

# **The Sex Industrial Complex**

**Big Sexology, Big Pornography,  
& Big Pharmacology**

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

## **Draft Report**

**The Indiana State Legislature  
Ways and Means Committee**

**February 2005**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. An Indiana University “Orgasmatron” .....	2
KI Tests Perfume Arousal on Women Viewing Pornography--Seeking the Holy Grail .....	2
“Science Catches” up with Woody Allen After 30 Years.....	2
II. Defining Our Terms: The Psychopharmacology of Pornography .....	3
III. Former President George W. Bush Proclaims “Protection from Pornography” .....	3
Sexologists: ASECT & SSSS Pornography Trafficking Sales and Production .....	4
“Educational Learning Objectives: Participants Will Be Able To” .....	5
“ <i>Note: There will be no nudity or sexual activity among the participants.</i> ” .....	5
IV. Grants for Kinsey Institute Sex Experimenters .....	5
Bancroft, Graham, Janssen: Pornography Experimenters for Pfizer, Lilly, etc. ....	6
<i>Frontline</i> : Dr. Janseen Admits KI Study Desensitized and Probably Addicted Male Subjects to “Extreme” Sadistic Pornography .....	6
Researchers Subvert the KI ‘Human Subjects Review Board’ by Hiking “ <b>Dosage</b> ” .....	6
The Kinsey Institute Grant Citations: [Probable standard pornography use].....	7
V. Experiments in Heightened Female Arousal to Pornography .....	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 OKs 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
<b>Kinsey Lied: Seduced His Male Students, Tortured Himself, Made Pornography</b> .....	11
<b>Jones’ Confirmed by Gathorne-Hardy: Never Legally Challenged</b> .....	12
<b>Briefly: Kinsey’s Child Sex Abuse Research Protocol</b> .....	12
VII. Cynthia Heiman Kinsey Institute Director Works for Pornography Patrons	
Pandering Brothel Aids, Paraphernalia for Everyone .....	12
Heiman’s IASHS, Pornography as Ideological and/or Economic Collusion.....	13
<b>Sexologists “On Our Advisory Council”</b> [Quoting Verbatim. Note: Eli Coleman and others have been added to this list since it was copied in 2003.] .....	14
Heiman Panders AIDS/Anal Sodomy and Criminal Child Lust .....	14
Heiman Markets “Sinclair Select” Brothel Aids.....	16
Heiman Supports Hazardous Brothel Aids (“Sex Toys,” Porn Videos) .....	16
Heiman’s S&M Brothel Aids: Advertising Handcuffed Girl.....	16
Heiman’s Grants are 95% Sex Experiments, 5% “Cancer” .....	17
Heiman is “Designing Women” -- <i>The Washington Post</i> .....	19
VIII. Dr. Layden on Sex Addiction .....	21
IX. The <i>Brave New World</i> of Kinsey-Huxley and Child Sex .....	22
X. Kinsey “Experts” on <i>Childhood Sexual Development (Incomplete)</i> .....	22
“Over the Past 100 Years We Are More Often Wrong Than Right” .....	24
Book Frauds: Congress Gave “\$750 million a year to abstinence-only sex education” .....	25
“I Got Around the Word “Normal”” -- We Can “Produce” Consensus .....	25

Introduction: John Bancroft .....	26
<b>KI Hijacks Child Abuse “Studies”?</b> .....	26
<b>Bancroft Condemns Congress for Rejecting Rind, Tromovitch, and Bauserman Child Sex</b> .....	27
Philip Jenkins Cleans Up Kinsey Institute for the History Books .....	27
<b>Blaming Bender and Blau for Tappan, NRC, Kinsey, etc. “No Harm” From Abuse</b> .....	27
<b>Tappan Credits Kinsey, <i>Not</i> Bender/Blau for Model Penal Code Sex Changes</b> .....	28
<b>The National Research Council Credits Kinsey <i>Not</i> Bender and Blau for Harmlessness</b> .....	29
<b>Kinsey, Pomeroy and Gebhard Make Incest Globally Harmless</b> .....	30
<b>Jenkins Hides <i>Penthouse</i> as KI’s Pomeroy’s “Normal” Population Claims for Incest</b> .....	30
<b>Jenkins Hides <i>Penthouse</i> as KI’s Gebhard’s “<i>Random Sample</i>” Claims For Incest</b> .....	31
<b>“Suspected Or Detected, Fraud Needs Intensive Investigation”</b> .....	32
Friedrich’s Expert Summary: “Children Are Sexual Beings” .....	32
Lucia F. O’Sullivan: Parents Hamper Study of Child Sexuality .....	33
<b>Bribery Offsets Boys’ Distress at Sexual Questions</b> .....	33
Anke Ehrhardt and the KI Icon, John Money .....	33
<b>Supporting Children’s Sex Change Operations?</b> .....	34
<b>An Informational Side Bar on the Ehrhardt and Money Research Bias</b> .....	35
<b>The “Experts” Disdain Child “Innocence” and Child Asexuality</b> .....	35
Meredith A. Reynolds and Debra L. Herbenick – Kinsey Institute Study.....	36
Suzanne Frayser Condemns Pre Kinsey Sexual Reticence And Procreative Values.....	37
<b>Lies About Alfred Moll and Child Innocence</b> .....	37
Gilbert Herdt: Pedophile Comrades Label Minors “ <i>Gay and Lesbian Youth</i> ” .....	38
<b>When She’s Only About Six Or Seven Years Old</b> .....	39
<b>Journal of Paedophilia, Statement of Purpose “Paedophilia [is] Legitimate”</b> .....	39
Jeffry W. Thigpen, Elsie M. Pinkston, And Jay H. Mayefsky.....	39
<b>Sexperts: Male Babies Have Erections And Female Babies Vaginal Lubrication</b> .....	40
<b>Pedophile Advocates See Orgasmic Responses in Five Month Old Babies</b> .....	40
Michael Bailey: “We” Don’t Know That Child Abuse is “Harmful” .....	41
<b>Michael Bailey &amp; the International Academy Of Sex Research</b> .....	41
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:.....	41
□ PROGRAM SECRETARIAT: Michael Bailey [sued for sex with transvestite patient, info used w/o consent. ....	41
Heino Meyer-Bahlburg: We “Liberal Folk” .....	42
<b>Fanatic \$500 Million Abstinence Educators</b> .....	42
<b>Meyer-Bahlburg Would Be Free Of “Abuse” Language</b> .....	42
Jany Rademakers: Americans are Afraid of Sex.....	43
Janet Hyde: “We” Must Define Normal Child Sexuality .....	43
Erick Janssen: Problems With “Normal” .....	43
Diane di Mauro: Use the SIECUS Foundation .....	43
Elsie Pinkston: All Sexual Behavior is Normal .....	43
Ed Laumann: Well, Not “Normal” But “Age Appropriate” .....	43
Appendix A.....	45
Federally funded study pays Women to watch pornography.....	45
Appendix B: .....	46
SF State University’s “Kinsey At 50” Retrospective.....	46
Boy Lovers Are Stigmatized Like Communists Were .....	47
Bancroft Cannot Reveal “In House” Response to Reisman .....	47
Herdt and Gagnon Kiss Passionately on Stage .....	48
Conservative Grass Roots Attack Might Impact Legislation .....	48

Appendix C: .....	50
Kinsey is Republished in 1998 Absent Apology or Correction .....	50
Appendix D: .....	50
Some Questions For The Kinsey Institute.....	50
Appendix E.....	55
Protection From Pornography Week, 2003.....	55
By the President of the United States of America A Proclamation .....	55
Appendix F:.....	56
"NIH: Questioned Kinsey Work" .....	56
Appendix G: .....	56
Ex-Kinsey Institute employee later convicted of sexual molestation .....	56
Appendix H .....	58
Big Pharma and the Ties That Bind: The Politics of Drug Promotion .....	58
Appendix I:.....	60
Conflicts of Interest and the Public Trust.....	60
Appendix J: .....	62
Harvard Approves Pornographic Magazine.....	62
Appendix K: .....	65
Organizing Committee .....	65
<b>International Methodology Symposium</b> .....	66
<b>The Journal Of Paedophila</b> .....	67
XI Draft Endnotes To Draft Report.....	68

# The Sex Industrial Complex: Big Sexology, Big Pornography, & Big Pharmacology

## Executive Summary

Pornographers and “sexologists,” two powerful fringe groups historically hostile to Judeo Christian morals, values and laws have joined forces with “Big Pharma,” a business that commands more lobbyists and a greater ‘persuasion’ budget than any other.<sup>1</sup> This tripartite union seeks impotence drugs for men and a “Viagra” pill for women. 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>2</sup> ....Our dance cards are no longer empty.”<sup>3</sup> As women are roughly “58 percent of Medicare recipients by age 65 and 71 percent by age 85,”<sup>4</sup> should Medicare pay not only for a low male but a low female libido, such a pill promises meteoric profits. Hence, lifestyle drug companies seek a *female market* interested in enhanced libido. As women have been the major blockage to mainstreaming pornography and the permissive sex urged by sexology, all three industries now share a marketing goal to increase the eroticization of women and young girls. At an earlier 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. A 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 KI experiments to increase arousal of students and other subjects. Resulting addictions, obsessions and other disorders are, to date, not reported by sexologist-experimenters. However, the law now states that legislators can demand access to names and addresses of all experimental subjects, despite confidentiality agreements. By credentialing themselves as “health professionals” sexologists have accessed academic credibility, and cutting edge technologies to test libido drugs and odors via fMRI brain scanners as well as more intrusive sexual arousal devices.

On the evidence, a “lucrative conflict of interests” exists between pornographers, drug researchers and the Kinsey Institute (KI) led by Director, Julia Heiman. Heiman is employed also by the commercial “Sinclair Institute,” an Internet pornography trafficker selling brothel aids, paraphernalia such as AIDS efficient “anal fun” devices euphemistically labeled “sex toys”. This public employment is of a fit with the KI history as a *Playboy* grantee and its team on record as pornography users, producers and addicts. Roughly 95% of Heiman’s grants seek to enhance sexual arousal, largely via exposure to pornographic films. Even one small “cancer” experiment involves “Sexual Arousal after a Brief, Psycho-educational Intervention.” One other part time study (5%) in 1999, “Enhancing Recovery from Blood and Marrow Transplantation” was unlisted in the National Cancer Institute or the National Library of Medicine websites. It may or may not also test for sexual arousal.

Despite full knowledge of the origin of Kinsey’s criminal child sexual abuse research,<sup>6</sup> in 1998 the KI boldly republished the Kinsey Reports (1948, 1953) as ethical and accurate science. 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 even pedophile manuals.<sup>7</sup> These KI child “sexperts” almost uniformly condemn American sexual morality and repudiate traditional 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 KI libido experiments are of a fit with its *Sexual Development in Childhood* findings. Both would support childhood sexuality, hence lowered age of consent and increased pornography and impotence corrective drugs. What is normalized for adults swiftly filters down to children, with child venereal disease and pregnancy immunizations already tested and two mandated (HepB, HPV) and more in the wings. Should health professionals trained by sexologists control “mental health” screening and diagnoses (as in many Catholic seminaries) the future is highly troubling.

## To Market to Market: A Tax Paid Kinsey Institute “Magic Pill” for Pornographers?

Pornographers are eagerly creating a female market for both male and ‘women-centered’ pornography.<sup>8</sup> In 2004 the *Los Angeles Times* reported:

[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>

Those in the sexology field have been willing to benefit from the drug company largess for some time:

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>

**SOME RESEARCH QUESTIONS:** How did pornography become a billion dollar business? Would this business find methods to recruit women--and children—as uses and performers? Did sex radicals credential one another as “health professionals” and bearing such ill-begotten titles, did these sex radicals posture as “sexperts,” defending pornographic and pedophile magazines in courtrooms and legislatures? With law enfeebled, have sexologists screened pornography to measure drugs that might arouse sexually resistant females? Does the evidence find a lucrative “conflict of interests” linking sexologists, the Kinsey Institute and its Director Julia Heiman with the pharmaceutical industry and pornographers? Is Dr. Heiman profiting from “The Sinclair Institute,” an Internet pornographic trafficker of both “soft” and “hard” core brothel aids (such as sadistic and AIDS efficient paraphernalia they mislabel “sex toys”)? Did 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>

**SOME RESEARCH ANSWERS:** The Kinsey Institute’s false claims in 1948 and 1953 of widespread, harmless sexual promiscuity and of ‘child sexuality,’ forged the permissive sex laws that launched the sexual revolution and worldwide pornography.<sup>15</sup> These frauds resulted in pandemic child pornography and its fallout, for example, 58,200 children kidnapped by non-kin in 1999 most sexually abused.<sup>16</sup> In order to continue their promiscuous life style as a cultural norm, pedophiles, pornographers, and many sexologists seek to solve our sociosexual carnage by immunizing newborns and children with STD and pregnancy vaccines. Adults more secretly can violate vaccinated children in bi/heterosexual, homosexual, and other criminal sexual conduct.<sup>17</sup> Hepatitis B was the first STD vaccine federally mandated for infants and children, followed recently by Human Papilloma Virus vaccinations. Sexology-accrediting teaching and outreach agencies are *on record* advocating free access to pornography and legalized prostitution for (vaccinated) children. Such a shared view of sexual morality bespeaks an innate business venture joining Big Sexology, Big Pornography and Big Pharma. The following draft address these issues.<sup>18</sup>

## I. An Indiana University “Orgasmatron”

The public is increasingly aware that university investigators, too often abuse university facilities, income, and prestige to profit themselves by serving private industry (drugs, tobacco, alcohol, etc.). Too often is the public trust violated (see Appendix B) when profit for the investigator—not the nation--drives the research, too often producing flawed or fraudulent data.

Considering the emerging scandal of increasing sexual addictions and obsessions and the limited research funds available, it is reasonable to demand that tax monies be awarded to those seeking cures and aids for our innocent populations, especially focusing on children’s spiraling diseases: autism, diabetes, cancer and similar debilitating, life threatening illnesses. Instead, we find millions of tax funds hijacked from children’s diseases to support creating bizarre sexual aids (rather like the “orgasmatron” where sexual ecstasy was only a click away without the need for any messy physical contact in “Sleeper,” an anticipatory 1973 Woody Allen film).

### KI Tests Perfume Arousal on Women Viewing Pornography--Seeking the Holy Grail

Why does the Kinsey Institute (KI) use pornography to test the female arousal increase due to libido perfumes? Its documented history of sex research fraud and child sexual abuse as a research protocol<sup>19</sup> finds the KI untrustworthy at best, to research sex. Yet, in point of fact, not only is the KI a major leader in sex research and information, but the KI actually usurped roughly \$711,000 from the National Institute of Child Health and Development (NICHD) for that purpose.<sup>20</sup> The KI has used these children’s funds, and similar grants, to continue producing bogus human sexuality data indeed to find ways to increase and to intensify orgasms.

Disregarding entirely the utility of orgasm to speed bonding and intimacy as a marital cement in the rearing of children, the KI justifies employing pornography in its experiments as a means of increasing female sexual arousal. Funds from Big Pharma mix with tax monies as the KI seeks a chemical “orgasmatron.” Anorgasma, lack of orgasm, cited in many KI researches, may distress, but it hardly takes ones life. Moreover, neither historical, literary, nor scientific evidence supports the current fashionable view that increasing orgasms increases marital happiness or solvency. Sex addicts, philanderers, adulterers, rapists of children and adults and serial rape murders commonly attain high rates of intense orgasm but such illicit orgasms are harmful to the individuals and society.

### “Science Catches” up with 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

**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 possibly addictive and harmful pornography as a research variable to discover the best “fragrance” for escalating female arousal--to pornography. Such studies are called “medicine” for tax and corporate funding.<sup>21</sup>

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.”<sup>22</sup>

The surgeon who patented the instant orgasm treatment expected many volunteers but absent a vulnerable student population apparently found few.<sup>23</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 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>24</sup> Orgasm-based sex addictions appear to be easily induced by pornography or any such stimulating technologically.

## **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>25</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” or “rut,” in semi nude or nude animal postures of mating 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>26</sup>

## **III. Former President George W. 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 could argue that exploiting university credibility to conscript trusting students as pornography subjects, absent prior screening or follow up, is 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.**<sup>27</sup>

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

Since sexperts are “trained” by massive pornography exposure, it is logical that a statistical percent of these sexperts will themselves become sex addicts, even producing their own pornography for personal use and/or sale.<sup>28</sup> Prof. Kinsey and his team are thus documented as filming pornographic films of themselves, addiction is rife in this telling.<sup>29</sup> The 1999 Joint Annual Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality (SSSS) and the American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists (AASECT) offers accredited courses in pornography trafficking. Hostile to monogamous heterosexual marriage, the sexology field promotes pornography as profitable “sexual enrichment.” ASSECT, SSSS and all such “sex coaching” and therapy groups have been and remain strong supporters, users, and commercial marketers of pornography and its wide variety of what were long recognized *brothel aids*.<sup>30</sup> In its course offerings for the 1999 conference, the brochure advertises:

#### **Workshop X: "Couples" Sexual Enrichment: The Infusion of Instructional Erotic Videos Into The Marketplace (2.D Ces)**<sup>31</sup>

Presenter: *Patti Britton, Ph.D., Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality, Los Angeles, California* [2008 ASSECT president]

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. [Emphasis added]<sup>32</sup>

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

Having desensitized lovemaking to fit the pornographic orgasm model, Dr. Britton of the IASHS (the Harvard of the human sexuality field) claims, “[r]esearch shows” pornography use increases marital satisfaction. The 2008 program, sponsored by Big Pharma and Big Pornography, touts the benefits of pornography and “vibrators in...partner sex in order to create mutual orgasms that will lead to a more fulfilling sex life.”<sup>33</sup> Hence, any pornography study quoted by ASSECT and the like cannot lay claim to honesty or objectivity re: the marital benefits of their sponsor’s products as reported here.<sup>34</sup> Britton says ASSECT sexperts will be trained in the selection and use of pornography (“sexual enhancement videos”) as their “Learning Objectives” defined in the ASSECT/SSSS 1999 sex conference brochure.

#### 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.”***

The 1999 ASSECT/SSSS program carries a warning that, “*There will be no nudity or sexual activity among the participants.*” One searches in vain among other medical, academic, or service conferences for such a warning broadcast in any official brochure. 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” required for 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. The recent conferences therefore restricts public sex acts. The 2008 conference notes that “While there are many sexually explicit media depictions throughout the SAR and a great deal of sexually explicit conversation, no live nudity or sexual activity occurs during the program.” Nice to know this time.

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

Having undergone years of sexual desensitization Kinsey Institute researchers are themselves committed to teaching all they can reach that pornographic stimuli are proven helpful and not harmful. How *and why* do sex researchers--who insist pornography, masturbation, all fantasy, is helpful to individuals and society--carry out studies on “sexual development in children”? Following are some Kinsey Institute sex and drug studies in which the researchers largely claim *pornography is benign*: It is probable that all sex arousal studies cited below have

used pornography or “sexually explicit material” as their independent variable. Since “sexually explicit” materials are often used without credit or recognition, I have suggested, until a full investigation is legally obtained, that pornography is used throughout the following experiments.

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

#### ***Frontline*: Dr. Janseen Admits KI Study Desensitized and Probably Addicted Male Subjects to “Extreme” Sadistic Pornography**

**JAR NOTE:** This is a 2-year grant through 2005. Assuming one more year of \$230,000, this KI grant received another \$470,000. *Although we now know that Janssen and as below John Bancroft use pornography in their experiments, their use is found inadvertently throughout the KI website, while commonly excluded from 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>35</sup> (Emphasis added)

This is the addiction process at work. The KI experimenters subjected Indiana University students and others to pornography addiction, similar to that of Kinsey himself (who may have died due to self inflicted wounds to his sexual organs).<sup>36</sup> The KI researchers deny any potential harm to the young “subjects” brains, minds, memories, and conduct. *As the student “subjects” are not made aware of the real-time restructuring of their brains by these “erotic” stimuli, the KI subjects were unable to give “informed consent” to their experimentation and possible lifetime addiction to the sadistic pornography, or worse, to which they were exposed.*

#### Researchers Subvert the KI ‘Human Subjects Review Board’ by Hiking “Dosage”

To get erection, arousal in the addiction process, more extreme forms of pornography are necessary. Similarly, in order to get their subjects arousal the KI researchers had to increase the “dose” given to their subjects. This required, said the KI researchers, “more extreme forms of porn.”<sup>37</sup> The KI researchers would have had to fully inform the Indiana University human subjects review board of their pornography use and the HSRB would have to approve the methodological research shift from initial, “soft porn clips” to the “extreme” sadism (S&M) film clips. Hence, either the HSRB supported the slow addiction of students, or Janssen et al violated their HSRB contract. For, not only does Janssen write of their subjects speedy addiction to “more extreme forms of porn” including, “sadomasochism,” in *Frontline*, but the KI former director

John Bancroft approves of the study and the article and announced it in their KI newsletter! The grant read as follows:

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.<sup>38</sup>

The Kinsey Institute Grant Citations:<sup>39</sup> [Probable standard pornography use]

1997, Cynthia Graham, Principal Investigator on research grant (\$33,803.00) Olfactory Research Fund, Ltd.  
1999, Co-investigator on research grant (\$65,664.00) Eli Lilly & Co. (Raloxifene) [Probable pornography use]  
2000, Co-investigator on research grant (\$25,000.00) Lilly Center for Women's Health, Sexual inhibition and excitation study "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.

**"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.**

**"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.

**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. **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.

**Study on Mood Arousal & Sexual Risk Taking (NICHD):** estimated \$470,000 **over 2 years** Funding = estimated \$711,000\$237,038 in FY03, Title as of June 2003: Mood Arousal and Sexual Risk Taking, Title in

## V. Experiments in Heightened Female Arousal to Pornography


The “laboratory studies” methodology was censored by the Kinsey applicant in his/their grant application.<sup>40</sup> 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.**

Note that the KI seizure of roughly \$711,000 of NICHD children’s health funds to study “Mood Arousal & Sexual Risk Taking” would measure an immeasurable literary fiction. Mood is defined as “a state of mind or emotion.” Hence, “mood” is a combination of varied cognitive and unconscious states, bemired to individuals themselves, much less sensible of analysis to stranger researchers. The claim that this research will allow an understanding of “mood’s” effect on “risk taking” reveals researchers with a surplus of conceit and an absence of wisdom. While misleading the granting agencies, KI tests are a disservice to children and society. For, *on the evidence, a profitable arrangement exists between Kinsey Institute researchers, pornographers and the sexual enhancement—impotence--pharmaceutical industry* (p. 12).

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

At right is one of hundreds of *Playboy* “jokes”<sup>41</sup> identifying a too common role women and girls 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 boy friends and husbands fantasize centerfolds and others without guilt if their female “partner” shares their disordered addiction.

Such female Viagra-type pills could legally take the place of the spate of illegal “knock out drops” currently used to drug young boys, girls, and women for unconscious 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 influence to the contrary, fully confirmed by victim and perpetrator testimonies, research, common sense, neuropsychology, historical, empirical and addiction data.



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.

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

The commercialization of love is a known pathology. Kinsey, a recognized sexual psychopath, physically damaged and perhaps dead due to his additive orgasm quest, argued that the more orgasms the happier one is, independent of how one attains such orgasms. Already women nationwide undergo surgery for larger or more “perfect” breasts and for

surgery to tighten and re-sculpt their genital organs to resemble pornographic models. Such is the female driven to please pornographically imprinted men.<sup>42</sup> That the Kinsey Institute leads in such “mad scientist” sex research is at one with its long history of sexual violence, including its mass child sexual abuse and its unapologetic cover-up of its abuse record.

All KI pornography research is fraudulent on its face. Any legitimate study of the KI claims for methodologically valid science should be sufficient to halt such studies, recalling test subjects for examination, decontamination and for follow up. Moreover, the grant proposals and alleged data strongly suggest that there are medications, stimulants, drugs used in these studies that are deliberately censored from the grant proposals. Such defrauding of the State is legally liable under the “Federal False Claims Act,” also known as the federal Whistleblowers, “Qui Tam” provisions.<sup>43</sup>

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

How did the KI claim to the federal committee investigating their funding, that they were researching the effects of women's "mood" on sexual arousal to pornography, pass muster? There is no scientific trial adequate for such “mood” research. That this bogus study passed the peer review process does not surprise. Even legitimate science 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>44</sup>

Since the entire sexuality profession is 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 OKs Unmonitored Female/Male Pornography Experiments**

There does not appear to be any societal justification for tax paid "research" experiments using pornography. What is the 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 sex 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. Nor are these studies commonly agreed upon as “health” benefits--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 some percentage of males and females, old and young to pornography and sexual dysfunctions. 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. Impotence is defined as “without power.” The key role of pornographers is to strip virile males of their power as men to make love absent fantasy images created by pornographers. Thus are male pornography users rendered impotent, in the full sense of the word, dependent on the Sex Industrial Complex for the rest of their lives. The sexology profession has been using and prescribing such impotence-based 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).<sup>45</sup> 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 Kinsey’s professional “field” of sexology receives tax dollars to use toxic pornography to which many subjects are already addicted, to find the magic drug, smell, image that will truncate impotence long enough for the victim to wrest some kind of sexual climax to pornography with or without a partner. KI research is 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 was not what Congress earmarked millions of tax dollars to children’s health for. This is a lawsuit just waiting to happen. All Kinsey Institute grant information, from the 1960s to today, should be investigated immediately. Big Pharma may even 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 *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.” Recently the Kinsey Institute included the name of the staff member who posed for the fake ‘Susie Homemaker’ photograph.

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

Below is a leftist web encyclopedia entry for Kinsey that *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 and compromised; covering up the Kinsey crimes and pseudo science touted as science to the world, while slandering the Whistleblower. 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 and/or repeated trauma to the sex organs. Kinsey, a gall wasp specialist, officially began studies of 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. The left leaning Wikipedia encyclopedia states:

[Kinsey] 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>46</sup>

Child sexual abuse is fully confirmed as conducted under the auspices of the Kinsey Institute and claimed by Kinsey himself to be witnessed “truth” in both *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953). The quote from the above Kinsey friendly biography summarized some of the pathological data revealed by Kinsey hagiophiles, Jones and Hardy and to identify the cover-up by the Kinsey Institute of 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, GrossLouis (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.

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	80.0
Up to 11 yr.	34	9	25	223	133	
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	65.0
Up to 15 yr.	2	2	0	317	206	
Total	317	111	206	317	206	

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.”

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*.

### Briefly: Kinsey’s Child Sex Abuse Research Protocol

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 Works for Pornography Patrons Pandering Brothel Aids, Paraphernalia for Everyone

Modern pornography has little traffic with words, speech. Instead, pictorial pornography creates a dependence on pictures for sexual arousal and/or climax. Hence pornography induces impotence (“without power;” the inability to perform sexually without using fantasy stimuli) in

males. Impotence pills via Pfizer, Vivus are a booming business. Since all or most are often covered by Medicare, impotence is becoming a trillion dollar market. Current IK director, Cynthia Heiman, employed by Pfizer, Vivus and the Sinclair Institute (a pornography trafficker) has headed a series of pornography-based studies for the pharmaceutical industry in both her last position and as the Kinsey Institute Director.

Heiman seeks a female Viagra pill and is additionally made wealthy due to her credibility service to the Sinclair marketers. Her "clinical" and "reproductive" history at the University of Washington hospital in Seattle focused on searching for the female Viagra pill and on using pornography to try and recreate intimate "relationships" among couples. 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 trafficker selling "anal fun" kits, painful, AIDS efficient, disembodied conduct restructured by pornographers as a "sex" act.

### **Heiman's IASHS, Pornography as Ideological and/or Economic Collusion**

Official statements on The Kinsey Institute webpage follow for Julia R. Heiman, Ph.D. "Curriculum Vita." Dr. Heiman writes she provided "New directions in sex therapy (1981, October)" in a "Lecture for the Advanced Institute of Human Sexuality, San Francisco." The IASHS however, says Heiman, is actually one of their "Distinguished Lecturers."

By exposing students and others to high doses of pornography at the KI, Dr. Heiman and her aides would knowingly create untold numbers of pornography addicts, who go forth into society secretly carrying 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, the service, of the pornography industry, such protests must be viewed as self-serving and 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; the National Institute of Mental Health IRG Study Section and, Member of Violence and Traumatic Stress Research Review Committee, 1992

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

Dr. Heiman is a National Institutes of Health, Special Reviewer, 1992-present: NIH committees provide unpaid or token remunerated appointments that seldom incur a conflict of interest unless a member's paid associations are hidden. However, The Sinclair Institute is a pornography brothel "sex toys" business.

Some of the pornography videos Dr. Heiman uses in her tax funded "research" would possibly *still* qualify as "obscene" or at least "indecent" under the law. Malpractice would be an appropriate charge as Dr. Heiman via Sinclair pornography recommends that consumers engage in an purchase products that induce dysfunctions, including AIDS efficient anal sodomy. Moreover, Dr. Heiman has no oversight as to who is purchasing the pornographic products, she is pandering. There can be no proof of the ages of the purchasers or of their psychological and

health status, information that a professional health practitioner would normally ascertain in a face-to-face meeting prior to any kind of treatment.

Dr. Heiman and other sexologists serving the “Sinclair Institute” advisory committee are also on faculty at the IASHS, while recall that the Sinclair marketers are also economic sponsors of ASSECT. Schoen, the Sinclair director, was the distributor of FOCUS videos, the first “academic” pornography sold to higher education worldwide. Sinclair’s pornography website announces: **About The Sinclair Institute**” [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.”<sup>47</sup>

**Sexologists “On Our Advisory Council”** [Quoting Verbatim. Note: Eli Coleman and others have been added to this list since it was copied in 2003.]

**“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 Panders AIDS/Anal Sodomy and Criminal Child Lust**

In the earlier version (2003) of this paper, The Sinclair catalogue opened with “soft” pornography, the side bars offering the harder (what was once called obscene) Erototoxins. The marketing approach in 2008 remains basically the same. 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>48</sup>

Sinclair advisors like Dr. Heiman avow these painful and dehumanizing films, videos and 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 as well as fecal leakage as reported by AIDS research, can lead 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, commonly to please their pornographically addicted men. The fallout to children (boys and girls) who are both violated by pornographically stimulated predators and who mirror, or copy these pornographically modeled predators (“copy cats”) would have to be known by all of the Sinclair “advisors.”

Heiman/Sinclair also sell anal sodomy as film videos for those needing added instruction. 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” to help couples with “intimacy” problems. Heiman/Sinclair would have couples share “Anal Play” and other devices, all of which are profiles 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 Anal Play**  
Many couples partake in anal sex. We have the tools (and toys) to explore anal play and help dispel negative myths. 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!”

Image redacted

**Anal Play Kit**  
~~\$49.90~~ \$34.93

Sinclair’s Pornography Inst.

## Heiman Markets “Sinclair Select” Brothel Aids

“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 Brothel Aids (“Sex Toys,” Porn Videos)


Heiman’s Sinclair/brothel pornography patron also sells such bordello paraphernalia as “wrist and ankle cuffs” (~~39.90~~ \$29.90 at right) designed for “bondage play.” Let us translate. These devices are designed for sexually sadistic activity, tying the victim (voluntary or not) and acting out forms of abuse on the bound person. Cutely entitled, “S&M” (pain) this common form of dehumanization commonly involves whips and other abuse tools. Women and children nationwide are increasingly forced into vile, debasing acts *taught here by Sinclair marketers*. Sinclair sells a pornography video called “shaved pleasures.” With child pornography illegal, “legitimate” pornographers have long resorted to using an young looking female adult with shaved pudenda, often in a child’s clothing--the “pseudo child.”

## Heiman’s S&M Brothel Aids: Advertising Handcuffed Girl

Those in the child protection field are fully aware that the shaved pudenda 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? Adults? Go back to whom? Where do adult men have access to girls with hairless genitalia—if not in their homes, cuing incest.

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. More “bondage” films are sold by Heiman’s pornography traffickers.

Note Sinclair sells the “restraints” locking up this young woman/girl handcuffed and tied as a sexual victim. Police find thousands of victims tied in this manner by pornography addicts, who let loose violence on allegedly “willing” victims. Some women, girls and boys have been tied in this manner, sodomized and raped for days and then killed. 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



Full body image redacted.

not of joy or fun but of fear, shame, and coercion. This same image is used in “Spencer’s Gifts” stores to sell these brothel sadism paraphernalia to adult and juvenile customers.

This is “academics” in the sex field. As the KI produces and traffics in pornography, it is impossible for those associated with the KI 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 ones private parts and “anal play” “toys” to “dispel negative myths”!!!

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

As mentioned earlier, Dr. Heiman has scores of grants from NIH. Grants from Pfizer largely 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 then to find that such researchers find tobacco harmless, even helpful. Such “scholars” would research how best to deceive the public into early, addictive, 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]. Dr. Heiman’s KI website credentials read:

**Teaching Responsibilities:** [She lectures widely, 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 [Probable 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.” Probable 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. Probable 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) [**Probable 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 [**Probable 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 [**Probable 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** [**Probable 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 [**Probable 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.** [**Probable 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** [**Probable 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 I Methodology Study Assessing the Use of Angio MARK Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging to **Demonstrate Genital Response to Visual/Audio Sexual Stimulation in Healthy Women** [**Probable 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 [**Probable 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 [**Probable**  
**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 [**Probable 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)  
[**Probable 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)**  
[**Probable 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 [Probable 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 the washingtonpost.com article, “Designing Women,” 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>49</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 smell, 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>50</sup> an apt title considering the aims of Dr. Heiman’s studies, reporter Cynthia Gorney observes that “Scientists and capitalists dream of finding a drug that could boost female sexuality.” Ms. Gorney reports that Dr. 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 anything 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.



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.....**<sup>51</sup>

**Dr. Heiman signed “confidentiality agreements”** that prohibits her from disclosing details about what products they're testing and how they're conducting the tests.<sup>52</sup> The studies use a photoplethysmograph—a blood flow device shaped like a tampon wired to internally measure the woman’s degree of pornography arousal. Gorney reports that female researchers picked the pornography for the Heiman’s test subjects.

### **“Is that a good thing, or not?”**

Considering the exposure of vulnerable subjects to pornography, it is telling that Dr. Heiman’s professional researchers found viewing the “stacks of explicit videos” was traumatic; **"the worst two weeks of my life,"** said one aide. If viewing these films traumatized the professional aides, how do the “subjects” felt after leaving the laboratory? “You sell things off insecurity. And I think women are so subject to this” said Dr. Heiman, who continues to do so. Ms. Gorney writes:

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?

Revealing either the naiveté of an 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.” Ms. Gorney’s conclusion follows. It is worth pondering since these sex “studies” launched with *Playboy* magazine in 1954 sexually trained our Baby Boomers. 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 Dr. Heiman, her Sinclair pornography and pharmaceutical arousal patrons. But Ms. Gorney, perhaps intuiting that orgasms are hardly proofs of “love” notes that one of Dr. Heiman’s experimental "subjects" reported she hoped she was

given a placebo. No one told her. 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.” Ms. Gorney writes:

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>53</sup>

Indeed, “is that a good thing or not?” Again, *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 on Sex Addiction

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>54</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. The pornography (“sexually explicit images”) currently shown to young children world-wide as sex education and as “AIDS Prevention,” conditions children to separate sexual conduct from the civilized expectations of privacy, love, marriage and parenthood. The following excerpt from *Brave New World*, Chapter Three, is arguably the view of sex educators nationwide.:

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. The rates of juvenile suicide, crime, sex offenses, venereal disease, illegitimacy, depression and so on find that the Kinseyan sexology training of our youth has been “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 Kinsey chart on page 180 of his Male book below).

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

Table 33. Multiple orgasm in pre-adolescent males

Based on a small and select group of boys. Not typical of the experience, but suggestive of the capacities of pre-adolescent boys in general.

Also, this flow chart that follows 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. In this brief draft 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 he never agreed to join the conference. Marshall is a well-known child protection advocate and has, in the past, identified the significant harms of pornography exposure to adults.

**WT Grant Foundation Radical Left Political Funding:**<sup>55</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 outlined 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 KI Fraud Cover-up Continued.** No “expert” at the KI conference are on record in their *Childhood Sexual Development* book as questioning Kinsey’s child sex abuse protocol. Nor does Philip Jenkins’ “history” of child sexuality in the USA question Kinsey’s child sex data. As the KI book “historian,” Jenkins covered-up the role of Kinsey’s fraudulent “data” on child


“orgasms” in order to ignore 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 host Kinsey Institute’s bogus “studies” on human sexuality. Table 34, one of five evidential records of Kinsey’s child sexual abuse protocol (reprinted above) is a direct copy taken from Chapter 5 in Kinsey’s *Male* volume. This and four similarly false “child orgasm” tables are represented by Kinsey as “science” and not as records of his men raping children for his books. Moreover, Kinsey’s child rape records are repeated in the *Sexual Development KI* book as accurate data!!!

Further, no establishment sexologist is on record ever asking that the KI child victimization be publicized so that a) those victims still living, or their kin, might seek redress, or b) that the victims be found and offered compensation or therapy. *Sexual Development in Childhood* documents a group of sexperts whose words express an excited hostility to traditional, even normal, Judeo Christian American sexual morality. One participant only, Dennis Fortenberry, was at times introspective, even rejecting the group’s “sexual positivism,” saying:

“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>56</sup>



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

Fortenberry’s warning was dismissed by all. John DeLamater is incensed that “people don’t listen to social scientists.” Proof? Congress allotted, he said, “\$750 million a year to abstinence-only sex education” that “we know” doesn’t work. Mr. DeLamater’s false claims went unchallenged. First, depending how you count, at the time “abstinence-only” received not \$750 but \$55 million dollars in 2003, millions less than received by Big Sexology.<sup>57</sup>

Second, although three decades of classroom “sex education” has produced epidemic sociosexual disorders, DeLamater wants to say that these 30 some years of Kinseyan sex education *did* “work” while a few years of abstinence education *did not* work. DeLamater says he is always asked “what’s normal.” Almost every book participant wrote at some point that *all* sexual “varieties” are “normal,” with DeLamater, *ignoring Fortenberry’s counsel*, writing:

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.<sup>58</sup>

### **“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: (p. 464)

It cannot be sufficiently stressed that no alleged expert revealed any outrage or called for any corrective procedures for the Kinsey crimes and frauds and his rejection of “normal” in word and deed. None condemned the team, none questioned the alleged funding for abstinence only teaching, none questioned that abstinence fails, and apparently that their programs succeed.

The vitae for Bancroft’s child “experts” finds most, if not all, wholly ignorant of Kinsey’s *actual* research, research they defend and build on. If aware, they share Kinsey’s pathological sexual beliefs. Ignorance of the kind of child abuse that formed their professional “field” and that hosted their meeting and book is like the Joseph Mengele Institute sponsoring a conference and book on Jewish.

My preliminary examination of their biographies finds information on their sexual training largely absent. Yet the “field” was founded, and has been based on Kinsey’s fraudulent data. The dominating, Kinseyan bias that grips this group--overt and covert--is a condemnation of American, Judeo Christian moral values and “normality.” For example, that there is less masturbation and oral sex reported by “African American men” leaves author Ed Laumann very personally sad. Laumann feels that “less” oral sex and masturbation is based on “the conservative upbringing that they have....”<sup>59</sup> This may or may not tell the reader that Mr. Laumann had a more liberal upbringing.....

## **Introduction: John Bancroft**

Although Kinsey is mentioned throughout the Bancroft childhood sexuality book there is no question raised about the children sexually abused for Kinsey's child sex data. "Esther White" testified on the Yorkshire television documentary "Kinsey's Paedophiles," broadcast throughout the United Kingdom, that she was incestuously victimized by her father for Kinsey's data. Dr. Bancroft said he searched the files and could not find her records. "Esther" pointed out that Dr. Bancroft did not have her real name. Moreover, he had earlier said the files were unsearchable.

Claiming we "cannot find any record" in our archive of the charge that Esther's 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 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. Yet Bancroft makes no mention of this slander and crime in the new child sexuality book published by the KI.

### **The 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 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) and the Kinsey Institute.

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 tied to Kinsey's fraudulently wrought revolution and its unprecedented role in hijacking traditional moral values, media, laws, and education by Kinsey's "sexology" profession.

Bancroft insists that post-Kinsey-children live in "a less sexually inhibited environment." Yet since Kinsey, roughly "one million 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 says Bancroft and "74% of women who had sexual intercourse before age 14 and 60% of those before age 15 were coerced."

Many sexologists argue that the reason for our sociosexual problems are that children are still not sufficiently sexually "aware" or "positive." Bancroft also notes that even more "teenage women" are "sexually active" which should increase the negative data in the coming years.

As a “woman” is “an adult female human,” and a teenager “between the ages of 13 and 19;” Bancroft, like Kinsey, blurs the difference between a mature, decision making adult and that of a vulnerable juvenile. This view will dominate the expert opinions in the book. Bancroft also notes other “problems” associated with the sexual license he calls “positive.”

### **Congress Condemned for Rejecting Rind, Tromovitch, and 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 Bancroft 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 crimes against children, 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 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 Lauretta Bender and Abram Blau” for the 1940s and 1950s “liberal-minded scholars” insistence that adult sexual abuse of children is harmless. Jenkins either knew better or he should stick with writing theology.<sup>60</sup> Any human sexuality book post 1948 finds Kinsey’s child sexuality “data” with a rare mention of Bender and Blau. Even the KI’s own Male volume has no reference to Bender and Blau.

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

The fact is that the alleged hard science of America’s Alfred Kinsey’s “sacred writ” displaced the notably soft science of Europe’s Freud’s “latency period” to become the foundation of a new, global, sex profession. The KI would change vocabulary, education, law, everything. Jenkins hides the past KI team’s criminality for his current KI patrons and their readers. 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>61</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).<sup>62</sup>

However, Mr. Jenkins would know Paul Tappan was a long time Kinsey friend/fellow traveler<sup>63</sup> and would be aware that a) Tappan parroted Kinsey’s “findings,” while b) Cohen parroted Tappan parroting Kinsey’s “findings,” else how could Tappan (a mere lawyer) make such claims about child sexuality? 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 these falsehoods 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. In my chapter in *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences* on “Kinsey’s Impact on American Law” I write:

[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.<sup>64</sup> .... On the fourth page of the code 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.” 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....The immorality of the extra-marital fondle or kiss may have to receive legislative concern once we embark on the task of enforcing morals.<sup>65</sup>

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....*"<sup>66</sup> [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.<sup>67</sup>


Jenkins is too revealing for those who know their business. He diligently cites "Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953, p. 121"<sup>68</sup> 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**

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."<sup>69</sup> 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>70</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 Kinsey (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).<sup>71</sup>

Jenkins study of the "older journal literature"<sup>72</sup> 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 Jenkins 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 natural right to slowly evolved sexual awareness.

## 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"<sup>73</sup> the better to ignore Kinsey's earlier 1953 "finding" that children desire incest. Left 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.

ADULT "PARTNERS"	% OF ACTIVE 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 solicitation 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>74</sup>

Kinsey co-author and part time lover, Wardell Pomeroy "scientifically" reinforced what the reader had just learned about the benefits of incest and adult sex with children in Pomeroy's *Penthouse Forum Variations* article. 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 Pomeroy's "Normal" Incest Claims

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).<sup>75</sup>

Jenkins pulled several tricks here. It was important to hide the first part of Pomeroy's quote. It was also important to hide the fact that 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 quoted 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 incest a very healthy choice 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 got most, not all, 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.<sup>76</sup>

Of course, the KI team, Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin and Gebhard *never had a "cross-section of the normal population."* The KI team did not have 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 Gebhard's "Random Sample" Incest Claims**

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.<sup>77</sup>

"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>78</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.<sup>79</sup> 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>80</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>81</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.”<sup>82</sup>

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].<sup>83</sup>

### **Friedrich’s Expert Summary: “Children Are Sexual Beings”**

William 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.”<sup>84</sup> 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.

William Friedrich says “elevated sexual behavior and sexual abuse in children” has overshadowed “nonpathologic” child sexual conduct.<sup>85</sup> 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.”<sup>86</sup>

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>87</sup>

In a troubling display of callousness, O'Sullivan explained that she and her colleagues 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."<sup>88</sup>

## **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).<sup>89</sup>

The lack of scientific and moral skills cannot be understated here. The rest O' Sullivan's report thoroughly reflects this staggering arrogance. After explaining that bribery obtained some cooperation, despite the boys obvious distress 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."<sup>90</sup> 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 elitist abusive 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 says there were "two sources of Kinsey data, recall data from adolescents and actual reports by perpubertal children."<sup>91</sup> 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>92</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.

Ehrhardt cannot be discussed without noting her mentor, John Money. Ehrhardt purged her years with the discredited John Money of John Hopkins (circa 1999) from her short book 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 surgically and hormonally re-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>93</sup>

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>94</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 strange 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.

## **An Informational Side Bar on the Ehrhardt and Money Research Bias**

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>95</sup>

Anke Erhardt spent decades colluding with John Money as a second author. She should therefore share in his recent disgrace. His innocent child sex change victim committed suicide. Bancroft and the Kinsey Institute however still eulogize John 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. Do 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.<sup>96</sup>

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. However, 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.<sup>97</sup>

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 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.”<sup>98</sup> 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,” the harmlessness of obsessive masturbation—suggesting their own sexual conduct—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.”<sup>99</sup> 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.”<sup>100</sup>) 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.”<sup>101</sup> She clearly disagrees with restricting child sexual exposure, knowledge, or activity. For support, Frayser 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.” This is ignorance or slander. In the page cited by Frayser Moll discusses the American practice of school “coeducation” *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 that one lad who had sex “was immediately ostracized.” Moll says 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>102</sup>

Frayser 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.<sup>103</sup>

Frayser says such education denies the “pleasures of sexual activity” and adds to children’s sexual confusion. Frayser is also 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).”<sup>104</sup>

Significantly more can be said about Ms. Frayser’s pedophile advocacy writings but we will move on to Dr. Gilbert Herdt, another expert in Bancroft’s book as well as in scores of other events and press productions involved with the Kinsey Institute.


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

#### 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: *Childhood and Sexuality: A radical Christian Approach* 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. Vern 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 Dynes, *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. van Naerssen, *Department of Clinical Psychology, Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht; NL*
- Will H.L. Ogrinc, *Mediaevalist, Author; History Department, Hogeschool Rotterdam & Omstreken (F.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 Torey, *Writer, Editor, NL*
- Daniel Tsang, *Social Sciences Bibliographer; Writer, USA*



*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 of nude children here redacted.

Gilbert Herdt, John Money, Vern Bullough, and Theo Sandfort (in the pedophile journal at left), are expert authorities in Kinsey Institute conferences, books and papers. 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 pedophilia journal (left) 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

Dr. Herdt supports the unsupported charge that children are born either homosexual, transsexual, bisexual or other. He is pleased that since so many boys were rejecting homosexuality post the AIDS scare, “gay culture [has] begun to institutionalize “socialization” techniques for the transmission of its cultural knowledge to a younger generation.”<sup>105</sup> As Bancroft’s child “expert,” Herdt advocates for pedophilia 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;

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.<sup>106</sup>

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.”<sup>107</sup> On the pedophile Editorial Board is Bill Andriette, Editor of NAMBLA, the North American Man Boy Love Association (see above) 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 ad biased....inflaming what is really an irrational set of attitudes.<sup>108</sup>

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.

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

“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....”[See conclusion at left]

The Editors.”<sup>109</sup>

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

Some critics argue that “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 those groups working to end the age of consent like 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 what they call “empirical studies” on “sexual behavior of children...the capacity for sexual response are believed to be present at or before birth (Goldman & Goldman, 1982; Martinson, 1981).” See below for my remarks about the Goldman pedophile biases.<sup>110</sup>

### **Sexperts: Male Infants Have Erections and Female Infants Vaginal Lubrication**

Thigpen, Pinkston and Mayefsky cite a favorite pedophile advocacy citation, first articulated in Kinsey but here given to Martinson, “For example, male babies have penile erections and female babies are capable of vaginal lubrication (Martinson, 1981).”<sup>111</sup> Bancroft’s authors seem unaware 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>112</sup>

Pedophiles and pedophile advocates regularly cite vaginal mucosa to eroticize baby girls. The male baby erection is similarly distorted to sexualize infant boys. However, erectile tissue exists in the penis, clitoris, and nasal cavity. In fact, “we all have three sets of erectile tissue in each nostril.”<sup>113</sup> 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>114</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>115</sup>

### **Pedophile Advocates See Orgasmic Responses in Five Month Old Babes**

Having reduced normal physiology to the possible sexual desire of small children, the Thingpin et al cite to Rutter, also identified as a pedophile advocate. 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.”<sup>116</sup>

Thigpen, et al, quote 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. In *Love and Attraction* Martinson bewails our “strong taboo” against the adult “caress” of the child’s genitals. Why? He claims that some Indian “mothers caress the child’s genitals during nursing.” Hence, in “respect” for the child’s emotions, says Martinson, “we cannot consider sexual interactions involving children a crime.”<sup>117</sup> So says the author’s expert Floyd Martinson.

After several more bows to Martinson’s child sex expertise, Thigpen, Pinkston and Mayefsky quote Kinsey saying children are sexual at birth. To do this, TPK must again hide the entire criminal and anti-science foundation of Kinsey’s fraudulent child sex abuse protocol. Still, the Bancroft authors equivocate for they say Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin, “suggested” infants masturbate from four months. However, the Kinsey Tables, listing the number and ages of children alongside their speed of “orgasm” are not displayed as suggestions but as facts.

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>118</sup>

No. The KI team did not “suggest,” they stated it was so in five tables and in pages of heart-breaking description. Next in Bancroft’s pantheon of sexuality heroes is Michael Bailey.

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

Bancroft’s Michael Bailey says: “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.”<sup>119</sup> This means we don’t know that being beaten is harmful, or being run over by a car is harmful unless “we” do the “right research.” Bailey adds that, “highly sexual children are more likely to be highly sexual with adults.” The Rind report found, he says, “the effects of childhood sexual abuse are at most modest.”<sup>120</sup>

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

Here note pedophile advocates Theo Sandfort (Chair) and Vern Bullough (Presenter) are Dr. Bancroft’s Child Experts at the Federally Funded, Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting, Kinsey Institute, Bloomington, Indiana July 16 – 19, 2003. The HOSTS are 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 since Bailey was sued for unethical sexual activity by and with a transvestite subject. Bancroft ignored Bailey's exploitive sex but condemned his bad science. That Bancroft still elevated Bailey as an expert in *Sexual Development in Childhood* is telling.

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's "AIDS Prevention Studies" ignores abstinence until marriage for true AIDS prevention nor does she mention condom failure rates. No citations appear to document where Bancroft, Heiman, Graham or any KI leaders received their "sexuality training." Note some key language and public morality issues are addressed in the following group discussion.

### **Heino Meyer-Bahlburg: We "Liberal Folk"**

Bancroft author Dr. Meyer-Bahlburg says "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."<sup>121</sup>

### **Fanatic \$500 Million Abstinence Educators**

Anke Ehrhardt agrees, "we should respect the principles of other groups, in this country." However, Ehrhardt, John Money's long-time collaborator adds, "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."<sup>122</sup>

### **Meyer-Bahlburg and Jenkins Reject "Abuse" Language**

Meyer-Bahlburg says, "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?"<sup>123</sup>

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.”<sup>124</sup>

### **Jany Rademakers: Americans are Afraid of Sex**

Rademakers explains that, “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.”<sup>125</sup>

### **Janet Hyde: “We” Must Define Normal Child Sexuality**

Says Hyde, “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....[or] we continue to make sexual development in childhood unmentionable by not being able to state that there is normal sexual development in childhood.”<sup>126</sup>

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

Janssen “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.”<sup>127</sup>

### **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.”<sup>128</sup>

### **Ed Laumann: Well, 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.”<sup>129</sup>

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

Di Mauro: “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 on curriculum [not]an authoritative statement on development. But there's a lot of groundwork that's been done.”<sup>130</sup>

## Appendix A

### **“Federally funded study pays Women to watch pornography”**

By 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 is my transcribed eye witness account taken from my notes of this conference. I sat in the rear of the auditorium, which turned out to be a wise decision. 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 a 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" 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 report 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 of 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. Said anthropologist Dr. Vance:

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

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

Gilbert Herdt and all other speakers sought tolerance of *all* sexual orientations—leaving out none. Especially cited as a key organizer of the conference was “academician,” Gayle Rubin, who writes of “cross-generational” encounters in *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*.<sup>1</sup> 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>

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, waiting for me on my desk were Reisman’s book, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, and its video production offshoot, “The Children of Table 34.”

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.

### **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 he said. Bancroft

---

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

assigned someone to prepare “a rebuttal” to Reisman’s charges. However, when asked by several individuals to see the rebuttal, Bancroft replied it is an “in house” copy and he cannot release it.

Bancroft noted Reisman’s new book includes the finding that Kinsey reported no data regarding the alleged sexual conduct of “fathers” or “mothers.” He was 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 concealed its factual proofs in “Kinsey’s Paedophiles.” There, we meet Dr. Fritz von Balluseck, a Nazi pedophile who raped hundred of children while serving as the commandant for a Polish Jewish ghetto. On trial post WWII for child sex abuse and originally child murder, von Balluseck was revealed in court as one of Kinsey’s pedophile “experts” whose WWII victims were killed in the gas chambers of Treblinka. The Nazi pedophile was exposed as directed onward in his child sex crimes by his 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.” Interestingly, Gagnon insisted that we “mustn’t care too much about Kinsey’s childhood,” a common source of adult obsessions.

*Gilbert Herdt gave John Gagnon a passionate kiss on the lips, that was returned, 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 as a speaker, 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 her proposed **Child Protection and Ethics in Education Act of 1995,**”

**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. Vance feared 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, authoritative 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*—as on the Editorial Board of that pedophile publication. He is also an editor of the *Journal of Homosexuality*. DeCecco distributes a “Children’s Sexual Rights” statement to his students which proclaims the “right” of children of all ages to have sex with whom they wish, and calling for contraceptive procedures to protect them from infection and pregnancy.

**John Gagnon**--University of Chicago, past Kinsey Institute principal researcher. Gagnon, cites Herdt as an expert on boy-man sex. He advocates that early sex abuse or neglect, any cultural influences be concealed if they are a feature of sexual orientation. Gagnon thus publicly called for “sex researchers” to alter their data by refusing to accept any information about the etiology of one's homosexuality (see 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 incest and sexual sadism. She is to speak to the SFSU students on “leather” in sexuality--a euphemism for sexual sadism.

**Anke Ehrhardt**--was 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, then the most prominent leader in the current human sexuality field, advocated 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) similar positions should be advocated.

I believe it is not too much to say that the flag being planted academically and in the sexpert 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 so profound that 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* or admissions of the child sexual abuse protocol by Indiana University and the Kinsey Institute.

No admissions of wrong doing were included in the 1998 edition sold worldwide. 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 Indiana University and The Kinsey Institute**

The then President of the United States, George W. Bush on October 25, 2003 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.”

#### **An Indiana University and Kinsey Institute “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 Kinsey Institute on the issue of human sexuality?
5. What follow up has the Kinsey Institute provided to its child and adult sex subjects?
6. Who is doing “conservative” Judeo-Christian professing sexuality research at the KI?

7. What is the precise pornography shown to the KI “mood” study subjects?
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 plan, 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 non traditional 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, (now deceased), Judith Reisman, Michael Jones and others? Please open immediately.
22. Do you claim that you and the other pornography “researchers” are not sexually aroused by the pornography you show to your subjects?
23. Will you all submit to an MRI test to see if your “non arousal” claim is true or false?
24. Please provide all information on the several Kinsey Institute “researchers” / employees ever 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 for any psyche and that these stimuli never cause copy cat, mirroring 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 thousands of 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 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?
45. Please provide Kinsey’s lecture in which he advocated sterilization of the unfit part of the population.

**Appendix E**  
**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

## **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 later convicted 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 by 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 non existent. 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.

## **Appendix H**

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

## **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**

### **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 CD4 cell counts: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2000; 284:2193-2202.

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

---

## **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 one should be able to murder infants up to 30 days after birth, also appears to think that all sexual prohibitions might reasonably be lifted. Professor Singer, chair of the Princeton bioethics committee, writes an apology for bestiality in “Heavy Petting.” “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.” Unless Dr. Singer speaks from personal experience, it appears that he opines based largely on Alfred Kinsey’s fraudulent data on libidinous “love” between dog and man.

## **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

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**

HOSTS John Bancroft, Cynthia Graham,  
Erick Janssen, and Stephanie Sanders  
The Kinsey Institute for Research

SCIENTIFIC  
PROGRAM  
COMMITTEE:

in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction  
Indiana University, Morrison Hall 313  
**Theo Sandfort, Chair (NETHERLANDS/USA)**  
**Michael Bailey (USA)**  
**Ray Blanchard (CANADA)**  
\* \* \*

SECRETARIAT:

**Erick Janssen (NETHERLANDS/USA)**  
**Michael Bailey**  
**Department of Psychology**  
**Northwestern University**

**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. Unedited Draft Endnotes to Unedited Draft Report

---

- <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> Tony Pugh, “Medicare prescription drug plan would cover impotence drugs,” *Knight Ridder*, October 12, 2004.
- <sup>3</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>4</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>5</sup> See Appendix B.
- <sup>6</sup> See my recent book, Judith Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences*, The Institute for Media Education, Crestwood, KY, 1998, 2000, 2003, especially chapter 7 with corrected endnotes on website, [drjudithreisman.com](http://drjudithreisman.com); 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> Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences*, especially chapter 7. Full 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 how the FBI and DOJ data are underreporting child sexual abuse.
- <sup>17</sup> Reisman, *ibid*.
- <sup>18</sup> Reisman, *ibid*., 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> Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences*, The Institute for Media Education, Crestwood, KY, 2003.
- <sup>20</sup> E.g., “Mood Arousal and Sexual Risk Taking Title in July 2003: Mechanisms Influencing Sexual Risk Taking,” Researcher: Janssen, Erik, <http://www.house.gov/hensarling/rsc/doc/NIHgrants.pdf>, Grant Number: R13HD04306.
- <sup>21</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>22</sup> *The New Scientist*, circa November 26th, 2003, <http://www.electricvenom.com>, “sex-bites/if-you-build-it-they-will-come.”
- <sup>23</sup> Health Highlights: Nov. 12, 2004, ScoutNews, LLC, 11/12/2004. “[Dr] Meloy was putting an electrode into the spine of a female patient with chronic back pain when the woman reported a decrease in her pain and an unusual side effect: “She let out a moan and began hyperventilating,” he told *Good Morning America*. [and] “she said, ‘You’re gonna have to teach my husband how to do that.’” [https://www.lifeclinic.com/ams/healthnews/article\\_view.asp?story=522339](https://www.lifeclinic.com/ams/healthnews/article_view.asp?story=522339).

---

<sup>24</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 stunning ignorance of literature, science and history 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."

<sup>25</sup> *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000.*

<sup>26</sup> Judith A. Reisman, *The Psychopharmacology of Pictorial Pornography Restructuring Brain, Mind & Memory & Subverting Freedom of Speech*, The Institute for Media Education, Arlington, VA, January 2000, Second edition, January 2001, Third edition, January 2002. Forth edition, July 2003.

<sup>27</sup> *The White House proclamation:* <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/10/20031025-1.html>.

<sup>28</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—Probable date and title.

<sup>29</sup> See Reisman, *ibid*, and extensive additional Kinsey biographic data cited throughout.

<sup>30</sup> See the newsletters, brochures, marketing advertisements of said groups, more recently including the co-opting of sex addiction therapy agencies, e.g.: <http://www.aasect.org/PDFs/Aug%2005%20CS.pdf>. See also the historic literature on brothels.

<sup>31</sup> November 3-7, 1999, Conference in Missouri.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid*, circa p. 5.

<sup>33</sup> Betty Dobson workshop, [http://www.aasect.org/PDFs/2008\\_AASECT\\_Final\\_Conference\\_Program.pdf](http://www.aasect.org/PDFs/2008_AASECT_Final_Conference_Program.pdf).

<sup>34</sup> ASSECT sponsors include: Adam & Eve, "adult products," alongside Eli Lilly and Co., American Institute of Bisexuality, Good Clean Love, [sexual lubricants, etc.] Helm Pharmaceuticals, Johnson & Johnson Personal Products Company, MyPleasure.com, Octavia Books, Pine Grove Behavioral Health – Gentle Path, [sex/drug addicts] Puckerup.com, [web site for adults only] Sex Smart Films, Sinclair Institute, [sodomasochistic and other sex films, devices], Slumber Parties, [sex products] Soul Source Enterprises, [genital dilators, transgender aids], Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, Sportsheets International, [sodomasochistic and other sex devices], The Haworth Press, Vibrator.com, Tantra.com, "No nudity or sexual activity occurs in an introductory workshop," <http://tantragrindrps.blogspot.com>, etc.

<sup>35</sup> Erick Janssen, "The Eloquence of Pornography, a special report," *Frontline*, February 18, 2005. [www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/porn](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/porn).

<sup>36</sup> See Reisman, Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences, for the discussion of Kinsey's death associated with "orchitis."

<sup>37</sup> Erick Janssen, "The Eloquence of Pornography, a special report," *Frontline*, February 18, 2005.

<sup>38</sup> Grant data with comments see at, [http://www.house.gov/hensarling/rsc/doc/2003\\_NIH\\_FUNDING.doc](http://www.house.gov/hensarling/rsc/doc/2003_NIH_FUNDING.doc), December 27, 2008.

<sup>39</sup> <http://www.kinseyinstitute.org/research/res-old.html>, <http://www.kinseyinstitute.org/resources/grants.html>, etc, December 27, 2008.

<sup>40</sup> Grant data with comments see at, [http://www.house.gov/hensarling/rsc/doc/2003\\_NIH\\_FUNDING.doc](http://www.house.gov/hensarling/rsc/doc/2003_NIH_FUNDING.doc), December 27, 2008.

<sup>41</sup> See my Department of Justice study, *Images of Children, Crime and Violence in Playboy, Penthouse and Hustler* (1986) for full documentation.

<sup>42</sup> *New York Times*, circa December 2004.

<sup>43</sup> See for example, <http://www.quitam.com>, <http://www.quitam.com/id8.html>.

<sup>44</sup> See Appendix A and B for full documents.

<sup>45</sup> Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences*, *ibid*.

<sup>46</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred\\_Kinsey](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred_Kinsey)

---

<sup>47</sup> Unfortunately the text cited was replaced with <http://www.more-fun.com/relationships/videos/about.htm>, although the sex site also includes, <http://www.bettersex.com/t-absi-advisory.aspx>, December 27, 2008. As of this cited date, the website reads "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, clery [sic], educators and professional association representatives who advise the company in the best interests of the consumer."

<sup>48</sup> Dr. Chyng Sun, see note 1; January 31, 2005. [chyngsun@hotmail.com](mailto:chyngsun@hotmail.com).

<sup>49</sup> Appendix C. See also, [http://discuss.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/zforum/02/magazine\\_gorney070102.htm](http://discuss.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/zforum/02/magazine_gorney070102.htm), December 27, 2008.

<sup>50</sup> Cynthia Gorney, "Designing Women," *Washington Post*, June 30, 2002; p. W08.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> Testimony For U. S. Senate Committee On Commerce, Science And Transportation, March 4, 1999.

<sup>55</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 queesting 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." More on Herdt shortly.

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>56</sup> John Bancroft, Ed., *Childhood Sexual Development*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2003, p. 464.

<sup>57</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:

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

<sup>58</sup> John Bancroft, Ed., *Childhood Sexual Development*, see roughly pp. 460-466.

<sup>59</sup> John Bancroft, Ed., *Childhood Sexual Development*, *ibid*, p. 461.

<sup>60</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>61</sup> John Bancroft, Ed., "Toward a Consensus" in *Childhood Sexual Development*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2003, p. 464.
- <sup>62</sup> Jenkins in Bancroft, *ibid.* p. 6.
- <sup>63</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>64</sup> Reisman, *ibid.*, p. 211,
- <sup>65</sup> Reisman, *ibid.* p. 217.
- <sup>66</sup> Reisman, *ibid.* p. 217.
- <sup>67</sup> Bancroft, Ed, *Sexual Development in Childhood*, Kinsey Institute, Bloomington, IN, 2003, p. 6.
- <sup>68</sup> Jenkins, *ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>69</sup> Jenkins, *ibid.*, p. 5.
- <sup>70</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>71</sup> Jenkins, *ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>72</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>74</sup> See Reisman, *Kinsey, Crimes & Consequences*, pp. 160-161.
- <sup>75</sup> Jenkins, *ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>76</sup> Reisman, *ibid.*, p. 160, also Pomeroy, *Penthouse Forum Variations*, 1977, p. 85-90.
- <sup>77</sup> Reisman, *ibid.*, pp. 160-161.
- <sup>78</sup> Reisman, *ibid.*
- <sup>79</sup> Letter from Paul Gebhard to Judith Bat-Ada (Reisman) in Israel, dated March 11, 1981, in the author's archive.
- <sup>80</sup> Reisman, *ibid.*, p. 159, see Wardell Pomeroy, *Girls and Sex*, NY: Delacorte Press and Laurel-Leaf Books, 1969, 1981.
- <sup>81</sup> John Gagnon and William Simon, *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality*. Chicago: Aldine, 1973.
- <sup>82</sup> Jenkins, *ibid.*, p. 7.
- <sup>83</sup> Reisman, et al, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, Huntington House, Lafayette, LA, 1990, p. 16.
- <sup>84</sup> Freidrich in Bancroft, Ed., *Childhood Sexual Development*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2003, p. 119.
- <sup>85</sup> Freidrich, *ibid.*, p. 119.
- <sup>86</sup> Freidrich, *ibid.*, p. 119.
- <sup>87</sup> Fortenberry in Bancroft, *ibid.*, p. 464.
- <sup>88</sup> O'Sullivan in Bancroft, *ibid.*, p. 25.
- <sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>91</sup> Ehrhardt, in Bancroft, *ibid.*, p. 726.
- <sup>92</sup> Ehrhardt, in Bancroft, *ibid.*, p. 726.
- <sup>93</sup> John Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised As a Girl*, Harper Collins, New York, 2000.
- <sup>94</sup> Simon LeVay, review in **Psychology Today**, May, 2000.
- <sup>95</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>96</sup> Ehrhardt, *ibid.*, p. 731.
- <sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 731.
- <sup>98</sup> Finkelhor, *ibid.*, p. 731.
- <sup>99</sup> Reynolds and Herbenick in Bancroft, p. 79.
- <sup>100</sup> Reynolds and Herbenick in Bancroft, p. 79.
- <sup>101</sup> Frayser in Bancroft, *ibid.*, p. 264.
- <sup>102</sup> Albert Moll, *The Sexual Life of the Child*, 1912, The Macmillan Company, pp. 198-199.
- <sup>103</sup> Frayser, *ibid.*, p. 269.
- <sup>104</sup> Frayser, *ibid.*, p. 267.
- <sup>105</sup> See my report on "Crafting Bi/Homosexual Youth" on my website, [drjudithreisman.org](http://drjudithreisman.org), white papers.
- <sup>106</sup> Herdt in *Paidika, The Journal of Paedophilia*, Winter 1994, The Netherlands, p. 6.
- <sup>107</sup> Herdt, *ibid.*, p. 13.
- <sup>108</sup> *Paidika*, *ibid.*, p. 14.
- <sup>109</sup> *Paidika*, "Statement of Purpose," Summer 1987, p.p. 2-3.

- 
- <sup>110</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>111</sup> Bancroft text, Thigpen, Pinkston and Mayefsky cited on p. 241.
- <sup>112</sup> *Merriam-Webster's Medical Dictionary, 2002 Merriam-Webster, Inc.*
- <sup>113</sup> ABC, Dr. Karl; <http://www.abc.net.au/science/articles/2000/11/01/198395.htm?site=science/greatmomentsinscience>.
- <sup>114</sup> <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/erection>.
- <sup>115</sup> <http://www.urologychannel.com/erectiledysfunction/index.shtml>.
- <sup>116</sup> Thingpin et al in Bancroft, *ibid.*, p. 241/3.
- <sup>117</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>118</sup> In Bancroft, *ibid.*, p. 243.
- <sup>119</sup> In Bancroft, *ibid.*, p. 424.
- <sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 423.
- <sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.
- <sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, the "discussion" is found on pages 457-464.