

## THE US SUPREME COURT & HAMER'S GENE STUDY

by

Judith A. Reisman, Ph.D.

### US Supreme Court Rules Judge Must Judge Science Validity

*Science* magazine, the editorial voice of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), recently reported on a United States Supreme Court ruling, that judges must assess "whether the reasoning or methodology underlying the testimony is scientifically valid...and can be applied to the facts in issue."<sup>1</sup> Said *Science*, the "ruling is expected to force the courts to look more closely at the scientific principles that underpin testimony from expert witnesses." It puts "scientific validity front and center" in deciding whether to admit or exclude evidence, said the court.

To this end, they explain, a judicial committee of the Carnegie Commission is working "on a manual to help federal judges negotiate this new terrain....by spelling out some of the questions they should be asking....procedure and process, not content" is at issue for "judges have to be given guidance on what is and isn't scientifically valid.." Yet, despite a British medical journal, *The Lancet's* decision that "Reisman and her colleagues demolish" the Kinsey findings<sup>2</sup>, neither Carnegie nor the established American academy have responded professionally to Kinsey et al's., sex science frauds and crimes against children and society. Considering its tainted academic background, what can a judge believe from establishment sexuality/psychology, etc., in the mine field of "sex science" or "sexuality"?

### *Measuring "Love And ' Good Sex'" In the Courtroom*

Until the recent expose of the scandalous fraud<sup>3</sup> of pioneer sex scholars Dr. Kinsey et al, the validity of "sex" science, while notoriously unprovable, motivated major changes in American law and public policy.<sup>4</sup> World renowned pedagogue, Allan Bloom, the deceased author of *The Closing of the American Mind*, typifies the intellectual belief in sexology findings and their "expert testimony." In *Love And Friendship*, Bloom's trust in the honesty of sexologists, etc., illustrates some of the problems now facing American judges.

[Bloom] starts with Kinsey, for whom he feels a moderate admiration, a well-meaning student of behavior whose intention was to liberate men and women from unnecessary shame over statistically "normal" inclinations, and goes on to Freud....These two, and the sciences of sexology and psychology, he makes responsible for the change in emphasis in Western society from Love to "good sex"<sup>5</sup>

Due to the legal challenges of a radical homosexual leadership, sexual issues are in the courtroom as never before. If "experts" like Bloom--and hundreds of thousands of other scholars have--for nearly 50 years--believed the reckless claims of sex scientists to be honest

findings of "well-meaning" students of behavior, then how will veteran judges, with their pragmatic and fact-oriented backgrounds, uncover sex science fraud<sup>6</sup> in their courtrooms?.

***What "Reasoning or Methodology" Underlies The Testimony?***

The US Supreme Court asks are the data "scientifically valid"? Until recently, judges largely put judicial faith in the objectivity and honesty of the class, "scientists." Now, the court says a judge must identify what "scientific principles...underpin [expert] testimony." The court now "puts scientific validity front and center" in deciding whether to admit or exclude evidence. Well then, how could sexologists (or psychologists who are also trained by sexologists in the area of human sexuality) "prove" the "scientific validity" of their claims about homosexuality? If the scientists are tainted, serving special interests and themselves sexually or merely ethically compromised, this even further taints intractable brain, chromosome, blood, and hormonal findings.

In this intimate sexual arena, a judge must ask basic questions and use his common sense and experience to establish whether the findings are political or scientific.

So, the first scientific "fact" to obtain in any *sex research* would be to uncover any special (sexual) interest of the researchers (sexual orientation, habits), and any other possible conflict of interest in the subject (sex or gender) under study. This is, of course, easier said than done and often the more tainted the research/researchers the more hidden are their personal interests. However, special-interest conflicts are often found in the sources, citations and authorities referenced for the researcher's data.<sup>7</sup>

Professionally, a scientist's *success and prestige* depends upon refuting any data which "disproves" the researcher in the researcher's area of expertise. To put "scientific validity front and center" would mean to invalidate almost 50 years of the fraudulent sex science data which has turned our view of sex and sex crime on its head.

***Homosexual Control In The Academy***

For example, a researcher cannot examine homosexual "scientific" data without an understanding of what academic historian Jerry Muller calls "*The Homosexual Moment in the Academy*," in which Muller documents the domination of a pro-gay orthodoxy in all aspects of higher education.<sup>8</sup> Muller's findings are verified by National Endowment for the Humanities official, Jerry Martin, in "*The University as Agent of Social Transformation: The Postmodern Argument Considered*."<sup>9</sup> These recent critiques are typical of the academic historians' documentation of the current Kinseyan pro-gay, anti-tradition, university orthodoxy.

*Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* documents Kinsey's fraudulent data as the foundation of kindergarten to university sex education, AIDS prevention programs, and all professional sex accreditation and therapy programs. Following the appearance of this book the Kinsey Institute, which is now being de-funded by Indiana University, actively engaged in clandestine efforts to undermine and discredit an expose of their sex science frauds. The documents now

available (on request), further prove an Institutional conspiracy to cripple the Reisman research in order to keep the facts from the public and scholars.

### ***Monopoly of The Sex Education Accreditation Process***

***Kinseyan Sex Theorists:*** Students of "Child and Adolescent Development," the psychological foundations for the integrated human, have no theorist to cite for authority on sexuality except Kinsey. The key CAD theorists, Piaget, Elkind, Erikson, Freud, Kohlberg and Maslow, do not find for early sexuality, but rather for delayed sexuality--even Freud claiming a "latency" period during which the child remains asexual in order to prepare for his/her mature movement into adult society. Only Kinsey and his followers have developed any "theory" of sexuality taught within the school system today, under a score of labels from "Project 10" (Kinsey's infamous 10%) to just "AIDS Prevention."

***Kinseyan Sex Education Accreditation:*** Early on the Kinsey Institute was established as the western world's sex research center, creating SIECUS (Sex Information, Education Council of the United States) to carry out the sex education of the nation under Kinseyans; Pomeroy, Calderone, Kirkendall, Calderwood, et al. Three main accreditation institutions were created to legitimize Kinseyan sexuality programs and degrees: 1) New York University, 2) the University of Pennsylvania and 3) the Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Sexuality in San Francisco.

These "educational" curricula included training in "sensate" therapy, massage, weeks of viewing pornographic films (called SAR, "Sexual Attitude Restructuring"<sup>10</sup>) designed, said the faculty, to "desensitize" those who wished to enter the sexuality field as teachers, lecturers, counselors, etc., and the like. A "nude body workshop" is documented as part of the curricula in some if not all of the accreditation centers. Upon completion of this "training" or "sexual attitude restructuring" students obtained degrees and licenses to practice, accredited by the SSSS (Society for the Scientific Study of Sex) and AASECT (the American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors & Therapists).

### ***Only Kinseyan "Progay" Sex Science Data***

Within this background, the recent research from England, France, and the USA finds Kinsey's claims of a 10% to 47% homosexual (normative bisexuality) population to be outrageously exaggerated. Recent findings of a 1.1% homosexual population must be understood to discredit all sexuality research which now would lay claim to "immutability," or genetic predisposition. Kinsey's fraudulent research was accepted for nearly 50 years when no specialized scientific knowledge was needed to understand its falsity. There is little reason to accept the specialized data which now claims a genetic core to homosexuality based on these refuted findings.

### ***The Science Conflict of Interest***

Kinseyan, John Gagnon's sex survey data<sup>11</sup> was published in *Science* (1989) as well as a score of other essays suggesting objections to sex surveys were based on religious fanaticism. *Science* subsequently published several pro-Kinsey articles on Dr. June Reinisch, now past director of the Kinsey Institute. Since 1990 *Science* has denied their constituency any access to our findings of Kinseyan fraud in science. This despite reports in several foreign science journals (*The Lancet* (Great Britain), *The German Medical Tribune* (July 19, 1991 pp. 1 & 6) and recently the *British Medical Journal* (July 3, 1993 p. 61). Moreover, *Science* refused to reveal our findings despite the support of Walter Stewart, the National Institutes of Health key fraud in science investigator. Thus, *Science's* publication of the LaVay (1991) brain study and the Hamer (1993) gene study, both fragile and tainted, is in keeping with the magazine's censorship of anti-Kinseyan data and its promotion of pro-gay data, despite the deficiency of the research.

#### ***Gagnon Demands Sex Researchers PreCensor Homosexual Data***

*Science* enthusiastically defends Dr. John Gagnon's proposed 1989 sex survey but provides no information to its readers of Gagnon's Kinsey commitment and of his warning to sex researchers like LaVay, Hamer, Bailey, etc., of the anti-science warnings Gagnon felt comfortable about publicly expressing. In *The Journal of Sex Research* (February 1987) Gagnon demanded sex researchers exclude vital data in order to slant their findings to serve sex-partisan goals. *Dr. Gagnon demands sex researchers conceal data.*

*[Do not collect data which would] locate the origins of [homosexual] desires.... Attempts to placate the oppressors will only invite further persecution. The source of freedom in everyday life for gay men and lesbians is continued vigilance and practical political action (p. 124).*

In any study on AIDS or homosexuality, "the origins of [homosexual] desires" is critical. *To purge questions on adult and incestuous rape of young boys--as Gagnon's proposed sex survey and the other genetic surveys cited -- is partisan politics--not science. This documents their fear of the findings. It is anti-science--and "fraud" to pre-select data, especially since these studies are all allegedly conducted without a political agenda, to assist in the fight against AIDS.*

#### ***In The New "Genetic Studies" Hamer Stands On Kinsey***

For something to be "genetically" determined it must be cross-culturally and historically consistent. That is, accounting for differences in racial stock, we should see roughly the same numbers of boys versus girls born, weights, heights, and other basic demographics should be fairly consistent across boundaries of time and space. Homosexuality has increased and decreased in different environments when faced with a different constellation of variables.

Whereas scientists had been unsuccessfully searching for genetic causes for homosexuality at least since the turn of the century, in just two years several studies find homosexual immutability. In 1991, *Science* published LaVay's "brain" study locating brain differences in homosexuals versus some brains he thinks were heterosexual. While geneticists discredited this study almost immediately, the next 1991 study, published in *The New York Times* by Bailey/Pillard, found from 14% to 22% of homosexuality in twins reared in the same home--without ever revealing the rates of early sex abuse or neglect. This also was widely discredited. In 1992 Allen and Gorski looked at brain cadavers and said homosexual men had a larger brain section than heterosexuals. This did not get much interest. In 1993 Bailey and Pillard found identical twins more likely to be lesbians than fraternal or adopted girls<sup>12</sup>. Noticeably absent are data on early sex abuse--although twins apparently have a high incest victimization rate.

Finally, July 16 *Science* published a report by Dean Hamer of the National Cancer Institute, "to determine whether or not male sexual orientation is genetically influenced" (:321). To this end the Hamer team studied 40 apparently activist homosexual brother pairs ("[p]articipants of the study were recruited through the Whitman-Walker Clinic, the National Institute of Health's outpatient HIV clinic, Gay organizations and ads in Gay publications").<sup>13</sup> His "Kinsey score" displayed in four *Science* tables, Hamer states the research protocol involved:

an interview or questionnaire covering childhood gender identification, childhood and adolescent sexual development, adult sexual behavior, the Kinsey scales, handedness, alcohol and substance use, mental health history, medical genetics screen, HIV status, and demographics....Sexual orientation was assessed by the Kinsey scales which range from 0 for exclusive heterosexuality to 6 for exclusive homosexuality....self identified as either Kinsey 5 or 6....either less than Kinsey 2 or more than Kinsey 4....Kinsey scores in males have been reported by others (321-322).

Since the protocol asked about "childhood and adolescent development" Hamer should have reported his findings of early sex abuse on the 40 brother-pairs. If the child sex abuse literature finds roughly 1 in 7 (14%) of boys have sustained molestation,<sup>14</sup> Hamer should have some of this number in his subject population. Not only does he sanitize these data, he "blames the victim"

#### ***Were "Most" Brothers Abuse Victims By Age 10?***

Streams of chromosome drawings and pages of Locus and label data may fulfill Hamer's quest but they do not cover up the use of fraudulent data (Kinsey) and what other researchers might arguably call a pederast<sup>15</sup> view of children. For, Hamer says "most" of the brothers were "attracted to another male" by 10 and some as early as age 5. Many working in the fields of child development and of child abuse could see here a shocking record of "most" of Hamer's brother cohort as early sex abuse victims. Especially revealing is Hamer's

failure to specify if the children were "attracted" to older persons (an older brother, uncle, dad?) and whether sex occurred.

Most of the subjects experienced their first same-sex attraction by age 10, which was prior to the average age of puberty at 12 years...Self-acknowledgement occurred over a broad range of ages between 5 and 30 years, with the greatest increase occurring between years 11 and 19. The mean age for public acknowledgement was 21 years, which is similar to the age for "coming out" reported by others (:322).

Although Hamer, unlike Gagnon and Bailey, questioned the brothers about their early abuse or neglect, he and the others conceal the brothers' answers about early abuse histories. Anthony Falzarano of Transformation Exgay Ministries recently confirmed the incest and abuse studies, finding 85% admissions of early sexual molestation among gays in recovery.<sup>16</sup> As children, the boys always blamed themselves for their own abuse.<sup>17</sup>

#### ***The Polls Find A Genetic Cause Needed For Public Acceptance***

The tainted nature of Hamer's study is added to by homosexual activists' admissions that these studies are strategically important to the movement says a homosexual spokesman in *The Washington Blade*:<sup>18</sup>

If the polls are accurate, support for our cause will increase as people learn that the stereotype of 'choice' is inaccurate.... Homosexuality is not the problem. Bigotry is. And perhaps we should do some genetic testing to find the biological basis for prejudice (15).

As with Kinsey, sex research findings frequently reflect the scientist's intimate vision for society. Hence, Hamer's "References And Notes" brazenly censure the massive body of homosexual research identifying a neglect/abuse etiology, citing the pro-homosexual research including the invalid and fraudulent Kinsey data as a reference. Moreover, in *Science*, Hamer cites the wholly discredited "Kinsey scale"(:322) to have the brothers:

rate their fathers, sons, brothers, uncles, and male cousins as either definitely homosexual (Kinsey 5 or 6, acknowledged to the proband or another family member) or *not* definitely know to be homosexual (heterosexual, bisexual or unclear)[(emphasis added)].

Hamer claims a rigorous follow-up schedule for these claims, unverifiable unless one has access to the entire population and is able to visit and interview all of the same people using the same questionnaire protocol.

#### ***Feldman Says 1 in 4 Boys Will Die***

The North American Man Boy Love Association has always marched in the Gay Rights parades. In this light, Hamer's systematic use of the discredited Kinsey data and his casual disregard for the etiology of early sex abuse as causal in homosexual conduct is even more ominous. Hamer suppresses the role of child sexual abuse in his findings. In *Gay and Lesbian Youth*, while Dr. Douglas Feldman said "one in four" gay teenagers" die from AIDS since they "tend to be very susceptible to sexually transmitted diseases," yet he still urged youngsters to adopt the homosexual lifestyle. Reisman's recent analysis of *THE ADVOCATE*, the homosexual mainstream newsmagazine, finds solicitation of youths for sex both common and accepted among homosexuals. Scientists are not better than other people, nor do sex researchers have a history of protecting children. As homosexuals seek entry into the first grade with *Heather Has Two Mommies* and *Daddy's Roommate*, parents had best understand their children are at risk as much from educators and those in "science" as from the feared child molester. And, educators and sex scientists have their share of child molesters.

## ENDNOTES

1. *Science Magazine*, "Expert Testimony," Vol. 261, 2 July 1993, p. 22.
2. *The Lancet*, "Really, Dr. Kinsey?" Vol. 337: March 2, 1991, p. 547.
3. See, *Kinsey, Sex & Fraud*, Reisman & Eichel (1990). The "acid test of scientific fraud is the intention to deceive....;" the Committee on the Conduct of Science of the National Academy of Sciences, *On Being a Scientist*, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 1989.
4. A draft manuscript of *The Impact of Kinsey on Law And Public Policy* (Reisman) is available for review upon request.
5. *The Washington Post*, July 25, 1993, Book World, p.1.
6. In my study of Kinsey's impact on Law & Public Policy, I discovered dozens of testimonies of outright perjury and/or delivery of misleading information by Kinsey and Kinseyans to federal and state judges and juries. These "expert" testimonies dramatically effected judicial decisions on a broad spectrum of sexually related issues, including individual crimes and media rights cases.
7. For example, an influential early study of "drug cultures" utilized white, upscale, college males who spent a few years in Yemen, apparently partaking of the Quat culture they were assigned to study. The "experts" inevitably reported back to the USA that drug using has little impact on the health and welfare of a culture--despite the massive malnourishment and destitution of the Yemenese people. A judicial analysis of the facts would require disclosure of drug use by the ACLU boys, prior to a judge's accepting their "evidence" as fact.
8. Jerry Z. Muller, (August/September 1993). "Coming Out Ahead: The Homosexual Moment in the Academy." *First Things*, Religion and Public Life. New York. See also, Muller, *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours: Designing the Decent Society* (Free Press).
9. Jerry Martin (Summer 1993). "The University as Agent of Social Transformation: The Postmodern Argument Considered." *Academic Questions*, Rutgers, New Jersey, Transaction Press.
10. *Sexuality Today*, Nov. 16, 1987 p. 2-3: "SAR-to use sexually explicit materials to desensitize the participant to sexual issues." See; *British Journal of Sexual Medicine*, Jan. 1982: "(Trimmer) I know the Institute of Advanced Sexology relies heavily on desensitising procedures including what you call a 'fuckarama'. Is that really necessary? I've seen one and it seemed quite unnecessary to me.  
(Pomeroy) We think it is therapeutic. Let me explain. As part of our intensive courses we project several films on to a series of screens simultaneously. They vary in context from 'hard porn' homosexuality to milder loving themes. After the session



the audience breaks up into small groups for discussion. The results are very interesting and useful." [JR: Nude body workshops often follow.]

11. See, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, (1990) pp. 192-196 for a review of Gagnon's (*Science*, Jan. 29, 1989 pp. 304-348) Kinseyan sex research proposed by the National Research Council and its flawed, if not outright fraudulent, Kinseyan data.

12. *The Washington Times*, July 20, 1993 (A1): "Mother's genes called determiner of homosexuality" -- a review of five studies since 1991 that identified possible biological explanations for sexual orientation.

13. *The Washington Blade*, July 16, 1993, p. 15.

14. See Reisman, *Soft Porn Plays Hardball*, (1991), "Whatever Happened to Childhood" pp.138-159, especially for the role of in-house pornography in eroticizing the children in the home to each other, the adults, and to themselves--precipitating homosexual and heterosexual "experimentation" among children and subsequent dysfunction among some number of this population.

15. *Ibid*, p. 322. A pederast is a male who seeks sex with boys--teens and younger.

16. Personal interview July 21, 1993, Washington, D.C.

17. A major problem for recovering abuse victims is their sense of guilt at having solicited the sexual conduct with the older juvenile or adult. In this case, as in issues of mental and emotional impairment, it would be easier for women to admit to heterosexual abuse than for men to face their homosexual assaults as children. This would be the case especially in incestuous abuse--typically pornography triggered abuse of younger brothers occurs in which boys act out sexually on younger siblings--resulting in various sexual and emotional dysfunctions for numbers of girls and homosexual acting out for numbers of boys.

18. *The Washington Blade*, July 16, 1993.

INDEX

- "most" 5
- 10% 3
- AASECT 3
- adolescent 3, 5
- Advocate 6
- AIDS 2-4, 6
- Bailey 4-6
- behavior 1, 5
- Bloom 1
- British Medical Journal 1, 4
- Calderone 3
- Calderwood 3
- Carnegie 1
- demographics 4, 5
- Elkind 3
- Erikson 3
- evidence 1, 2
- Exgay Ministries 6
- Falzarano 6
- Feldman 6
- fraudulent 2, 3, 5, 6
- freedom 4
- Freud 1, 3
- Gagnon 3, 4, 6
- Gay Rights 6
- gene 1, 4
- German Medical Tribune 4
- Hamer 1, 4-6
- HIV 5
- hormonal 2
- judges 1, 2
- Kinsey 1-6
- Kinsey scale 6
- Kirkendall 3
- Kohlberg 3
- Lancet 1, 4
- latency 3
- LaVay 4
- law 1
- methodology 1, 2
- molester 7
- child 3, 5-7
- monopoly 3
- Muller 2
- oppressors 4
- partisan politics 4
- Piaget 3
- polls 6
- Pomeroy 3
- Project 10 3
- psychology 1
- Reinisch 3
- sanitize 5
- SAR 3
- Science magazine 1
- sex abuse 4-6
- sexology 1, 3
- SIECUS 3
- special-interest 2
- SSSS 3
- Stewart 4
- validity 1, 2
- Washington Blade 5, 6
- Whitman-Walker 5