

THE CHILD-PORNOGRAPHY MYTH

By LAWRENCE A. STANLEY

"Child pornography has become a highly organized multimillion-dollar industry preying on the youth of our country who either are unable to protect themselves or are induced into participating by those they trust."

—SENATOR DENNIS DE CONCINI, *Congressional Record*, February 4, 1988

"Currently, there is a growing market for using children in the production of sexually explicit material. Often, these children are runaways who are given drugs or alcohol in order to entice them into participating in the production of sexually explicit material. There have even been shocking instances in which parents have actually sold their children for use in such material."

—SENATOR STROM THURMOND, *Congressional Record*, February 4, 1988, on the introduction of the Child Protection and Obscenity Enforcement Act of 1988

It was during the mid-Seventies, shortly after child pornography appeared on the shelves of adult bookstores in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Minneapolis and other major cities, that child pornography and sexual abuse of children came to be perceived as serious and pervasive problems in American society. Within a year or two, in the face of mounting public pressure, distributors and retailers of adult pornography began removing child pornography from their stocks and shelves. The Federal and state governments responded by enacting legislation proscribing the production and sale

of child pornography and by funding law-enforcement efforts to combat it.

The war against kiddie porn proved a major success. Two major investigations attest to its virtual elimination as an organized business.

In 1977, the Illinois Legislative Investi-

gating Committee (I.L.I.C.) began an intensive three-year probe, interviewing incarcerated child molesters and pornographers, setting up entrapment schemes and exchanging information with the FBI, the Los Angeles Police Department, the United States Postal Service and United States Customs.

The I.L.I.C. conclusion: Child pornography had disappeared from the commercial chain of distribution in the United States.

"Pornography and other sex-related industries continue to be enormous operations in this country," read the report. "However, neither child pornography nor child prostitution has ever represented a significant portion of the industry. Individuals may have made significant amounts of money from their own child-pornography operations . . . but these have not been organized activities. They should not be construed to be significant elements of the very real sex industry that exists in this country."

At the same time that the I.L.I.C. conducted its investigation, the FBI concluded its own 30-month sting operation. Child pornography was actively sought nationwide, and 60 raids were eventually staged simultaneously on warehouses where pornography was supposedly stored prior to distribution. In those many months of searching for child pornography on a commercial level, none was discovered. Furthermore, none of the raids resulted in any seizures of child pornography, even though, in the words of the I.L.I.C. report, "the raids were



The largest child-pornography ring in the United States is run by the Government. It is possible that without Uncle Sam, there would be no child-porn business.

gating Committee (I.L.I.C.) began an intensive three-year probe, interviewing incarcerated child molesters and pornographers, setting up entrapment schemes and exchanging information with the FBI, the Los Angeles Police Department, the United States Postal Service and United States Customs.

The I.L.I.C. conclusion: Child pornography had disappeared from the commercial chain of distribution in the United States.

"Pornography and other sex-related industries continue to be enormous operations in this country," read the report. "However, neither child pornography nor child prostitution has ever represented a significant portion of the industry. Individuals may have made significant amounts of money from their own child-pornography operations . . . but these have not been organized activities. They should not be construed to be significant elements of the very real sex industry that exists in this country."

At the same time that the I.L.I.C. conducted its investigation, the FBI concluded its own 30-month sting operation. Child pornography was actively sought nationwide, and 60 raids were eventually staged simultaneously on warehouses where pornography was supposedly stored prior to distribution. In those many months of searching for child pornography on a commercial level, none was discovered. Furthermore, none of the raids resulted in any seizures of child pornography, even though, in the words of the I.L.I.C. report, "the raids were



Safety in numbers? AIDS activists stage a 'die-in' last summer in New York

HALEBIAN—GAMMA-LIAISON

IDEAS

How Many Gays Are There?

A new debate about the numbers of homosexuals

For years, the gay-rights movement has sought safety in numbers. Its leaders have long claimed that homosexuals constitute 10 percent of the American population. They cited Alfred Kinsey, who interviewed thousands of men and women for landmark studies on human sexuality in the 1940s and 1950s. Activists seized on the double digits to strengthen their political message—that millions of citizens are excluded from the mainstream by anti-gay discrimination. Policymakers and the press (including *NEWSWEEK*) adopted the estimate—despite protests from skeptical conservatives—citing it time and again.

But new evidence suggests that ideology, not sound science, has perpetuated a 1-in-10 myth. In the nearly half century since Kinsey, no survey has come close to duplicating his findings. Most recent studies place gays and lesbians at somewhere between 1 and 6 percent of the population. While experts say these survey results are biased by underreporting from reticent participants, the gap is still significant. Some gay activists now concede that they exploited the Kinsey estimate for its tactical value, not its accuracy. "We used that figure when most gay people were entirely hidden to try to create an impression of our numerosness," says Tom Stoddard, former head of the Lambda Legal Defense Fund.

So how many gays and lesbians are

there? No one knows for sure. Kinsey, who interviewed 12,000 male volunteers between 1938 and 1947, rocked post-World War II culture with an unprecedented peek into the American bedroom, featuring data on sexual habits, adultery and homosexuality. But experts say his sampling—weighted toward institutional populations like schools, prisons and hospitals—is unscientific and can't be meaningfully extrapolated to the general population. The 10 percent—which represents adult males who said they were predominantly homosexual for at least three years—suggests that a significant part of Kinsey's sample was gay, but nothing more. "It's just not a real number," says University of Washington sociologist Pepper Schwartz.

There are compelling reasons to develop a reliable gay census. One of them is AIDS. "Simple facts about the size of the homosexual population . . . give you the scientific basis for understanding what's driving the epidemic," says Charles Turner, former director of the National Academy of Science's committee on AIDS research. Scientists have tried unsuccessfully to get federal underwriting. In the late 1980s, Congress approved two national surveys of sexual behavior, one for adults, the other for teens. But conservatives, led by Sen. Jesse Helms and Rep. William Dannemeyer, killed the measures. They argued

that the studies would confer unwarranted legitimacy on homosexuality.

With no prospect of public funding, scientists have turned to private sources. Between 1989 and 1992, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago added two sex questions to its annual General Social Survey. The results have been consistent. Among men, 2.8 percent reported exclusively homosexual activity in the preceding year; women registered 2.5 percent. NORC is still tabulating the results of a full-scale, 3,000-person sexual behavior study, but experts don't expect the numbers to be appreciably different.

Upfront bias: The anti-gay right has used its own studies to

challenge the 10 percent claim. Child-pornography researcher Judith Reisman argues in her 1990 book, "Kinsey, Sex and Fraud," that homosexuals constitute perhaps as little as 1 percent of the population. Her findings were used by anti-gay activists in Oregon last year in their unsuccessful campaign to exclude homosexuals from state civil-rights protections. In sponsoring a 1992 constitutional amendment overturning gay rights in three Colorado cities, Coloradans for Family Values claimed that the figure was closer to 3 percent, citing estimates by the Washington-based Family Research Institute. Its founder, psychologist Paul Cameron, is upfront about his bias. "It's hard to find anyone who writes in this field who is not driven by ideological concerns," he says.

Many gay activists refuse to back off from the 10 percent, as if a lower estimate somehow makes violence and discrimination against them less of an outrage. "Until I see a different number, 10 percent is the number," says Donna Redwing, a Portland lesbian organizer. But others see a risk in defending a questionable claim. "If you say a number that you can't prove, there's always the chance that by disproving one part of your argument, your opponents weaken you overall. I think that's dangerous," says Tim McFeeley, executive director of the Human Rights Campaign Fund, a gay political-action committee. The truth is that growing gay political clout—more openly elected officials, a larger voice in the Democratic Party and \$3.5 million in contributions to Bill Clinton's presidential campaign last year—makes reliance on Kinsey less important. In the long run, gays may discover that a maturing political movement is best served by credibility, not numbers games.

PATRICK ROGERS

Mounting woes threaten future of Kinsey Institute

By Joyce Price
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

A-1 July 12

The Kinsey Institute has fallen on hard times.

Indiana University is halving the funding it provides the sex-research institute, located on its Bloomington campus.

"We get about half our funding

from the university," Stephanie Sanders, Kinsey's interim director, said late last week. "We received \$522,490 from the university in fiscal 1992-93, but it's providing only \$256,888 in fiscal 1993-94."

The money woes come at a bad time. The Kinsey Institute already is:

- Facing credibility problems as a

result of attacks on the methodology used by the late sex researcher Alfred Kinsey and his claims that homosexuals make up 10 percent of the population.

- Hearing criticisms and calls for a congressional inquiry into the lives of 317 boys who were the subject of "child sexuality" findings in Mr. Kinsey's 1948 book "Sexual Behav-

ior in the Human Male."

- Searching for a new director in the face of the recent resignation of June Reinisch, who garnered \$3.5 million in grants for the institute during her tenure but had a stormy relationship with university officials.

see KINSEY, page A10

KINSEY

From page A1

Eugene Eoyang, chairman of the institute's board of trustees, said the reduced funding from Indiana University will "cripple the sex-research center" and hamper efforts to hire a first-rate director.

He called Indiana University's funding cutback a "good way to turn the institute into a dead-letter office." He said some institute staffers already have been transferred and others are slated to be laid off as a result of the cuts.

Mr. Eoyang said he'd rather "dissolve the institute" than see it eroded. "We're hoping for a resolution here," he said, noting that the institute would like to remain at Indiana University — its home since 1940.

If the budget problems can't be worked out, Mr. Eoyang said he will try to find a home elsewhere in Indiana. "We can't afford to stay where we are being gutted emotionally and financially," he said.

Alfred Kinsey started out at Indiana University as a zoologist but got involved in human sex research at

the urging of students and colleagues, said university spokesman James L. Green.

Mr. Kinsey's interviews with 12,000 male volunteers between 1938 and 1947 provided America with an unprecedented look at previously taboo subjects, including homosexuality, adultery and other sexual habits.

While Mr. Kinsey and his team restricted their research to sex, the institute today also examines issues of gender and reproduction.

The institute also houses extensive archives on studies related to sex, gender and reproduction, Ms. Sanders said.

Mr. Eoyang said, "We're trying to organize public support as much as possible [to get the funding restored], but not everyone in the public has an enlightened attitude about sex. . . . They'd rather just eliminate" funding for the institute.

Robert H. Knight, director of cultural studies for the Family Research Council, is such a person. "The Kinsey Institute has done as much to undermine traditional sexual morality as anyone before or after [pop star] Madonna. . . . I'd mourn the passing of the snail darter

more than the loss of the Kinsey Institute, if that were to occur."

Judith Reisman, director of the Institute for Media Education and a longtime critic of the Kinsey Institute, is also pleased by Indiana University's decision to slash the institute's funds.

"Sex science is junk science . . . and after 60 years of misleading the nation with human sexuality junk science, the famed Kinsey Institute seems to be failing, or maybe their mission has been accomplished," said Ms. Reisman, author of the book "Kinsey, Sex and Fraud."

In her 1990 book, Ms. Reisman attacked as "manufactured science" Kinsey data that found 10 percent of the population was "at some time" homosexual.

Ms. Reisman called the Kinsey data "flawed" because they relied heavily on information from "prison inmates, sex offenders, male prostitutes and homosexual child offenders."

More recent studies — conducted by the Battelle Human Affairs Research Center in Seattle, the National Opinion Research Center in Chicago and researchers in Europe — suggest that homosexuals make

up less than 2 percent of the population.

Ms. Reisman also attacked data about "child sexuality" that Mr. Kinsey included in his book.

From others' observations of pre-adolescent boys as they masturbated or were orally or manually stimulated, Mr. Kinsey concluded that young boys derive sexual pleasure, even experiencing orgasms as young as 6 months old.

But Ms. Reisman disputes that theory, adding that Mr. Kinsey himself noted the children were screaming, fainting, having violent convulsions and struggling "to get away."

In an editorial in March 1991, the British medical journal Lancet found "imperfections" in the Kinsey data and "unethical, possibly criminal, observations on children."

Ms. Reisman has asked for a congressional inquiry into the fates of the children Mr. Kinsey reported on in his book. The Family Research Council, too, believes such an investigation is warranted.

"There are some very vocal people trying to discredit Dr. Kinsey's work in general," noted Ms. Sanders, the Kinsey director.

Ms. Reisman, who is suing the Kinsey Institute and Indiana University for defamation, said she believes the university is distancing itself from the institute because of damaging information she obtained from the institute's files.

Indiana University denies that charge.

"We obviously want the Kinsey Institute to remain at Indiana University," George Walker, vice president

for research and dean of the graduate school, said in a statement.

"Securing external support is a necessity for all of our research centers and institutes. . . . We are trying to help the Kinsey Institute realize its potential for supporting its own budget."

However, Mr. Eoyang said, no other research center at the university suffered the kinds of cuts Kinsey is experiencing.

Kinsey, master of child abuse

I wrote last week about the new blockbuster book exposing the foremost child abuser in history — Alfred C. Kinsey, whose “Reports” on male and female sexuality have provided the chief theoretical basis for sexology and sex education over the last 40 years. Titled “Kinsey, Sex, and Fraud,” this hard-hitting expose shows that Kinsey’s work, funded by the Rockefeller Foundation, constituted a massive deception of the American people.

This book is so significant that I feel compelled to bring it to your attention again. After you read it, you’ll want to purchase an extra copy for religious leaders, educators, and public officials. It is certain to set the agenda for a decade of debate.

As authors Dr. Judith Reisman and Edward Eichel point out, Kinsey’s research was seriously skewed from the very start, for the obvious reason that all of his adult subjects were volunteers.

In fact, Kinsey was warned about the method’s built-in flaws by noted psychologist Dr. Abraham Maslow, who observed that “any study in which data are obtained from volunteers will show a falsely high percentage of non-virginity, masturbation, promiscuity, homosexuality, etc.”

Kinsey deliberately ignored



David Chilton

Maslow’s warnings. Far from even seeking a random sample, he actively recruited, from bars and prisons, a high percentage of volunteers who were sexually promiscuous — including hundreds of male prostitutes and several known child abusers. Yet he presented his findings as if they were representative of the American public as a whole.

In addition, Kinsey played a statistical shell game, shuffling facts, concealing relevant information, and repeatedly offering sweeping generalizations with no supporting evidence whatsoever.

Without proof, for example, he claimed that bisexuality is the “balanced” sexual orientation of normal people. All hogwash, but received as gospel by many who were only too eager to believe this self-appointed oracle of sexual liberation.

But by far the most disturbing

revelation in this unsettling book centers on the hundreds of instances of deliberate child abuse by Kinsey and/or his research assistants.

The following quotation, taken from Kinsey’s book on male sexuality, literally stunned me. “Experiments” had been conducted on preadolescent boys, some as young as 5 months old, attempting to induce orgasm. Kinsey describes the results, with a clinical detachment that is almost as immoral as the experiments themselves:

“Extreme tension with violent convulsion . . . gasping, eyes staring . . . groaning, sobbing, or more violent cries . . . extreme trembling, collapse, loss of color, and sometimes fainting of subject . . . pained or frightened . . . will fight away from the partner and may make violent attempts to avoid climax, although they derive definite pleasure from the situation.”

Note Kinsey’s use of the word “partner” — when the situations he is describing are really nothing less than a series of rapes. Physicians who have examined Kinsey’s data have concluded that the children must have been forcibly held or strapped down.

His incredible view that this violent assault could actually be pleasurable for the victim was further developed in his published

study of female sexuality, in which the old pervert claimed that little girls often benefit from sexual intercourse with adults (including incest).

Kinsey went to hell in 1956, but several of his co-authors are still around. One of them, Ward Pomeroy, has gone so far as to suggest that “incest can be a satisfying, non-threatening, and even an enriching emotional experience.” In a sex education book for children, Pomeroy offers the additional insight that sex with animals is not “abnormal.”

Are there moral absolutes? Many sexologists don’t believe so — except for their absolute “right” to indoctrinate young minds with Kinsey’s propaganda.

This issue is at the heart of the debate over sex education classes. It is really a battle for civilization against the enemies of civilization.

Kinseyites argue that since many primitive cultures engage in deviant sexual practices, we should discard our western, Judeo-Christian inhibitions and bring perversions out of the closet and into the public square. It does not seem to occur to these intellectuals that such practices may have something to do with cultural “primitivism” in the first place — that what we call primitivism is, in reality, decadence.

There are all kinds of culture. Some cultures belong in a petri dish, and out of the bloodstream of a healthy civilization.