

things, he said that he had a "four-year-old 'sex slave' imprisoned in his office," and according to *Time* he discussed in "graphic detail" having sexual relations with children. He mentioned a child-pornography collection.

Richard Berendzen resigned, was admitted to the Sexual Disorders Clinic at Johns Hopkins, and kept his tenured

professorship. In the following year he was the university's highest-paid professor (receiving \$261,000). In 1992 he addressed a national conference on child victimization, with particular reference to "survival techniques." By now he had "discovered" that *he* was the victim. His mother had sexually abused him when he was a child. In his book,

Smoking and Sex

ACCORDING to frequent warnings from the government health-care complex, a single unguarded act of sexual intercourse can expose a person to a deadly virus that will dismantle the body's immune system. A single cigarette, on the other hand, can do no such damage. Despite these very unequal hazards, smoking is now fiercely opposed, while sexual activity of almost any description is encouraged—usually as an aid to mental health. This happens most subversively in sex-ed classes, which President Clinton's former surgeon general, Joycelyn Elders, thought suitable for children in kindergarten.

Smoking is now viewed with the zealous moral disapproval once reserved for the ancient category of sexual deviance. Concern about souls has been transferred to the body, with moral indignation remaining a constant. Judith Reisman suggests a separate parallel: Just as the cigarette makers wanted to get the kids hooked on their product, so the sexologists want to get the kids hooked on theirs.

Is there a conflict between the rising concern about bodily health and encouragement of sexual expression? Condoms will square that circle. They "can be sexy," too, sex educators exult. And like filter-tipped cigarettes they can give a false sense of security. Condoms have a failure rate of over 15 per cent—where failure is measured by pregnancy; twice that where sexually transmitted agents are the test. But don't expect Surgeon General's warnings any time soon. Meanwhile, boatloads of condoms are being shipped to the Third World. Foreigners whom we treat with such disdain can be forgiven for thinking us morally depraved.

Those who are trying to stamp out smoking usually disapprove of sexual abstinence. Here's the latest message on sexually transmitted disease, plastered on buses in several cities earlier this year: "Abstinence Will Not Cure AIDS. Research Will." This was paid for by Amfar, a New York-based AIDS foundation which has enjoyed much socialite support.

Leading sex educators have encouraged sexual experimentation at an age that would cause tobacco executives to blanch. The leading sex-ed organization is SIECUS, the Sexual Information and Education Council of the United States. Chartered in 1964 by Dr. Mary S. Calderone, medical director of Planned Parenthood, it has promoted its agenda under the rubric of children's rights. A few years ago Dr. Calderone said that children have a fundamental right to "know about sexuality and to *be* sexual." (Her italics.) SIECUS today calls on the national media "to present sexuality as a positive aspect of the total human experience at *all stages of the life cycle*." (My italics.) Your tax dollars are at work. SIECUS boasted in 1994 that it was "one of the 24 national recipients of a new five-year cooperative agreement with the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention."

Debra Haffner, SIECUS's executive director (lately she has been on sabbatical at Yale Divinity School), wrote a few years ago that "we need to tell teens that the safest sex doesn't necessarily mean no sex." Her list of pressure-relieving activities for kids included "oral sex" and "mutual masturbation." This would "help them delay the onset of sexual intercourse and its consequences." Sex educators view kids, demeaningly, as high-pressure

boilers in need of socially constructed safety valves.

Recent goings-on at the Martha Winston Elementary School in Washington, D.C., suggest that the kids have learned their lessons. A fourth-grader who "challenged the authority" of a teacher was sent to an empty classroom. He coaxed several classmates into the room. According to the *Washington Times*, they "disrobed and practiced sexual acts on one another." The school's principal considered that no disciplinary steps could be taken because the sexual acts—between fourth-graders, ranging in age from 9 to 12—were "consensual."

For those parents who still don't realize what is going on, the point to grasp is that their children are viewed as prey. Perhaps the most striking feature of sex ed is its mendacity. In *Slouching towards Gomorrah* Robert Bork notes that it seems to operate "more as an incitement" than as a caution against sexual experimentation. Above all, the disparity between the little that we really need to know about intercourse and the lurid array of materials deployed by the sexolatrists should warn us of an undisclosed agenda. Those (numerous) cases in which parents have been kept in the dark about what is going on, and especially the cases in which children are not allowed to opt out of courses, should teach us the same lesson.

Some local-government posters displayed in classrooms could not possibly be shown in this magazine. In fact, the embarrassment of normal people in dealing with this subject has contributed to a broad news-media blackout about the horrible details. This has enabled the sex educators to take advantage of the very reticence that they are trying to break down. Judith Reisman's parents, old-line Communists, were shocked by the sexual revolution. But then, like Communists everywhere, they aspired to "build a new society." The sexologists have no such reconstruction in mind. Their goal—conscious or not—is merely to destroy the old. —TOM BETHELL

Come Here: A Man Overcomes the Tragic Aftermath of Childhood Sexual Abuse, he describes his obscene phone calls as a form of involuntary "data gathering." Ted Koppel called the book a "genuine service to anyone who cared about the roots and consequences of child abuse." Berendzen finally became chairman of the Advisory Board for the National Center for Survivors of Child Abuse. His wife, Gail, wrote a "survivors" article for *Ladies' Home Journal*.

Dr. Reisman—who stumbled across child abuse in Kinsey's research, questioned the accuracy of Kinsey's data

The old forces of blackballing, ostracism, and disapproval, once deployed by the orthodox against heterodoxy, are now fiercely arrayed against the counter-revolutionary holdouts.

more generally, and then attempted to examine the adverse effects of pornography—has been vilified from coast to coast. She was run out of American University on the day her grant expired. The money was only half spent and her research was incomplete; but she was denied access to her own database, and her half-finished work was rewritten by unknown hands. For her there was no academic freedom. She appeared as an effective gladiator on a *Donahue* show (Phil Donahue, to his credit, did not stack the deck against her), and she has not been seen on the big TV shows since. *McNeil-Lehrer* taped her, but nothing appeared; Bill Moyers wrote letters—again nothing. Attacks on her appeared in *Playboy*, *Penthouse*, *Hustler*, and the *American Psychological Association Monitor*, in Jack Anderson's column, and in news stories that had all the detachment of a Herblock cartoon. Headlines had a way of imputing the prurient interest in porn to her.

As her experience shows, tolerance is *not* the all-pervasive dogma of our day, but is specifically withdrawn from people and institutions who behave as if no revolution in sexual mores has occurred, or who obstinately question its wisdom. All the old forces of blackballing, ostracism, and disapproval, once deployed by the orthodox against heterodoxy, are now fiercely arrayed against the counter-revolutionary holdouts. The scattered remnants of orthodoxy know this and know that they will be vilified if they dare to fight. Their prudent instinct is to withdraw into private enclaves, home-school their children, and find a quiet retreat at a safe remove from crime and the federal judiciary.

Judith Reisman, now a grandmother of nine, is still ready to stand and fight, however. Progress has been made in exposing Kinsey's deceptions, she notes. The *Washington Post*, *The Lancet*, and *Reader's Digest* have published articles about the role of pedophiles in producing some

of Kinsey's data. The Family Research Council produced an effective video on the subject, and even *CBS Evening News* did a segment. There is a slow, grudging reappraisal of Kinsey's findings, his methods, and especially his badly skewed samples (1,400 of his 5,300 male subjects were imprisoned sex offenders, for example).


Kinsey's big lie—that he was a scientist, not a moralist, showing what is rather than what ought to be—has at last come under attack. Pomeroy disclosed in his 1973 book that Kinsey was engaged in an ideological mission to undermine the Judaeo-Christian ethic. In 1995, a bill was introduced calling for a congressional investigation to determine if there was "systematic sexual abuse of children" in Kinsey's research. Its main sponsor, Rep. Steve Stockman of Texas, was defeated in the 1996 election, but Rep. Peter Hoekstra of Michigan is said to be still interested.

In the United States, at least, there is no doubt that Kinsey was a more successful revolutionary than Marx or Lenin. One reason is that he didn't proclaim himself to be one. Looking back on her parents' heroes, Judith Reisman thinks that it is very difficult to instill a revolutionary outlook by encouraging young adults to go to the library and read books like *Das Kapital*. "It doesn't change you," she said. "Not in the way that having an affair can change you. That can radicalize you." Sexuality "reaches in below the belt and takes control of your emotions."

SHE does not believe that there is such a thing as impartial scientific research into sex. She has no doubt that the women's-liberation movement was and endures as a response to the betrayals of the sexual revolution. As for pornography, it "short-circuits the brain" and precludes rational thought. She is surprised that the women's movement has not produced more opponents of pornography like Andrea Dworkin and Catharine MacKinnon.

Judith Reisman's story tells us almost more than we want to know about the inequality of forces in the cultural war. In fact, the image of war is itself misleading. "War implies two opposing armies," Dr. Reisman says. In reality there is only one. The sexual revolution has resembled an incoming tide more than a war. Nothing seems able to resist it, and we can only hope that one day it will turn and move back out to sea. The cultural wreckage left behind will be considerable. Meanwhile the laws have been changed, good habits undermined, the string untuned.

"How can we have been so blind?" Dr. Reisman used to hear her family and friends say when she was young, referring to the Holocaust. "But look at us," she says. "People cannot identify their enemies." Still, she has not lost the gift of optimism. "This country is blessed," she says. "Change is possible. We are supposed to stand up and be counted. Beyond that, it is in God's hands." □



"Not the serpent in the garden?"