activities may develop."

## Harvard University

On February 11, Harvard University approved of a student-run magazine that will contain nude images of its students. The University's Committee on College Life (CCL) voted 12-0 to allow the creation of a racy publication called *H-Bomb*. According to The Harvard Crimson, the magazine "will feature nude pictures of Harvard undergraduates and articles about sexual issues."

## University of California – Santa Cruz

University of California - Santa Cruz Professor Gayle Rubin believes that all laws prohibiting sex with underage children have "more in common with ideologies of racism than with true ethics." Ms. Rubin believes, "Boy lovers are so stigmatized that it is difficult to find defenders for their civil liberties, let alone erotic orientation. Consequently, the police have feasted on them."

## Abandoning an Age of Innocence

It is truly tragic and revolting that many of today's universities promote such a disturbing agenda. The eyes of moral clarity among many of America's elitist educators have become so dimmed that they can no longer recognize anything wrong with a sexual relationship between a 50-year-old predator and a naïve fifth-grader — so long as it is "consensual."

## Take Action!

Contact your state legislators and encourage them to remove state funding from any colleges or universities that advocate such grotesque platforms.

## Sources:

“Academics Defend Pedophilia,” *NewsMax*, September 23, 2004.  
<http://www.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2004/9/23/94446.shtml>

John Money, “Introduction to Boys on Their Contacts with Men – A Study of Sexually Expressed Friendships,” Johns Hopkins University.  
[http://www.just-well.dk/john\\_mny.htm](http://www.just-well.dk/john_mny.htm)

Chow, Christopher, “U. Minnesota Press Publishes Pro-Pedophilia Book,” *Accuracy in Academia*. May 2002.  
[http://www.academia.org/campus\\_reports/2002/may\\_2002\\_2.html](http://www.academia.org/campus_reports/2002/may_2002_2.html)

Mirkin, Harris, “Sex, Science, and Sin: The Rind Report.”  
[http://www.ipce.info/ipceweb/Library/mirkin\\_rind\\_text.htm](http://www.ipce.info/ipceweb/Library/mirkin_rind_text.htm)

“Endorsement of Adult-Child Sex on the Rise,” *The Washington Times*, April 19, 2002.  
[http://www.vanguardnewsnetwork.com/temp/TerrorTimeline/041902\\_Endorsementofadult-childsexonrise.htm](http://www.vanguardnewsnetwork.com/temp/TerrorTimeline/041902_Endorsementofadult-childsexonrise.htm)

“Heavy Petting by Peter Singer,” *Nerve.com*, 2001.  
<http://www.nerve.com/Opinions/Singer/heavyPetting/main.asp>

“Harvard Approves Pornographic Magazine,” *The Center for Reclaiming America*, February 12, 2004.  
<http://www.reclaimamerica.org/Pages/NEWS/newspage.asp?story=1555>

## Appendix K: Organizing Committee

2001 Sexualities in Transition
An International Social Science Conference
Inter-University Centre (IUC), Dubrovnik
June 12-16, 2001
Dr. James E. Elias [He ran the pornography conference at Northridge, inviting “stars,” ACLU lawyers, showed pornography, pedophile speakers, etc]
Center For Sex Research
California State University at Northridge
Dr. Theo Sandfort [pedophile magazine editor, etc]
Netherlands Institute for Sociosexual Research
Utrecht
Dr. John Bancroft [one wonders, a lot]
The Kinsey Institute
Indiana University at Bloomington
Dr. Erwin Haeberle [of the IASHS, wrote the pro incest and adult sex with children article alongside the child pornography sold to HUSTLER magazine by the IASHS]
Archive of Sexology
Robert Koch Institut at Berlin
Dr. Vern Bullough [Editor on the pedophile magazine, as above, etc.]
Distinguished Professor Emeritus
California State University
State University of New York



### *Researching Sexual Behavior: Methodological Issues*

Edited by John Bancroft  
Indiana University Press, 1997  
528 pp., cloth, \$49.95

Additional cites to Theo Sandfort and other Academic Pedophile connections to the  
Kinsey Institute

#### International Methodology Symposium

*Researching Sexual Behavior: Methodological Issues*, an international methodology symposium initiated and organized by The Kinsey Institute and funded by the Ford Foundation, was held on the Indiana University Bloomington campus April 26–28, 1996.

Participants represented a wide range of research experience and methodological expertise. Included were representatives of national sexual behavior surveys conducted in the United States, France, Great Britain, and Switzerland. The primary purpose of the meeting was to share current research experiences representing the "cutting edge" of the field and to promote interdisciplinary discussion. Key issues related to both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies were explored.

An important objective of the meeting was to produce a publication to enable others working in the field to benefit from the conference. See [\*Researching Sexual Behavior: Methodological Issues\*](#), published by Indiana University Press, October 1997. Scroll down to view the program and list of participants.

## **CHAPTER 6 - PARTICIPATION BIAS *Sampling Male Homosexuality* Theo Sandfort**

Theo Sandfort, Gay and Lesbian Studies Dept., State University Utrecht, PO Box 80140, 3508TC Utrecht, The Netherlands. Email: sandfort@fsw.ruu.nl

### **Kinsey Institute's International Academy of Sex Research Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting, Bloomington, Indiana, July 16 - 19, 2003**

<b>HOSTS</b>	John Bancroft, Cynthia Graham, Erick Janssen, and Stephanie Sanders The Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction Indiana University, Morrison Hall 313
<b>SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM COMMITTEE:</b>	<b>Theo Sandfort, Chair (NETHERLANDS/USA)</b> <b>Michael Bailey (USA)</b> <b>Ray Blanchard (CANADA)</b> * * *
<b>SECRETARIAT:</b>	<b>Erick Janssen (NETHERLANDS/USA)</b> <b>Michael Bailey</b> <b>Department of Psychology</b> <b>Northwestern University</b>

And Vern Bullough was an honored speaker at the conference above, funded by the feds.

#### *The Journal Of Paedophilia*

Theo G.M. Sandfort, **one of the "Editorial Board"** of *Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia*, along with the North American ManBoy Love Association (NAMBLA) Bulletin, Bill Andriette. Sandfort sets "abuse" and "predator" in quote marks to suggest these terms are inappropriate in speaking of adult sex with children. His article in the 1992 "Special Women's Issue," entitled, "'The World Is Bursting With Adults, So I'm Always Glad To See A Little Girl': A Young Woman's Account Of Her Paedo-Erotic Interests," concludes Sandfort's warm and supportive account of a female pedophile's lust for little girls:

With respect to the future, Cindy hoped she would once again come across a little girl with whom she could start a relationship

If she is 7 when we start a relationship, then it will last for some years. I'm really longing for that. I've been talking with my friend, Albert about what will happen when a little girlfriend joins in. He said that he will accept it as long as it doesn't jeopardize our relationship. But where to draw the line? When it happens I think I'll choose in favor of the girl. I think he is aware of that. But I'm not going to keep him dangling. That's not my style. Children would be able to do so. And I think I'll really put up with that, when a girl does it. I'm sure there will be a girlfriend once again. (page 73)

---

## XI Report Endnotes

---

- <sup>1</sup> “675 registered Congressional lobbyists and a ‘persuasion’ budget of roughly \$200 million [1999, 2000]; more than any other industry.” June 23, 2003; Drug Industry Employs 675 Washington Lobbyists, Many with Revolving-Door Connections, New Report Finds *Companion Study Shows That Top 10 Drug Companies Made \$36 Billion Last Year – More Than Half of All Profits Netted by Fortune 500 Companies*. Public Citizen <http://www.citizen.org/pressroom/release.cfm?ID=1469> and see <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines04/1020-20.htmto>
- <sup>2</sup> American Association of University Women, 2004; Source: *Medicare: Prescription for Change: Why Women Need A Medicare Drug Benefit*, Older Women’s League, 2000. AAUW Public Policy and Government Relations Department January 2003, [http://www.aauw.org/takeaction/policyissues/women\\_medicare.cfm](http://www.aauw.org/takeaction/policyissues/women_medicare.cfm)
- <sup>3</sup> Tony Pugh, “Medicare prescription drug plan would cover impotence drugs,” *Knight Ridder*, October 12, 2004.
- <sup>4</sup> Response To Sexology And The Pharmaceutical Industry: The Threat Of Co-Optation - response to L. Tiefer, *The Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 37, p. 273, with comments by Tiefer, [May, 2001](#).
- <sup>5</sup> See Appendix B.
- <sup>6</sup> See my recent book, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* (1998, 2000, 2003), especially chapter 7. Full documentation available upon request.
- <sup>7</sup> Full quotes follow throughout this report.
- <sup>8</sup> Dr. Chyng Sun Revisiting the Obscenity Debate, <http://www.counterpunch.org/sun01312005.html>, January 31, 2005. Dr. Sun is a professor of media studies New York University and the producer of the forthcoming documentary “*Fantasies Matter: Pornography, Sexualities and Relationships*.” [chyngsun@hotmail.com](mailto:chyngsun@hotmail.com). Also note, “More women than men depend on Medicare. Women comprise nearly three-fifths of all Medicare beneficiaries and, by age 85, women outnumber men in the Medicare program by a two to one ratio. Twenty million older women depend on Medicare and another two million women with disabilities are covered by the program.” <http://www.clintonfoundation.org/legacy/050399-press-release-on-vp-unveils-new-report-on-importance-of-medicare-for-women.htm> Office of the Vice President, “Vice President Gore Unveils New Report Highlighting Importance Of Medicare For Women,” May 3, 1999.
- <sup>9</sup> See Appendix B.
- <sup>10</sup> David Willman, *LA Times*, “The National Institutes of Health: Public Servant or Private Marketer? Doctors have long relied on the NIH to set medical standards. But with its researchers accepting fees and stock from drug companies, will that change? A continuing examination by The Times shows an unabashed mingling of science and commerce,” December 22, 2004.
- <sup>11</sup> Tony Pugh, “Medicare prescription drug plan would cover impotence drugs,” *Knight Ridder*, October 12, 2004.
- <sup>12</sup> Response To Sexology And The Pharmaceutical Industry: The Threat Of Co-Optation - response to L. Tiefer, *The Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 37, p. 273, with comments by Tiefer, [May, 2001](#).
- <sup>13</sup> See my recent book, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* (1998, 2000, 2003), especially chapter 7. All documentation available upon request.
- <sup>14</sup> Full quotes follow throughout this report.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>16</sup> See my website, [drjudithreisman.org](http://drjudithreisman.org), White Papers, on the FBI and DOJ data underreporting child sexual abuse.



---

<sup>17</sup> Reisman, *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences*, see discussion on the mission statement of the Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality in San Francisco, led by Kinsey co-author Wardell Pomeroy (now deceased) as "Academic Dean."

<sup>19</sup> Cynthia A. Graham, Ph.D., et al, "Sexual Fantasy, Women And Fragrance, Aroma-Chology Review, The Official Publication of the Olfactory Research Fund, Vol VII, No 2, 1998.

<sup>20</sup> ScoutNews, LLC, 11/12/2004.

<sup>21</sup> Jemima Lewis, "Come one, come all," *The Sunday Telegraph*; [United Kingdom] February 6, 2005.

"Since 1953, when the American zoologist Alfred **Kinsey** announced the discovery of the clitoris to a stunned and disbelieving world, [more Kinsey mythology here, jar] sex has got a lot more complicated. The female orgasm is no longer an intriguing possibility, so much as a right - and even a duty. Failure to produce one can send both men and women into a tizzy of shame, inadequacy and self-loathing. It is hardly surprising, then, that finding a cure for "female sexual dysfunction" has become one of the most expensive and time-consuming quests in modern science....Almost every week, the alchemists unveil some new potion or gadget that promises to transport lacklustre ladies to the wildest shores of passion. One of them, a British woman named Mary, described the experience to the Daily Mail. The first time they tried it, she said, her husband turned the controls up too high and her leg shot into the air. But once they got the hang of it, "We couldn't wipe the smile off our faces. We had sex five times over the next five days, and I had an orgasm every time." Alas, every silver lining has a cloud. "When the device was taken out at the end of the trial I was devastated," she confessed. "Now our sex life is back to how it was before. A climax is impossible without the Orgasmatron."

Far be it from me to disparage anything that gives women satisfaction, but I can't help wondering whether it has to be this complicated. For a small proportion of women (those whose nerves have been damaged by a hysterectomy, for instance), this kind of drastic intervention could be a godsend. For everyone else, a little research and a lot of patience should suffice. There is a simple reason why so many women can't have orgasms: they are doing it wrong. Popular culture - from whence most of us get our sex education - is both coarse and coy on the subject. It endlessly repeats one part of **Kinsey's** message (that women can and should be satisfied in bed), while ignoring the most important bit: how this can be achieved. In Hollywood sex scenes, especially, the missionary position still hogs all the limelight, while the clitoris seldom even gets a walk-on part.

Inexperienced lovers emulate what they see on screen, and are perplexed when it doesn't work. Women (an insecure breed at the best of times) blame themselves, and a vicious circle of misery, self-consciousness and fakery begins that can last a lifetime.

Hollywood, having shamelessly distorted **Kinsey's** message, has now made a film about him (out here next month). It is, by all accounts, a worthy effort to restore the nuts and bolts to his theories. But the damage has been done. Lovers will keep striving after an impossible ideal, while alchemists cash in on the inevitable anti-climax. [useful article]

<sup>22</sup> *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000.*

<sup>23</sup> Judith A. Reisman, *The Psychopharmacology of Pictorial Pornography Restructuring Brain, Mind & Memory & Subverting Freedom of Speech*, © January 2000, Second edition, January 2001, Third edition, January 2002. Forth edition, July 2003, The Institute for Media Education, Arlington, VA.

<sup>24</sup> See *Meditations on the Gift of Sexuality*, oral, group and individual pornography, starring the IASHS staff, students and faculty as well as Wardell Pomeroy's interview with the British Medical Journal of Sexuality, circa January 1983—verify date and title.

<sup>25</sup> November 3-7, 1999, Conference in Missouri.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, circa p. 5.

<sup>27</sup> Erick Janssen, "The Eloquence of Pornography, a special report," *Frontline*, February 18, 2005.

<sup>28</sup> See my Department of Justice study, *Images of Children, Crime and Violence in Playboy, Penthouse and Hustler* (1986) for full documentation.

<sup>29</sup> *New York Times*, circa December 2004.

<sup>30</sup> See Appendix A and B for full documents.

<sup>31</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred\\_Kinsey](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred_Kinsey)

<sup>32</sup> Dr. Chyng Sun, see note 1; January 31, 2005. [chyngsun@hotmail.com](mailto:chyngsun@hotmail.com).

<sup>33</sup> Reisman, "Condoms never FDA-approved for sodomy," <http://www.wnd.com/2014/03/condoms-never-fda-approved-for-sodomy>.

<sup>34</sup> David Heitz, "FDA: Condoms Not Approved for Anal Sex," April 30, 2014, <http://www.imstilljosh.com/fda-condoms-not-approved-anal-sex>.

<sup>35</sup> Much of the very long article appears as Appendix C.

<sup>36</sup> Cynthia Gorney, "Designing Women," *Washington Post*, June 30, 2002; p. W08.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> Testimony For U. S. Senate Committee On Commerce, Science And Transportation, March 4, 1999.

<sup>40</sup> The SIECUS founding board included Kinsey co-author and sometime lover, Wardell Pomeroy as well as Mary Calderone of Planned Parenthood and John Money (of *Paidika*, the pedophile magazine). Originally funded by *Playboy*, SIECUS' promotion of "sexually explicit material" in the classroom for all age children is in accord with its foundation.

A biased, anti Judeo-Christian philosophy is clear in the Grant Web site, which funds normalization of the unscientific claim that children are genetically born "gay" as in the [Long Island Gay-Straight Alliance Network \(LI-GSA Network\)](#), that "helps high school students start gay-straight alliance clubs," the [Youth Enrichment Services](#) (Y.E.S.) that finds "13-15 year old lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queering adolescents" and shapes them in "arts, technology, and peer leadership," and others.

W.T. Grant also funded Gilbert Herdt, contributor to the Childhood Sexuality conference and part of the pedophile magazine, *Paidika*, as the Principal Investigator for a "Study of Gay-Straight-Alliances (GSA) in California High Schools."

It is fair to say that any examination of the Kinsey Institute "research" will find the results fully support all such leftist political ends. The Kinsey Institute, like its founder, continues to produce unscientific leftist bias in its "sex" research, in its employment and in the "experts" chosen to train Indiana University students--both at the Institute and at IU. In 2003 the Institute "researched" and taught on alleged "Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Youth" as though these were genetically based "orientations" as opposed to youngsters experiencing serious experiential, familial and other trauma. Clinton's former Surgeon General, Joycelyn Elders is a keynoter at the Kinsey Institute. These funds are in keeping with the political requirements as well of the Kinsey Institute funders, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

<sup>41</sup> John Bancroft, Ed. "Toward a Consensus" in *Childhood Sexual Development*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2003, p. 464.

<sup>42</sup> Aware that the \$750 million claim was seriously exaggerated, on February 17, 2005 I contacted Sonja Mydland, Development Coordinator for the National Abstinence Clearinghouse in Sioux Falls, SD, [development@abstinence.net](mailto:development@abstinence.net), [www.abstinence.net](http://www.abstinence.net) and received a breakdown of the funds allotted to abstinence only education. Ms. Mydland replied:

Last year, the President requested approximately \$182 million for the SPARNS abstinence-only-until-marriage program, which means this year's request is \$44 million than last year. Here is a breakdown of how this program has been funded since its inception:

<b>Fiscal Year 2005 Sprans Funding:</b>	<b>\$104 Million</b>
<b>Fiscal Year 2004 Sprans Funding:</b>	<b>\$70.1 Million</b>
<b>Fiscal Year 2003 Sprans Funding:</b>	<b>\$55 Million</b>
<b>Fiscal Year 2002 Sprans Funding:</b>	<b>\$40 Million</b>
<b>Fiscal Year 2001 Sprans Funding:</b>	<b>\$20 Million</b>

<sup>43</sup> When Jenkins reviewed *Satan's Silence* he lauded authors Debbie Nathan and Michael Snedeker as "a brilliant lawyer and a courageous journalist, both motivated by outrage at the atrocities inflicted on the wholly innocent by crooked and/or deranged therapists and prosecutors, and their airheaded cheerleaders from that unhappy alliance of radical feminists and fundamentalists." Yet, "crusading journalist" Debbie Nathan also wrote for *Playboy*, with its long history of systemic child sex abuse "cartoons" and images, claiming there was little problem associated with Child Pornography. 1992 October: In *Playboy's* "Cry Incest," Debbie Nathan (Stanley's advocate) asserts incest is trivial and blames children and their own alleged sexuality for sex abuse stating: "Such tales express people's anxieties about their own infantile aggressive and sexual impulses.... [children feel] guilt about normal sexuality" (p. 162).<sup>15</sup> [See also, Crime & Media, review of *Satan's Silence*, <http://www.fsu.edu/~crimdo/jenkins.html>.]

Also, in 1990 Sept/Oct: Debbie Nathan (unidentified as to credentials) nominated and presented pedophile editor Lawrence Stanley with the 1989 "Free Press Association Investigative Reporting Award" for his *Playboy* article, "The Child Pornography Myth." Free Press Association journalism chairman Professor C. McDaniel contested Stanley's award since his article was "advocacy" and Stanley had a "special interest" in the "outcome of the investigation." It was "not necessary" said *Playboy*, for the Free Press Association or *Playboy* readers to know Stanley was an editor of *Paidika*: *The Journal of Paedophilia*.

<sup>44</sup> John Bancroft, Ed., "Toward a Consensus" in *Childhood Sexual Development*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2003, p. 464.

<sup>45</sup> In a letter dated July 7, 1950, Warren Weaver, head of Rockefeller Foundation's Natural Sciences Division, revealed that Kinsey was considering the retention of several favored attorneys to assist him in completing a third report. One of those suggested was Harriet Pilpel, assistant to Kinsey's ACLU lawyer Morris Ernst. Another was Paul Tappan of New York University. Pilpel became a Kinsey lawyer and Tappan an ALI-MPC author. The evidence shows *all* 1955 MPC authors,

- 
- Wechsler, Ploscowe, Schwartz and Tappan, to be Kinsey partisans. (Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences, 2003, p. 203
- <sup>46</sup> Turner, Miller, Modes, Ed. *AIDS, Sexual Behavior and Intravenous Drug Use*, The National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. 1989, p. 79.
- <sup>47</sup> See Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* (2003), pp. 160-161.
- <sup>48</sup> Reisman, *Ibid*.
- <sup>49</sup> Wardell Pomeroy, *Girls and Sex*, NY: Delacorte Press and Laurel-Leaf Books, 1969, 1981.
- <sup>50</sup> John Gagnon and William Simon, *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality*. Chicago: Aldine, 1973.
- <sup>51</sup> John Bancroft, Ed., "Toward a Consensus" in *Childhood Sexual Development*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2003, p. 119.
- <sup>52</sup> John Bancroft, Ed., "Toward a Consensus" in *Childhood Sexual Development*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2003, p. 464.
- <sup>53</sup> Ehrhardt, p. 126.
- <sup>54</sup> John Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised As a Girl*, Harper Collins, New York, 2000.
- <sup>55</sup> [Simon LeVay](#), review in [Psychology Today](#), [May, 2000](#).
- <sup>56</sup> William Stanley, **Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality. - Review - book review**, [Journal of Sex Research](#), [Feb, 2001](#) <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/>
- <sup>57</sup> Albert Moll, *The Sexual Life of the Child*, 1912, The Macmillian Company, pp. 198-199.
- <sup>58</sup> See my report on "Crafting Bi/Homosexual Youth" on my website, [drjudithreisman.org](http://drjudithreisman.org), white papers.
- <sup>59</sup> Paidika, *The Journal of Paedophilia*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Winter 1994, p. 14.
- <sup>60</sup> Goldman and Goldman were published in Plummer Kenneth, "Understanding Childhood Sexualities," in the *Journal of Homosexuality*, vol.20, nr. 1/2, pp.231-249 (1990). They state "There is much evidence from biology, anthropology, psychology and sociology on the irrefutable existence of a *potential* or *capacity* for something that can be called 'sexual' by young children - a capacity that is often manifested in various 'sexual' behaviors. In those societies where sexuality is viewed positively and encouraged amongst children, nearly all boys and girls move from vague fingering of the genitals in the very early years to a systematic masturbation by the age of six to eight and coital relations may frequently be experienced prior to puberty (Ford and Beach, 1965; Ch. 10). But even in societies where childhood sexuality is looked on askance we find a lot of evidence for things going on that adults can see as sexual: serious researchers all over the world have noted this from the kindergarten onwards." <http://www.paedosexualitaet.de/lib/Plummer1990.html> . Of course, the Ford and Beach studies claimed that little girls who had their labia stretched by old men who then also inserted "stinging ants" in their vaginas were having a pleasurable sexual experience. These are "serious researchers."
- <sup>61</sup> *Merriam-Webster's Medical Dictionary, 2002 Merriam-Webster, Inc.*
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid*, f. 42.
- <sup>63</sup> <http://www.urologychannel.com/erectiledysfunction/index.shtml>
- <sup>64</sup> Floyd Martinson, "Infant and Child Sexuality" in *Love and Attraction*, Ed. Mark Cook, Glenn Wilson, Pergamon Press, Oxford, New York, 1977, pp.495-497.
- <sup>65</sup> Bancroft, *Ibid*, p. 243.
- <sup>66</sup> *Ibid*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.