

The Case Against Kinsey

by E. Michael Jones

Alfred Charles Kinsey, the compiler of 4,000,000 gall wasps and 18,000 sex histories, has been dead for almost 33 years now but the controversy surrounding his work lives on after him. It is, you might say, his legacy. June Machover Reinisch, the current director of the institute that Kinsey founded to a large extent from proceeds from his male and female reports, is now fighting for her job. After evaluating her performance over the past six and a half years, Indiana University has decided to ask her to leave. They allege incompetence. In February a former student of Reinisch claimed that she "should not have been listed as co-author because she made no contribution to the portion of his thesis published in the science journal *Nature*." In March the National Institutes of Health announced that they were sending a team of investigators to Bloomington "to conduct a preliminary study of Kinsey's grant records." In question is "how millions of federal research grant dollars were spent" by Reinisch. One of the things the funding agencies found intriguing was a joint bank account Reinisch opened in 1980 with a Danish psychiatrist. That this type of academic squabbling makes it into nationally-syndicated news articles is a tribute to the work that Kinsey did and the name he made for himself and the field of sex research.

However, it is just as much an indication of the controversy that continues to surround the field of sex education. Those within the charmed circle of the sex industry like to explain this as having to do with the field of sexuality itself, which, they tell us, is very "controversial," controversial to the point of paranoia, one suspects. When I asked for a picture of Kinsey to accompany this article I was told by one of the functionaries at the Kinsey Institute that they would have to wait until Dr. Reinisch returned from Denmark to get her approval. When I expressed surprise at the institute's administrative style, I received a return call from that person's superior, reminding me how "controversial" work on Kinsey was and informing me that they "might not even have a picture to send me." It was almost as if I had asked for a picture of Kinsey himself *in flagrante dilectu*. But it's just part of the curious double standard one gets used to when dealing with the Kinsey Institute for Research on Sex, Gender, and Reproduction. They profess not to bat an eyelash at the most

hair-raising of sexual perversions, but nonetheless become positively Victorian when the conversation moves in the direction of Kinsey himself.

IT'S SEX, BUT IS IT RESEARCH?

"It's safe," said one sex educator dismissing abstinence as a way of avoiding both pregnancy and disease. "but is it sex?" The same sort of question comes to mind when one delves into the field of sex research. "It's sex," one is inclined to admit when confronted with the 64,000 volumes of pornography, the 3,500 three dimensional objects, the 25,000 pieces of "flat art" and the hundreds of films of sexual activity that comprise the Kinsey collection on the campus of Indiana University, "but is it research?" A recent AP article gives some insight into the scholarly credentials of the institute and the accuracy of its media apologists.

In an AP story dated December 11, 1988, AP news-features writer John Barbour recounted the 50-year history of the Kinsey reports and Institute and the problems of the current director. In the course of the article the enormous Kinsey pornography collection was described as "the world's second largest repository of sexual publications, erotica and pornography, the largest being in the Vatican." The line had a sort of throw-away quality to it—as if it were either a misprint or meant as a joke. However, when I contacted him, Mr. Barbour was dead serious. He stood by the claim that the Vatican had more than 64,000 volumes of pornography, etc. Having worked at the Vatican more than once, my curiosity was aroused.

"Can you tell me where it is?" I wondered, feeling certain that someone from one of our major news agencies certainly wouldn't make up something like that.

"IN SOME BASEMENT SOMEWHERE"

"I don't know," Barbour replied, "It's in some basement somewhere. I can't tell you exactly."

When I pressed him on the issue, Barbour admitted that he hadn't seen the collection himself. He said he got the information from the Kinsey Institute, "and then I think we at one time confirmed it with our Rome bureau. I don't recall exactly when. It's been used for a long time."

"In other words, the Kinsey people told you this?"

"That was the original source," Barbour replied.

E. Michael Jones is editor of *Fidelity Magazine*.

twenty-two

Fidelity (April, 1989)

"So you're saying that the Vatican has more than 64,000 volumes of pornography?"

"I'm saying that that's true. Whatever the figure is, I can't remember. It's a long time since I've done that story. What is your problem?"

"I don't think it's true, to be honest with you," I said.

"Well, why don't you call the Vatican?" Barbour wondered, a tone of annoyance creeping into his voice.

Monsignor Thomas Herron is now head of theology department at St. Charles Seminary in Philadelphia. Until his return to Philadelphia in the fall of 1988, Herron had lived in Rome and worked for the Vatican for nine years. For the last six years of his stay in Rome, he worked as one of a staff of six research assistants under Cardinal Ratzinger, prefect for the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. It was a job which entailed doing research not only in the Vatican libraries but also in archives open to no one but Vatican staff. When I asked Msgr. Herron about the Barbour statement, his answer was unequivocal.

"IT'S A FIGMENT OF HIS IMAGINATION"

"I can tell you that the statement is completely calumnious. It's absolutely without foundation. He cannot know it because it isn't so. It's a figment of his imagination."

"Now it seems to me," I replied, "that a collection like that would require a building of some size."

"I've worked over there about as closely as one can for the Holy See and in the offices of the Holy See and not only had access but the requirement of doing considerable research. There is absolutely nothing of the kind there."

"I called Mr. Barbour today, and he told me it was in a basement somewhere."

"It's absolute nonsense. Absolute nonsense."

Barbour, as I said, had never seen this collection himself, which given its size, should be hard to miss, especially for people as intrepid as AP's Rome bureau, so I asked him if he had ever spoken to anyone who had seen it.

"I mentioned it to a number of Catholic friends [Some of Mr. Barbour's best friends are Catholic, I'll bet.] and they said that they were not the least bit surprised. And we did ask our Rome bureau to check, and it was confirmed by them."

By now Barbour had reached the end of his patience.

"I think you really have some axe to grind, and that you might as well take it to some grindstone, sir. Goodbye."

With that Barbour hung up.

However, since Barbour mentioned the Kinsey Institute as his source, I decided to check with them. I asked to speak with Dr. Reinisch, but got a Stephanie Sanders instead. She has a Ph.D. too, probably in sex research. She is a former student of Dr. Reinisch's.

"Well," she said after I read her the quote from the Barbour article, "I'll tell you what we usually say about that. We may have the largest. We are not Vatican scholars, though we had always believed that we were second. That was passed down along the generations. Some Vatican scholars [Dr. Sanders gave no names.] have said that they believe that we have a larger collection. And why does the Vatican have it? Well, because they have been in the business of restricting those materials for Catholics for years. And so they have archived those materials, but I've never been there so I wouldn't be able to speak to the Vatican collection."

When I asked how large the Vatican collection was, Dr. Sanders responded, "I have no idea. And I'm a Catholic. I've been to the Vatican. But I'm not a scholar. I've never been in their libraries."

Dr. Sanders was becoming defensive.

"I don't even know if they have anything at this point in time. That would still make us the larger collection."

Which is certainly true.

She then promised to consult with Dr. Reinisch and get back to me. After a few minutes she called to say that Dr. Reinisch, who "was running between meetings," said that "as far as she's concerned that our collection is the largest collection."

"So you're saying that Barbour's statement is false then?"

"Absolutely. He interviewed with me and I know we would have said that we have the largest collection to our knowledge. Absolutely. Because we've got a lot of stuff."

"A Monsignor who worked at the Vatican says there is no collection of pornography there," I responded.

"That wouldn't surprise me," said Dr. Sanders, leaving me to interpret that as best I could. "And then again I don't consider our collection to be a pornographic collection. It has materials that have been censored over time, um, and things like that. But they're here for a different purpose. They're not here for prurient interests. And that's a very important thing I want to convey to you."

So, contrary to what Mr. Barbour of the Associated Press claimed in his article, the Kinsey Institute is not the source of the claim that the Vatican has a huge collection of pornography, at least according to one version of what Dr. Sanders told me. Well, if so, where did the claim come from? If Dr. Sanders were more familiar with the history of the institute, she would have known that the claim came from Kinsey himself.

KINSEY IS THE SOURCE

On p. 397 of Wardell Pomeroy's biography of Kinsey, *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research*, Pomeroy quotes a letter from Kinsey to Dr. Arthur L. Swift Jr., a professor at Union Theological Seminary,

in which he writes,

I find it difficult to understand why a scholar should have to justify the accumulation of a library in the subject in which he is working. This is particularly strange considering that there is no such sex library anywhere in the United States, and probably nowhere in the world short of the Vatican.

On p. 458 of the same book, Pomeroy, who was Kinsey's co-worker and coauthored the male and female volumes with him, says of the Kinsey Institute pornography collection that "it would be outstanding as the largest collection of erotica in the world, larger than the British Museum's and presumed to be more extensive than the legendary Vatican collection."

So the claim that the Vatican, like the Kinsey Institute, is in the business of collecting pornography has a long history there. In fact, it goes back to the founder of the institute itself. That the claim is baseless seems not to have prevented Kinsey from making it over and over again in his public lectures.

When I mentioned the Barbour article to Paul Gebhard, also a Kinsey co-worker and previous director of the Kinsey Institute, he just laughed.

"BARBOUR OUGHT TO KNOW BETTER"

"Barbour ought to know better," he said. He then gave the history of the remark.

"The truth is that Kinsey had been fond of saying in his lectures that our collections were second only to the Vatican or sometimes he would say that the Vatican was the second, but anyway he made this reference, and it always brought a big reaction from the audience. So he liked to do it. Some would gasp and say, 'I didn't know that.' And others would laugh. Mainly I think it was astonishment rather than laughter. "But at any rate after his death, I got to thinking about it and I said, 'If the Vatican has such a vast collection, why am I not in communication with them to swap duplicates perhaps or make xerox copies?' So I wrote the Vatican library and inquired about the collections and in due time received back a postcard with the papal seal and all the rest. Unfortunately it was in Italian so I had to take it over and get it translated, and in essence it said, 'we don't have any such collection. Get lost.'"

"So I went to one of my Jesuit friends and I said, 'Hey, I think the Vatican's covering up. What should I do about this?' And he said, 'Well, I have friends that have photographed and microfilmed the Vatican library. There's a big project located in St. Louis, where a bunch of priests microfilmed the Vatican library. I'll pass the word along to them that you're a legitimate inquirer and ask them about it.' So I did. I got in touch with them and they said, no. They said, if you're talking about confessors' manuals, yeah, we're loaded with confessors' manuals. And I said, well I thought it went this way, that the local priest would snatch the dirty book from the hands of the parishioner and then get it

to the monsignor, who would give it to the bishop, and it would finally end up at the Vatican. He said, 'No way. No bishop wants to be sending collections of porn to the Vatican library.'"

"KINSEY SAID SO"

"So then I was really baffled. So I wrote the American Library Association, and I said, 'Do you know anything about the Vatican library?' And they said, 'Yeah, they have a big porn collection.' So I said, 'On what basis do you say that?' And they said, 'Kinsey said so.'"

At this point Gebhard burst out laughing.

"All of a sudden I felt the circle close," he said. "So then I finally found out what happened. Many years before I joined the staff, somewhere about 1940 or so, old Dr. Robert Dickinson had just been at the Vatican and had visited Kinsey. At that time Kinsey had a book case about half full of porn, and Dickinson looked at it and said, 'Gosh, you've got quite a collection. You've got almost as much as the Vatican.' At that point Kinsey started making this remark."

The incident is instructive for a number of reasons. First of all, it gives some sense of the standards of scholarship that prevail in the field of sex research. Kinsey made the statement repeatedly throughout his career as the famous sex researcher, and no one ever challenged him on it, least of all the press. The American Library Association took it as a fact simply on his say so alone. Toward the end of his life, Kinsey even visited Rome and seems to have made no effort to contact the Vatican. So there is every reason to believe that he continued to make the statement even knowing that it was false.

According to Gebhard, Kinsey made the statement just to get a rise out of his audience, but the dynamics involved in the claim go deeper than that. As Dr. Sanders said of the Kinsey Institute's pornography, "They're here for a different purpose. They're not here for prurient interests." The implication is clear, and it goes right to the heart of the double standard—one of the many double standards one finds in the sex research business. If the Vatican were to collect pornography, their interests would be clearly prurient. However, when sex researchers do the same thing they accuse others of, they do so only from the highest, scientific motives. The double standard bespeaks anti-Catholic bigotry more than anything else. But here as elsewhere even bigotry can be made to look respectable if cloaked in the mantle of science.

Beyond that, the whole incident shows how the mainstream press has run interference for Kinsey for over 40 years. Not only do they pass on his calumnies without taking the time to check them out, they also become involved in the Kinsey disinformation network by claiming that the untruths have been verified. John Barbour not only passed on a little piece of anti-

Catholic bigotry; he went even further out on a limb by claiming that AP's Rome bureau had checked it out. It's an indication of the kind of forces which have conspired to give sex research the air of legitimacy it has enjoyed for the past 40 years. It also is a good indication of the type of ideology masquerading as science which has provided the perfect cover for the sort of thing that if done in another context—say, by prelates at the Vatican—would have been condemned as prurient interest.

ANIMUS AGAINST CATHOLICS

"You must know," said Dr. James Jones, professor of history at the University of Houston, who is currently writing a biography of Kinsey and someone who has done research on him off and on for the past 20 years, "that Kinsey had an abiding animus against Catholics." Kinsey opposed certain "aspects of Catholic dogma that were very repressive," according to Jones. Guess which aspects the sex researcher had in mind.

"Kinsey felt that the absence of birth control was responsible for some real friction in marriages and that unwanted pregnancy was a source of real friction. Kinsey was pretty much of a eugenicist in his thinking and in some instances thought that the wrong people were having too many babies. He was very much concerned about the WASP concern about differential fertility."

In Kinsey's own writings, the anti-Catholic bigotry gets portrayed as the scientist's struggle for the truth. In her adulatory biography, Cornelia Christenson, another Kinsey co-worker, reprints an unpublished talk he wrote just before his death entitled "The Right to do Sex Research," in which Kinsey claims that

It is probably correct to say that our knowledge of the basic anatomy and physiology of human sexual response in the year 1940 was no better than our knowledge of the circulation of the blood in the early 1600s. . . . There were centuries, not too remote, in which any attempt to understand the structure of the universe, the nature of matter, physical processes, and biological evolution were condemned because they were considered an invasion of areas that should be left to philosophy and religion. The names of Galileo, Newton, Kepler, Pascal, and most of those who attempted to explore the physical realities of the universe appear in indices of prohibited books dating back not more than two or three centuries, and in some instances as recent as the last hundred years. How many persons would venture today to condemn all further physical research? It has been the history of science throughout the ages that ignorance has never brought anything but trouble to mankind, and that every fact, well established, has ultimately added to the happiness of our social organization. . . . The scientist's right to do research in these other fields involved the basic development of our right to establish knowledge as a source of our human capacity, and that is now a part of the written history. There is hardly another area in human biology or in sociology in which the scientist has had to fight for his right to do research, as he has when he attempted to acquire scientific understanding of human sexual behavior.

FINE SENTIMENTS

These are fine sentiments, I suppose, but they ring a bit hollow coming as they did from a man who used to talk about an imaginary Vatican pornography collection just to get a rise out the audiences he addressed. The anecdote was classic Kinsey, though, because it allowed him to push for an ideological agenda against an institution he saw as the main impediment to enlightenment in the area that concerned him most while at the same time posing as the objective and unflappable scientist. It bespoke an interesting mixture of scientism and sexual ideology that was potent enough to throw two generations of Americans off the scent. In fact the tradition of enlightened inquiry and academic freedom always did have an Alice-in-Wonderland quality about it. There was something bogus about sex research from the beginning and the tradition goes past Kinsey—to Freud, for instance—but it definitely takes a major turn for worse with him.

Kinsey, as I have already indicated, did not start out to be a sex researcher. He began his scientific career as an entomologist, but he had to struggle with his family to do even that. Kinsey's father, according to the two biographies we have of him, was rigid, intolerant of views differing from his own and a strict Methodist who expected his family to attend three separate services on Sundays. The elder Kinsey had worked his way up to a position at the Stevens Institute in South Orange, New Jersey and expected his son to follow in his footsteps. Young Alfred, however, was more attracted to things outdoors.

According to Cornelia Christenson's biography, which covers his earlier years in greater detail, Kinsey, whom she describes as "frail," "ranged the countryside [around South Orange] on Saturdays to collect botanical specimens. This hobby continued all through high school." One classmate remembers a discussion she had with Kinsey on the Darwinian theory of evolution, he expressing a belief in it and both of them feeling daring at taking such a "radical stance at that time."

Kinsey joined the then newly-formed Boy Scouts in 1910 and was remembered as wearing his uniform frequently. He was also remembered as having little to no interest in members of the opposite sex. According to Christenson, Kinsey

did not date or show any interest in girls. In fact, in his senior year the South Orange High School year book placed under his picture a quotation from *Hamlet*: "Man delights not me; no, nor woman neither." A classmate recalls that he was "the shyest guy around girls you could think of." Kinsey senior did not approve of dating in any case, so socializing on young Alfred's part would have undoubtedly led to increased friction at home.

The friction came anyway, even without the girls. Young Kinsey was, according to his father's wishes, to become an engineer but showed little aptitude or inclination for that profession. After two years at the

Stevens Institute, there was a break with the family, especially the father, and Kinsey set off for Bowdoin College in Maine to study biology.

According to Christenson, "Alfred's family life might be described as unduly restrictive during his boyhood and adolescent years, but he was already reaching outside of his home into the beginnings of his lifelong romance with nature and the out-of-doors." On a trip as an undergraduate to the northern Maine woods to collect live animals for the Bowdoin Museum, he and his friends agreed to stop their watches as a way of being more in tune with the rhythms of nature. "This wish to be close to nature is a recurring leitmotif throughout Kinsey's life," Christenson adds. He seems to have been fascinated by all sorts of animals, especially snakes; however, his first professional interest fell upon insects in general and the gall wasp in particular. Christenson gives an interesting explanation of what Kinsey found attractive about this particular insect:

Their curious life history sometimes includes alternating generations, a rather rare biological phenomenon, in which offspring do not resemble their parents. One generation may be agamic—that is, able to reproduce without sexual union.

After graduating from Harvard's Bussey Institution, Kinsey was given a Sheldon Travelling Fellowship which allowed him to pretty much go where he wanted throughout the United States, collecting gall wasps and enjoying life outdoors. "I am more and more satisfied," the young Kinsey wrote to his high school biology teacher, "that no other occupation in the world could give me the pleasure that this job of bug hunting is giving."

Kinsey began his academic career at Indiana University in Bloomington in the fall of 1920. During his first year there he had his first date and married the woman a year later. He then settled down to the business of teaching, raising a family and collecting gall wasps. In 1938 he was asked to be one of the teachers for a non-credit marriage course. According to the two official biographies he was appalled by the lack of "scientific" material on sexuality and tried to do some research on his own. The students he taught came to him for advice and out of these conferences the project of accumulating sex histories was begun. Dr. Judith Reisman, who received her Ph.D. in communication from Case Western Reserve, disputes the official Kinsey Institute version of how Kinsey went from collecting bugs to investigating huggery.

"Kinsey spent at least a decade preparing the groundwork getting that course started," Reisman said. "He planned every step of the way. There was nothing coincidental about it." The fact that Kinsey ended up teaching the course was the result of "a long carefully-structured strategy."

By mid-summer of 1939 Kinsey was deeply involved in getting sex histories, so much so that he was spending

just about every weekend in Chicago, where he had gained entry into the homosexual demi-monde. Kinsey was interested in variation more than anything else—this was true both of wasps and sex, and this interest was to predetermine the results he eventually got.

"UNLIMITED NONIDENTITY"

Many people have remarked that starting off in entomology was a curious way to get involved in sex research, but virtually no one has commented on the connection in any depth or detail. Kinsey, however, did just that in an address he gave to the campus chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in 1939, one year after he had embarked on his project of collecting sex histories. Kinsey begins his talk by stating that for the past 20 years, he has been interested in "individual variation as a biologic phenomenon." "Variability," he tells the group, "is universal in the living world," so much so that "the failure to recognize this *unlimited non identity* [my emphasis] has . . . vitiated much of our scientific work." What begins as a talk on biology soon shades over into a critique of human society, much like the allegory of the termites that one of his professors had given him in graduate school. "The moths at one point may be in reality not quite like the moths at other points," leading Kinsey to conclude that "what is one caterpillar's poison may be the next worm's meat."

If biologists so often forget the most nearly universal of all biologic principles, it is not surprising that men and women in general expect their fellows to think and behave according to patterns which may fit the lawmaker, or the imaginary ideals for which the legislation was fashioned, but which are ill-shaped for all real individuals who try to live under them. Social forms, legal restrictions, and moral codes may be as the social scientist would contend, the codification of human experience; but like all other averages, they are of little significance when applied to particular individuals. . . . Prescriptions are merely public confessions of prescriptionists. . . . What is right for one individual may be wrong for the next; and what is sin and abomination to one may be a worthwhile part of the next individual's life. The range of individual variation in any particular case is usually much greater than is generally understood.

"Continuous variation," Kinsey concludes, "is the rule among men as well as among insects." He then goes on to draw sweeping conclusions about how society should be changed according to the lessons Kinsey has learned from studying the taxonomy of gall wasps.

Under the laws of our own society, the decision between an acquittal and a ten-year sentence too often depends upon a theory that there are two classes and only two classes of people: acceptable citizens and law breakers. In ethical situations we commonly recognize right and wrong without allowance for the endlessly varied types of behavior that are possible between the extreme right and the extreme wrong. . . . Our conceptions of right and wrong, normal and abnormal, are seriously challenged by the variation studies.

"WHATEVER IS IS RIGHT"

Right and wrong, according to Kinsey, are to be determined empirically. It is a curious way of thinking, but there is no doubt that this is what Kinsey believed. Like Alexander Pope, he could exclaim, "Whatever is is right." Well, not quite. Kinsey wasn't really all that consistent. Materialists tend not to be. So, for example, when it came to a conflict between human laws and mores, which have every bit as much ontological status as insect behavior, and sexual impulse, the latter was clearly to prove the must for the former.

Given this procrustian attitude, one wonders why Kinsey stopped only at moral laws dealing with sexual behavior. Why not set out to reform moral and legal strictures concerning human speech, for example? Kinsey, I suppose, could have interrogated people on whether they always told the truth. He probably would have found that lying was fairly common among the population. It seems fairly certain that most people do it at least sometimes. He then could have catalogued the various types of lies that people tell. And then? Could he have argued that the prohibition against lying is unfounded because empirical investigation shows that it is widespread? What about laws against perjury and fraud? Should they be struck down on the basis of people's behavior? What about theft? People steal all the time. They have been doing this sort of thing for thousands of years. Does that mean that the laws against theft are "puritanical" and should be abolished? To be consistent Kinsey would have to argue for this as well. But it seems that the only area where this type of thinking has any purchase on the modern mind is in the area of sex. Sex is an appetite of unusual power, especially when it is not properly controlled. It leads in these cases almost naturally to compulsive behavior, and compulsive sexual behavior is the antithesis of rationality. The human conscience is capable of recovering from almost any type of injury, but at a certain point in people's lives they tend to lose heart in the struggle against a particular vice. Since the sexual vices—or to use a contemporary term, sexual addiction—can be particularly compulsive, people can tend to despair that they will ever conquer them. At this point a peculiarly modern temptation enters the picture—the temptation to make wrong right. The temptation to rationalize, the temptation to use the intellect, or "science," the modern's truncated form of rationality, as a way of de-legitimizing the norm or, something which is the same thing expressed differently, of making deviance the norm. A careful reading of Kinsey's Phi Beta Kappa speech shows that this is precisely what he is up to. "Popular judgments of normality," he tells us,

more often represent measures of departure from the standards of the individual who is passing judgment—an admission that "only thee and me are normal and thee, I fear, is a bit queer." The psychologist's more presumptuous labeling of the abnormal is, too often, merely

an attempt to justify the mores, a reassertion of society's concept of what is acceptable in individual behavior with no objective attempt to find out, by actual observation, what the incidence of the phenomenon may be, or the extent of the real maladjustment that the behavior will introduce. Scholarly thinking as well as the laymen's evaluation still needs to be tempered with the realization that individual variations shape into a continuous curve on which there are no sharp divisions between normal and abnormal, between right and wrong.

ABSOLUTES?

Once again one is tempted to ask if we are dealing with absolutes here. Is it always true that saying something is abnormal is simply an "attempt to justify the mores"? Is Dr. Kinsey exempt from his own injunction? Is his attempt to label this country's sex laws "abnormal" simply his own desire to justify his own mores or that of a group to which he feels a particularly close identification? If there is no right and wrong, by what right does he claim the mandate to change sex laws? A little bit of reflection will show that there is no consistency here, and that what claims to be clear-headed empirical thinking is nothing more than an ideology for social change based on the prestige that science had among the common man in the late '30s. Kinsey is attempting to use science to de-legitimize the norm and substitute deviance in its place.

These individual differences are the materials out of which nature achieves progress, evolution in the organic world. Standardized, interchangeable genes in the primordial bit of protoplasm would have covered the earth with nothing but primordial bits of protoplasm. . . . In the differences between men lie the hopes of a changing society.

Difference clearly takes on a metaphysical if not downright theological role in Kinsey's philosophy. Kinsey concludes his lecture by hoping "that our university has not put any standard imprint on you who have gone through it. In fact from what I know of some of you who are the newly-elected members of Phi Beta Kappa, you are a strange assortment of queer individuals; and that is why I respect you, and believe in your future."

ABSOLUTE DEVIANCE

Kinsey's philosophy then is more than just moral relativism. It is a philosophy—constructed with the help of Darwin—in which deviance is the cause of all progress. Deviance is the engine which allows new things to happen. Without deviance there would be no human society, no human beings, no higher animals; there would be nothing but that primordial bit of protoplasm with its standardized genes. As a result of his immersion in Darwinian theory and the minutiae of insect taxonomy, Kinsey came up with a theory which allowed him to undermine the concept of the norm, both social and personal, in the area of sexual morality.

Because of Kinsey's fixation on deviance as the

engine of social and biological progress, the outcome of Kinsey's survey was pre-programmed from the beginning. As previously mentioned, Kinsey's sex research grew out of the conferences he had with students enrolled in his marriage course. If he had been interested in the nature of human sexuality or what most people did, he would have tried to gather a scientifically valid demographic sample of the population as a whole. Instead Kinsey moved in the opposite direction—toward deviance. In June of 1939—less than a year after he got started in the sex business—he made his first trip to Chicago. Why Chicago? According to Christenson, he went there

primarily for homosexual histories, but along with them was a mixture of divorce cases made available to him by an investigator for a state committee, and also histories of big-city prostitutes. Of the homosexual histories he wrote that they were "the most marvelous *evolutionary* series [his emphasis]—disclosing as prime factors such economic and social problems as have never been suggested before, and a simple biologic basis that is so simple that it sounds impossible that everyone hasn't seen it before.

During his entire career as a sex researcher, Kinsey remained fascinated by deviance. His favorite groups for information—the ones he kept returning to again and again were homosexuals, prostitutes, and prison inmates. From Kinsey's point of view as a collector of sex histories this is not hard to understand. Aside from any prurient interest on Kinsey's part—something we will take up later—the fact remains that these groups were more willing to talk about their sex lives than the population in general. Why this should be the case is not hard to understand. To begin with, prisoners are, if you'll pardon the expression, a captive audience. They have nothing else to do, and more importantly no social status to lose by talking about the things that Kinsey was interested in hearing. Sexuality for a prostitute is a business matter, and they talk about it in this fashion, although Pomeroy makes the fascinating observation that although prostitutes were willing to talk about their customers, they were unwilling to talk about their husbands and loved ones. With homosexuals the situation is even easier to understand. Homosexuals in the 1940s were, to use their own argot, almost exclusively "in the closet." They were part of a secret society, engaging in criminal activity. They were in many instances part of a criminal conspiracy. Such a life causes a great deal of psychic strain. Homosexuals then, once they felt secure that their confidentiality wouldn't be breached, would find the type of interview Kinsey conducted deeply cathartic. In fact, many wrote and told him exactly this. Here one could tell one's deepest secrets not to a confessor who would expect that person to change his life, but to a sympathetic, nonjudgmental scientist, whose refusal to entertain moral concerns would itself be deeply soothing to a troubled conscience. It is no wonder then that once Kinsey penetrated their *monde* homosexuals would flock to Kinsey to tell their stories. Kinsey for his part recip-

rocated by being deeply interested in the homosexual world, so much so that even the deeply-sympathetic Pomeroy writes, "one of the chief complaints was that he compiled too large a portion of homosexual histories. There was some truth in this. . . ."

The truth of this, however, raises troubling questions about the accuracy of the survey. When one purports to give a broad survey of sexual mores the question of the nature of the sample becomes crucial. And in Kinsey's case questions over the nature of the sample have plagued his research from the beginning.

In 1954 The American Statistical Association published its own analysis of Kinsey reports in *Statistical Problems of the Kinsey Report on Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Cochran, Mosteller, Tukey and Jenkins. They concluded that "critics are justified in their objections that many of the most [...] provocative statements in the book are not based on the data presented therein, and it is not made clear to the reader on what evidence the statements are based." The ASA committee specifically mentioned concern about the unknown number of homosexuals causing "bias in the sample." When I asked Paul Gebhard what percentage of the sample were homosexuals, he deflected the question, saying "now we're going to get into the nasty problem of defining what is a homosexual."

Lewis Terman expressed similar doubts about Kinsey's sample in an article, "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male: Some Comments and Criticism," which was published in the *Psychological Bulletin* in 1948. Terman faults Kinsey for "generalizing beyond the data." He finds examples of generalizations based on small samples and generalizations which are contradicted by the data given:

On p. 567 Kinsey asserts in bold type, that "Not more than 62 percent of the upper level male's outlet is derived from marital intercourse by the age of 55." On checking back to table 85, p. 348 we find that there were only 81 upper-level married men above the age of 45 years upon whom data on source of outlet are given. From table 56, p. 252, we find that there were only 109 married men in the total population (all education levels combined of ages 51-55 and only 67 above the age of 55. Surely bold type is hardly suitable for sweeping conclusions based on such limited data.

Kinsey bases his statement that orthodox Jews are the least sexually active of all religious groups in the United States on a sample of "59 orthodox Jews in the entire U.S., all of college level." One of the most quoted statements in the male volume, "Among males who remain unmarried until the age of 35, almost exactly 50 percent have homosexual experiences between the beginning of adolescence and that age," is based on a sample of "68 for the 0-8 educational level, less than 50 for the 9-12 level, and 71 for the 13+ level. . ." which leads Terman to conclude that Kinsey "does not hesitate to express judgments of evaluation and interpretation for which no data, or only inadequate data are given."

"MORALISM AND PRUDERY"

According to Pomeroy, Terman's article was "the one review that appeared to concern Kinsey most." According to Pomeroy's reading of Kinsey, "Terman's review symbolized for him the moralism and prudery of so many of his worst critics, wrapped in a blanket of professional criticism.... Kinsey remained convinced that Terman had betrayed him, through jealousy and basic prudery." So much for Kinsey's willingness to face the facts in a disinterested scientific manner.

More crucial, however, than how Kinsey generalized from his oftentimes surprisingly small samples was the question of who volunteered to be surveyed. According to Terman,

One question regarding the representativeness of Kinsey's sampling is whether the subjects who volunteered, and who account for about three-fourths of his total population, tended to be of a special sort. One might suppose that persons most willing to talk about their sex lives would be, in a disproportionate number of cases, those least inhibited in their sexual activities. On p. 37 Kinsey says that many who volunteered did so because they were seeking information or help in connection with their personal problems.

By comparing Kinsey's volunteer sample with what he claimed were his hundred percent samples, Terman comes up with differences that range from 2 to 1 for premarital intercourse to 4 to 1 for homosexual contacts; that is, that volunteers were twice to four times as likely to have sexual activity as non-volunteers.

Differences of such magnitude confirm the suspicion that willingness to volunteer is associated with greater than average sexual activity. And since the volunteers account for about three-fourths of the 5,300 males reported upon in this volume, it follows that Kinsey's figures, in all probability, give an exaggerated notion of the amount of sexual activity in the general population.

VOLUNTEER BIAS

Abraham Maslow, the humanist psychologist, worked briefly with Kinsey in the '40s and got him into Brooklyn College where he surveyed Maslow's students. In an article which appeared in *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* in April 1952, Maslow and Sakoda conclude that

the bias introduced into a sex study by the use of volunteers is, in general, in the direction of inflating the percentage reporting unconventional or disapproved sexual behavior—such as masturbation, oral sexuality, petting to climax, premarital and extramarital intercourse, etc. The more timid and retiring individuals, evidently, are apt to be privately, as well as socially conforming. They are likely, it seems, to refrain from volunteering for sex studies in which they are asked embarrassing questions. The present study would lead us to conclude that the percentages reported are probably inflated and that they should be discounted to some extent for volunteer-error until reexamined.

Fidelity (April, 1989)

Kinsey, who knew of Maslow's objections while he was still preparing his first volume, ignored the objections. In a letter written in 1970, Maslow said that he warned Kinsey about volunteer error but Kinsey

disagreed with me and was sure that his random selection would be okay. I put the heat on all my five classes at Brooklyn College and made an effort to get them all to sign up to be interviewed by Kinsey. We had my dominance test scores for all of them, and then Kinsey gave me the names of the students who actually showed up for the interviews. As I expected, the volunteer error was proven, and the whole basis for Kinsey's statistics was proven to be shaky. But then he refused to publish it and refused even to mention it in his books, or to mention anything else that I had written. All my work was excluded from his bibliography. So after a couple of years I went ahead and published it myself.

Paul Gebhard now feels that "Maslow had a point, and it should have been analyzed." However, at the time, according to Gebhard, Kinsey "didn't believe that.... I think Kinsey's feeling was I've got enough to do without going off on a side tangent."

Once the male volume appeared little was heard beyond the din created by the popular press. Kinsey had a policy of not allowing journalists to be present when he spoke. He also had a policy of requiring journalists to submit their articles to him before publication; however, in spite of all that, the relationship between Kinsey and the press was for the most part a marriage made in heaven. The sweeping generalizations he made about sexual mores were guaranteed to stimulate reader interest, and if no one read the fine print, well, the journalists for the most part weren't going to complain. The entomologist from Indiana provided the perfect cover for the liberation from Christian mores and restraints, namely, science, which was probably at the height of its prestige as the validator of things real. No one knew about the infamous Tuskegee syphilis experiments yet, and the equally contemporaneous Nazi experiments were simply a part of the horror of World War II that hadn't been sorted out yet either. Hugh Hefner, no impartial bystander when it came to lobbying for the removal of restraints on sexual behavior, cited the Kinsey reports as justification for creating *Playboy*.

KINSEY AND HIS DATA

But behind it all we have two entities which have never really been examined by anyone outside of the charmed circle of the Kinsey Institute or the sex research establishment. I'm talking about Kinsey himself and the data upon which his study rests. Why was Kinsey so interested in sex anyway? Are we to believe that it was simply pure dispassionate thirst for the truth? Or were there other personal factors at work here? Given Kinsey's bias in collecting data, given his preference for deviance, is it not possible that his project, the "grand scheme," as Pomeroy would call it, was nothing more than the expression of deep-seated personal need if

twenty-nine

not compulsion. This is Paul A. Robinson's view of Kinsey's life as portrayed in both the Pomeroy and Christenson biographies. Writing a review of these two books for the May 1972 *Atlantic*, Robinson feels that

Kinsey's great project originated in the discovery of his own sexual ambiguities. I also suspect that Pomeroy holds the same opinion but that for ethical reasons he is unable to say so. Soon after he joined the project Pomeroy deciphered the code Kinsey used to disguise the identity of the histories. He was thus able to read Kinsey's own history, as well as those of his wife and children. Furthermore, during the period of their association Pomeroy and Kinsey took each other's history every two years in order to test the consistency of their recall. In composing his biography, therefore, Pomeroy had access to all the details of Kinsey's sexual development, but he was bound to silence by the ground rules of the project which guaranteed confidentiality even in death.

Robinson intimates "that Kinsey may have discovered in himself the homosexual tendencies he would later ascribe to a large portion of the population" as a result of his reading of the relationship which Kinsey had with a graduate student of his by the name of Ralph Voris.

"NO COMMENT"

When I asked Paul Gebhard, who has also seen Kinsey's sex history, if he would like to comment on Robinson's charges, he said, "Yeah, no comment."

"Do you think," I said, "that Kinsey's sex life was influential in his research?"

"It was a motivating factor. He had such a restrained childhood. He once said to me that he hoped that no other children would have to go through what he went through as a child. Sexual urges were inherently sinful. Masturbation would drive you mad—stuff like that. I think that was what gave him a little humanitarian devotion."

Or the desire to subvert sexual norms. It all depends, it seems, on where Kinsey himself stood. Even if Kinsey was not an active homosexual, he certainly seemed fascinated by what they did. One homosexual wrote in a memoir that Kinsey spent over 700 hours with him alone. This certainly bespeaks something other than scholarly objectivity, especially when Kinsey seemed so bent on collecting as many histories as possible. He could have collected at least 500 in the time he spent with this man alone.

The question of Kinsey's homosexuality is a particularly tantalizing one because we know that the answer lies in the Kinsey archives. Like Freud, with whom he is so often compared, Kinsey liked to project the image of himself as the scientist interested in discovering the fact of the matter. Like Freud, he was obsessively concerned with preserving his privacy. Freud burned his private papers, not once, but twice during his life time. Kinsey told his staff photographer William Dellenback that he would destroy the institute's files and go to jail

before he would let the FBI see them. This was to preserve their confidentiality; however, it is not hard to see that the most valuable instance of confidentiality is the one concerning the man whose project is at stake and whose objectivity would be compromised by evidence of a hidden sexual agenda.

Professor James Jones, who has seen the correspondence between Kinsey and Voris, is as evasive as Gebhard when asked to describe their relationship.

"If you will read in Christenson's book and in Pomeroy's book that's spoken to. The research that I've done beyond that is basically my research and I'm preparing a volume, and I think it's premature for me to say at this point what I'm going to write."

Ironies abound here. First of all we have a man who spent his life snooping into the private lives of thousands of people and proselytizing for the removal of sexual prohibitions and laws, yet no one knows what this man's own sexual orientation was. Secondly, the institute which this man founded to disseminate information on human sexuality is aggressive in thwarting any research into the life of its founder. Wouldn't it stand to reason that a man who was as intensely interested in sexuality as Kinsey was would be motivated by his own sexual concerns? And if so what were those concerns? And if not, why does the Kinsey Institute give the impression that it has something to hide? Talking to people like Dr. Gebhard, one is confronted with an inescapable double standard. The Kinsey Institute would claim that there is nothing wrong with any sexual practice that one finds stimulating. Yet alongside of this boundlessly progressive attitude toward sex in the abstract is a positively Victorian attitude toward the sexual habits of their founder in particular. Well, if committing sodomy is no different morally than collecting stamps, then tell us about Dr. Kinsey's sexual preferences. And if the institute can't tell us about their data then they should not expect us to accept everything they or Kinsey had to say as scientifically proven. Verifiability, after all, is the essence of science. In the area of sex research, however, one is expected to accept things on blind faith. It is as if Leeuwenhoek had invented the microscope, but then refused to allow anyone to look into it and claimed that whatever he saw we would have to accept on his say so alone. Such is the scientific status of modern-day sex education.

MORE SERIOUS CHARGES

In 1981 more serious charges were levelled against Kinsey. Judith Reisman, then a professor at the University of Haifa, Israel, gave a paper in Jerusalem which analyzed the data on child sexuality in the Kinsey report. Given the shocking nature of the data it is surprising that no one questioned it until 33 years after it had been published. Tables 30 through 34 in chapter five of Kinsey's book *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* document the incidence of orgasm in preadolescents. One

A Home-educated Child Does Not Learn About "Safe Sex"

He does not learn that abortion is just something between a woman and her doctor.

He does not learn that homosexuality is a perfectly acceptable alternate lifestyle.

THROUGH THE CURRICULUM AT SETON HOME STUDY SCHOOL...

He learns Catholic faith and morality.

He learns math, science, history, phonics, and religion under your watchful care.

And he learns how much his parents love him.

AT SETON HOME STUDY SCHOOL, WE KNOW THAT YOU ARE IN CHARGE.

Although Seton Home

Study School provides a daily lesson plan for all subjects, we never forget that YOU are the primary educator. You know your child best.

No longer will you worry about what the teacher might be telling your child. You are the teacher.

No longer will you worry that he is not learning. You will teach him.

Seton gives you the resources to take charge of your child's education.

SETON HOME STUDY SCHOOL IS WITH YOU EVERY STEP OF THE WAY.

Though most parents recognize the great joy to be found in home schooling, they also recognize their need



for a strong ally in the effort...

We are ready to help you seven days a week. Books, lesson plans, testing, and counseling are just some of the services which Seton provides.

From the day that your materials arrive until the last test is graded for the school year, the faculty members of

Seton Home Study School will be your constant partners in providing your children with the best education possible.

And what a faculty! From Mary Kay Clark, director and the recipient of a Ph.D. in Education from Assumption University, to Reverend Vincent Miceli, our religious consultant and a nationally recognized Catholic scholar, it's a staff that few other schools, public or private, could hope to match.

IMMEDIATE COUNSELING IS ALWAYS JUST A PHONE CALL AWAY.

From 8 AM to midnight every day, one of our 10 full-time staffers will be waiting

to answer your questions. We can even draw from the substantial academic resources of nearby Christendom College for help, so don't be surprised if you receive guidance from one of America's leading Catholic educators!

If you want to take charge of your child's education, now is the time to act.

Write or call Seton Home Study School—the foremost Catholic home-study school in America—for a full information packet. Then, bring the children home. Isn't it where they belong?

SETON HOME STUDY SCHOOL Dept. V, One Kidd Lane
Front Royal, VA 22630 (703) 636-9990

four-year old was "specifically manipulated" for 24 hours around the clock. This child achieved 26 orgasms in this time period. Another 11-month-old infant had 14 "orgasms," according to the Kinseyan definition, in a period of 38 minutes, for a mean orgasmic rate of 2.7 per minute. One 13-year old was observed having three orgasms in 70 seconds, or one orgasm every 23 seconds. Table 32 on p. 178 of the male volume documents "Speed of pre-adolescent orgasm," measuring those who took from "up to 10 sec." to achieve "orgasm" to those who took "over 10 min."

In addition the Kinsey team making these observations noted various types of reaction on the part of the children involved. One of the six types of reaction involved:

Extreme tension with violent convulsion: Often involving the sudden heaving and jerking of the whole body... gasping, eyes staring or tightly closed, hands grasping, mouth distorted, sometimes with tongue protruding; whole body or parts of it spasmodically twitching... violent jerking of the penis... groaning, sobbing, or more violent cries, sometimes with an abundance of tears (especially among younger children) (p. 161).

The children in group five manifest "extreme trembling, collapse, loss of color and sometimes fainting...." Those in group six become "pained or

frightened at approach of orgasm." In addition,

some males suffer excruciating pain and may scream if movement is continued or the penis even touched. The males in the present group become similarly hypersensitive [and] will fight away from the partner and may make violent attempts to avoid climax, although they derive definite pleasure from the situation.

A SIMPLE QUESTION

Reisman's paper raised a simple question. She wanted to know where Kinsey got the data described above. Given the data as Kinsey published it, there seems to be only two alternatives. Either Kinsey got the material anecdotally from pedophiles (or as Gebhard was to put it in a letter to Reisman, "parents, mostly college educated, who observed their children and kept notes for us," or Kinsey and his researchers got their data from actual experiments involving child/adult sexual contact. In the first case, the Kinsey data is hearsay and scientifically bogus; in the second instance it was obtained by criminal activity. Either way, it doesn't look good for sex research in general or for Kinsey and Co. in particular.

Even sex researchers sympathetic to Kinsey have mentioned the problematic nature of the child sexuality

data. John Gagnon, who was on the staff of the Kinsey Institute for 10 years, wrote in his book *Human Sexualities* that "a less neutral observer than Kinsey would have described these events as sex crimes, since they involved sexual contacts between adults and children" (p. 84). Gagnon urges caution in interpreting this sort of data, although he also feels that "the observations should not be ruled out simply because they emerged from illegal or stressful situations."

The dilemma here is that much of this information comes from adults who were in active sexual contact with these boys and who were interested in producing orgasm in them. The aggressive seeking by the boys may be an adult interpretation based on feelings of guilt. . . .

Reisman draws the analogy between rapists and their victims. The rapist frequently claims that his victim enjoys being raped. However, he is hardly a neutral observer in this particular sexual transaction. The same caveats then would apply to Kinsey's child sexuality data. If it was obtained from pedophiles, it was scientifically worthless. If it was obtained from experiments, then the Kinsey staff was involved in criminal activity.

On p. 315 of his biography, Wardell Pomeroy gives some indication that Kinsey may have been involved in sexual contacts with children himself. According to Pomeroy, Kinsey

believed that students in the field had all been "too prudish" to make an actual investigation of sperm count in early-adolescent males. His own research for the *Male* volume had produced some material, but not enough. He could report, however, that there were mature sperm even in the first ejaculation, although he did not yet have any actual counts.

As Reisman was to say later, "You can only collect early adolescent ejaculate by being pretty close to the adolescent. You don't necessarily have to do anything, but what I'm saying is that it sounds like experimental activity."

WORST CASE SCENARIO

According to Dr. Reisman's "worst case scenario,"

Dr. Kinsey and his colleagues would have organized and conducted the child orgasm tests, not unlike the concurrent and infamous Tuskegee Syphilis studies on Black adult males begun in 1932. . . . To report on mature sperm required laboratory analysis promptly following collection of the material. This necessitated "specific contact" for sperm collection, since Kinsey disdained secondary collection techniques—such as early morning urine samples. Early adolescent sperm "material" is *not* collected by recall.

Reisman also concluded according to the testimony of pediatricians that the children were either forcibly restrained or restrained by drugs. She also surmises that the children came from ghetto areas.

In 1983 Patrick Buchanan published the charges in one of his syndicated columns. "If Dr. Reisman's charges stand up in the storm that is coming," he con-

cluded, "Kinsey will wind up on the same ethical and scientific shelf now reserved for the German doctors who conducted live experiments on Jewish children. And he will belong there."

The storm that came, if one could call it that, didn't last long. Harriet Pilpel, a lawyer long associated with both the institute and the ACLU, wrote a threatening letter to Buchanan alleging that his claims were "totally without foundation, libelous and malicious." Miss Pilpel also claimed that "the archives of the Kinsey Institute contain no films of any human sexual experiments conducted by the institute." The claim, of course, set her up for an easy rebuttal by Buchanan, who simply quoted Pomeroy's biography about the existence of films of sexual activity made specifically at Kinsey's direction and paid for by funds provided by Indiana University. With the publication of Buchanan's column responding to Pilpel's letter, the coming storm subsided almost as soon as it arose. Virtually nothing has happened since Buchanan responded to the Pilpel letter. The charges were never refuted, but then again they were never definitively substantiated either.

When I spoke with Paul Gebhard he remembered Reisman as "very obsessed with this matter."

"She got the idea," he continued, "that we were running a kind of Masters and Johnson experiment on children, and she telephoned me—that was shortly before I stepped down as director—and wanted to know about this. Were did we get these data? I said well we got them from a diversity of sources. Some were from parents. We'd often ask parents about the sexual activity of their kids. Some of it we got from nursery school attendants who would tell us what they had observed, and some of it we got from pedophiles. We interviewed a number of pedophiles, particularly in prison. So we lumped that all together, and that's where we got the data. This distressed her. She decided that we were experimenting with children, and she's asked for an investigation. She has made all sorts of accusations, but nothing has ever come of it."

"You weren't experimenting with children?" I asked.

"No, of course not."

"Isn't there a stop watch used to time these experiments?"

"One parent used a stop watch, but we never did it. No, I can assure you we did not experiment with children."

"Do pedophiles use stop watches?"

"Not generally, no," Gebhard responded.

OUTRAGE

According to Dr. Jones of Houston University, both Gebhard and Reinisch expressed "outrage" at Reisman's charges against Kinsey.

"They felt that Kinsey had been unfairly accused and tried to figure out how they could respond without

violating the confidentiality of the records."

Jones has had more access to the Kinsey files than anyone not in the charmed circle of sex researchers associated with the institute. Although if he is, as he claims to be, outside of the circle, he is not far outside. Jones did his dissertation on Kinsey at Indiana University and has been in the past a member of the institute's scientific board of advisors.

According to Jones, "Kinsey to my knowledge was not involved in any abuse of human subjects. Whatever else I'm working on and trying to straighten out, I found no evidence of that. Kinsey was not doing experiments on human subjects as far as I know."

"What about getting people to come and perform sodomy?" I asked.

"I think there you'd have to ask other people. There are a lot of rumors now and basically what one has to do is try to separate rumor from fact. Reisman and Buchanan have made any biographer's task a very demanding one now because when you make those kinds of accusations someone is going to expect a serious scholar to straighten them out. And it's very hard to prove negatives."

In this case it is particularly hard because the Kinsey Institute has absolute control of the data. As a result the question of Kinsey's involvement in illegal activities has reached a stalemate. The Kinsey Institute is in full control of the archives that would allow scholars or journalists to resolve the issue, but they will only let those sympathetic to the cause of sex research and sex education in to do research. And even there, the material available is rigorously censored.

Describing his own research at the Kinsey Institute, Jones says, "No one has impeded me." But before long he is putting qualifications on to his own statement. "Let's put it this way, I don't know what's in the archives and what's not there. I've been permitted to see everything that I've asked to see. I don't know whether there are inner sanctum materials that I don't know how to ask to see. I don't know if materials prior to Kinsey's death were removed. I don't think they were, but I don't know."

When I asked Dr. Gebhard what Jones was allowed to see, he gave a slightly different version. Jones, he said, "can see the stuff that's previously looked over. He got to see some of the correspondence, but I ran ahead of him and made sure to abstract anything that was confidential."

"Is Kinsey's sex history going to be available to historians?"

"No," Gebhard responded.

"Is it going to be available to Dr. Jones?"

"No."

"Is it ever going to be available?"

"Not as far as I know."

"TOUGH LUCK"

"Doesn't this pose problems for historians?"

"Yeah," Gebhard answered, "That's tough luck."

"All Kinsey Institute activities," we read in a glossy, two-color brochure put out by the institute,

derive from the belief that social policy and personal decisions about sex, gender, and reproduction should be made on the basis of factual information rather than on ignorance. The Kinsey Institute continues its commitment to providing such information.

The ironies here are too large to ignore. The Kinsey Institute, it seems, following in the footsteps of its founder, has mastered the art of having its cake and eating it too. They get over \$500,000 in state funds each year but have no public accountability. They call themselves an archive and yet consider their files as sacrosanct as the letters you wrote to your wife when you were engaged to be married. They get to agitate for the deconstruction of sexual mores and laws by basing their claims on "science," but refuse to let anyone see the basis of their data. When Kinsey puts forth his claim to be the quintessentially disinterested scientist, those of us outside the charmed circle of the institute are expected to believe this on the blindest of blind faith. It leads one to believe that the institute indeed has something to hide and that if free access were given to their archives or even to Kinsey's sex history that the whole edifice of sex research and sex education would come tumbling down like a house of cards. The sex researchers, like Kinsey himself, protest too much. Beneath all the high-sounding ideals, one detects the unsavory odor of hypocrisy and mendacity and beneath that, sexual compulsion masquerading as scientific interest.

"Did you ever ask people to give performances before camera?" I asked Dr. Gebhard.

"No."

"Did you ever ask them to have sexual intercourse in front of cameras?"

TWO SCIENTISTS

"Some people," Gebhard answered, contradicting his earlier statement. "These people were scientists, and they were very few in number. See, if you observe sexual activity, Kinsey pointed out, you can't look at all parts of the body simultaneously. The best we could do was choose a few scientists who were willing to cooperate and film them and then we could look at the films over and over again."

It just so happens that one of the "scientists" who volunteered to perform before the cameras wrote a memoir of his experiences which appeared in the November 13, 1980 number of *The Advocate*, a homosexual newspaper out of Los Angeles. Samuel M. Steward, the author of the article, was "teaching English at a second-rate sectarian university in Chicago" when he first met

Kinsey in 1949. He later became proprietor of his own tattoo parlor, which I'm sure is a scientific endeavor of some sort. His partner in crime—sodomy was and is illegal in the state of Indiana—was "a tall mean-looking sadist. . . with a crew-cut and a great personality." The author's partner "was a free-lance artist doing fashion lay-outs for Saks and other Fifth Avenue stores, and under the name of Steve Masters he produced many homosexual ink-drawings for the growing S/M audience."

Kinsey brought these two "scientists" to Bloomington to be filmed while engaging in sado-masochism. According to Steward, Kinsey "never set up assignments of any kind—but his interest in sado-masochism had reached a point of intolerable tension. He knew that I experimented in that area, and he wanted to find out more."

Steward, according to his own testimony, became an "unofficial collaborator" for the Kinsey Institute from 1949 until Kinsey's death in 1956. The relationship began with Kinsey taking Steward's sex history, after which Kinsey "looked at me thoughtfully and said: 'Why don't you give up trying to continue your heterosexual relationships?'" It seems that the disinterested scientist wasn't above a little proselytizing after all. At any rate, Steward responded immediately: "I abandoned my phony 'bisexuality' that very evening," he said.

Apparently Kinsey and Steward found each other fascinating. Both of them were sexual record keepers; both kept their records in code, although Steward concedes that Kinsey's code was much more sophisticated than his. Both were avid consumers of pornography. Kinsey was interested in the pornography Steward wrote as well as his "sexual action Polaroid pictures," which he sent to Institute photographer Bill Dellenback, who made 8x10 glossy reproductions. "Kinsey," Steward wrote,

avored me in return with the most flattering kind of attention—never coming to Chicago without writing to me and trying to arrange a meeting. In the eight years of our friendship, I logged (as a record keeper again) about 700 hours of his pleasant company, the most fascinating in the world because all of his shop talk was of sex. . . .

All of this attention—700 hours is, after all, a long time to spend on one individual, especially when Kinsey was so pressed for time collecting sex histories that were to survey males and females in general—apparently got Steward to wondering about Kinsey himself and his own sexual motivations.

THE IDEAL FATHER

In him I saw the ideal father—who was never shocked, who never criticized, who always approved, who listened and sympathized. I suppose I fell in love with him to a degree, even though he was a grandfather. Of course, there was never any physical contact between us except a handshake. Many persons I knew would ask:

"Is he queer?" I told him this.

"And what do you answer?" he asked.

"Well," I said slowly, "I always say, 'Yes he is—but not in the same way we are. He is a voyeur and an *auditeur*. He likes to look and listen.'"

Kinsey laughed, but a moment later I caught him observing me thoughtfully. I may have hit closer to the truth than I realized.

Was Kinsey queer? We may never know. Dr. Reisman claims that certain Kinsey Institute files were destroyed shortly after her accusations were made public. Kinsey's own personal sex history is presumably still available but it would have to be decoded by either Pomeroy or Gebhard, both of whom have a vested interest in the outcome. According to Professor Jones, part of the reason Pilpel's letter to Buchanan was mere bluff was because the institute is afraid to become involved in litigation.

"No one at the institute wants to sue," he said, "because if you get into a court of law the issue of confidentiality on those records is joint because if the only way you can prove something is to go into the files then the court may order that. I don't think the institute wants a lawsuit for that reason. But I would not read that to mean that they couldn't win it in terms of what's in the files. It's just that if you are ordered by the courts to open those files then you've got a real quandary."

HETEROPHOBIA

In terms of external evidence, homosexuality is the piece that completes the jigsaw puzzle that is Kinsey's life and legacy. It explains, for example, the "heterophobia" that Edward Eichel, who received his degree in sex education from New York University, has described as the "hidden agenda in sex education." Sex education's primary purpose is to break down the child's modesty and then his natural aversion to homosexual activity.

For Kinsey, blurring of sexual identity—*bisexuality* (as opposed to heterosexuality)—was an essential step in opening up an unlimited range of sexual opportunities. Kinsey supported an ideology that might be called *pansexuality*; "anything goes" that provides excitement and pleasure. But in fact, it is an ideology that frowns upon monogamy and traditional concepts of normality, and considers intercourse between a man and a woman a limited form of sexual expression. (Pomeroy, in his article "The Now of the Kinsey Findings" [1972] refers to heterosexual intercourse as an "addiction.")

The disparity between the little one needs to know to function sexually and the elaborate outlay of time and money involved in sex education curriculums can best be explained by the fact that sex ed is there to educate children away from their natural aversion to certain unnatural activities. Sex education uses science as a legitimatizing device, just as Kinsey did in his own sex research. The protective mantle of science allows one to become involved in activity that everyone would

otherwise condemn as depraved, activities like voyeurism and collecting pornography, while simultaneously maintaining a veneer of respectability. Science is the legitimator that allows sex educators to engage in smutty talk in front of children without being either fired or arrested. If it could serve as a permission slip for Josef Mengele, then why not for Alfred Kinsey?

DOUBLE DEALING

Homosexuality also explains the phenomenon of the double life one finds all but ubiquitous in sex education curriculums. To put it simply, parents almost never get to see what their children see in the courses they take. The reason for this is obvious: the sex educators fear parental outrage. The Unitarian Universalist Association, publishers of *About Your Sexuality*, a sex ed program which shows to 14-year olds, among other things, graphic films of anal intercourse, refused one parent permission to see the materials in the program because he "had not demonstrated open-mindedness and good faith." The program was created by Deryck Calderwood, who died in 1986 of, according to some reports, AIDS. Calderwood was described in *The New York Tribune* article describing the whole flap as

a disciple of sex pioneer Alfred Kinsey [who] believed, with Kinsey, that no type of sexual behavior is abnormal or pathological. He crafted the ideology of the NYU program, which has been called by one former student, Edward Eichel, "a gay studies program for heterosexuals."

The Rev. Eugene B. Navias, director of religious education for the Unitarian Universalists "confirmed that the program forbids the children to speak to their parents about what is said by others in the groups. . . . But this practice, he said, protects the sense of group trust that is essential if the children are going to be able to share honestly." Which is reminiscent of what Kinsey and his successors had to say about the files of the Kinsey Institute. Academic freedom, it seems, is a one-way street headed in the direction of subversion.

SUBVERSION

Subversion is, of course, something Kinsey practiced with a vengeance all the while claiming that he had no other agenda than the pursuit of scientific truth. In fact the best way to achieve the former is by claiming the latter, something recognized by Paul Robinson when he reviewed the two Kinsey biographies:

The critics were right in asserting that the Reports had been inspired by moral as well as scientific principles.



At least implicitly, both the *Male* and *Female* volumes argued against existing sexual restrictions by showing that actual sexual behaviour bore little relation to these restrictions. . . . Whatever their motivation, the Reports were all the more effective polemically for their seeming disinterestedness. Instead, for example, of stating outright that premarital sex was desirable, Kinsey simply documented a high correlation between premarital sexual experience and sexual "adjustment" in marriage, leaving the reader free to opt against adjustment if his moral code so demanded.

It is now 50 years since Kinsey started his sex research—time enough to step back and have some sort of reevaluation. And the best place to start is with the sex history of Kinsey himself. If the Kinsey Institute wants to keep his life a dark secret, that is their right, I suppose, although I don't see how they can go on accepting public money if they take this stance. If they choose to remain secretive, however, they should not be surprised if growing public scepticism is the response to their claims. The essence of science is verifiability. On that score sex research à la Kinsey is not immune to the verdict of history, which threatens as of now to rank its credibility just below phrenology. □

FREE

Brown Scapular, book on purgatory, Saint Benedict medal — include large brown envelope and \$1.00 postage.

Wanted: volunteer scapular makers and rosary makers — hardworking, sincere individuals, sewing machine required.

Also wanted: promoters of perpetual adoration.

Write to:

Scapular Guild
P. O. Box 4651
Philadelphia, PA 19127