



Canadian
Medical
Association
Journal

Journal
de l'Association
des médecins
du Canada

CMAJ

MARCH 15, 1992, VOL. 146, NO. 6 • LE 15 MARS 1992, VOL. 146, NO. 6

Diatribes cloaked in scientific language

Having been given good evidence from the literature that the authors of *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: the Indoctrination of a People*¹ were not against sex, as his review (*Can Med Assoc J* 1991; 145: 989-990) implied, Dr. E. Robert Langford now claims to know of this material but says that it is off the point (*Can Med Assoc J* 1992; 146: 449). But he raised the point!

What readers of *CMAJ* are seeing if they read Langford's review and the subsequent correspondence is an example of a whitewash process in action. Many egregious ethical breaches took place in Kinsey's research,² and they are fully documented in the book. One of these is the use of data from illegal and inhumane sexual stimulation experiments conducted without parental consent on very young children and, as is clear from portions of Kinsey's own text, against the children's will (some were "fighting away from the partner"). Data from these experiments were used to reach conclusions — still accepted in academia today — on normal sexual development in childhood.

Instead of berating the people who have pointed out this travesty of science for having produced a "diatribe cloaked in scientific

language" Langford would be more credible if he joined them in the very reasonable call for the Kinsey Institute and Kinsey's co-workers to provide details about these children (including follow-up information on their health) and the experimental team. He does not seem to be perturbed that Kinsey coauthor and former Kinsey Institute director Paul Gebhard has refused to provide this information or that Gebhard has given a fairly good insight into the Kinsey team's ethical standards by recounting their "refusal to cooperate with authorities in apprehending a pedophile [one of their information sources] who was being sought for a sex murder."³ The whole thing is quite astonishing.

J. Gordon Muir, MD
205 Ronaldsby Dr.
Cary, NC

References

1. Reisman JA, Eichel EW. *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: the Indoctrination of a People. An Investigation into the Human Sexuality Research of Alfred C. Kinsey*. Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin and Paul H. Gebhard, Huntington Hse Inc, Lafayette, La, 1990.
2. Kinsey AC, Pomeroy WB, Martin CE. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Saunders, Philadelphia, 1948.
3. Masters WH, Johnson VE, Kolodny RC. *Ethical Issues in Sex Therapy and Research*. Little, Boston, 1977.

Dr. Langford is simply wrong in his implication that Dr. Muir has quoted me out of context. What I actually said was: "The authors raise serious and disturbing questions about the accuracy, reliability and perhaps, truthfulness of the figures given in Kinsey's 1948 book and the methods by which these data were obtained." This statement is particularly applicable to Kinsey's data on children.

In one table Kinsey reported data on orgasm in approximately 50 male infants aged 5 years and under. Kinsey wrote that the orgasms were observed and presumably induced by "certain of our subjects." Other data described orgasms in young males that were "timed with second hand or stopwatch," and still other "experiments" reportedly lasted up to 24 hours and yielded up to 26 orgasms.

Many of the subjects of these experiments were obviously too young to have given consent to these remarkable procedures. The details of the experiments are not given, nor is there a word of concern by Kinsey or his co-authors for possible consequences to the subjects. It appears that no follow-up was attempted.

I hope that these circumstances will raise ethical and factual concerns on the part of the scientific community. Langford contents himself with the statement that Kinsey "might even

have obfuscated a little" and gently reaches the conclusion that "Kinsey's work was flawed but not fraud." I see no factual basis for such a conclusion at present.

Also disturbing is Langford's focus on the motives of Muir and the authors. What is relevant is not the motivation of the bringing allegations but, rather, the evidence that they advance.

I find the evidence, particularly which is summarized above, compelling since it comes directly from Kinsey's book. I find it disturbing and believe it requires investigation.

Walter W. Stewart
Department of Health and Human
Services
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Md