

LAWRENCE S. KUBIE, M. D.
7 EAST 81ST STREET
NEW YORK 28, N. Y.

BUTTERFIELD 8-5230

Dr. Alan Gregg
The Rockefeller Foundation
49 West 49th Street
New York 20, N.Y.

June 16, 1948

JUN 23 1948

200
NRC
SEX RESEARCH
KINSEY

AC 17 48

16	6/24

Dear Alan:

Thank you for your letter of June 10th. I am going to be as frank with you about it as you were with me; which I know is what you want me to be. This is the first time that I have ever received a letter from you that seemed to me completely to miss my point. You overlook my tributes to the positive values of Kinsey's report, which have been duly appreciated by many other commentators, including close friends and supporters of Kinsey's, such as Frank Beach, and even including Kinsey himself. On February 5, after receiving a draft of my review, Kinsey wrote me: "Your criticisms, pro and con, are so eminently sincere, and your attitude so fair, that it is a pleasure to tangle with you." Evidently he did not feel the resentment which you seem to find in the reactions of analysts to the report.

In the second place my criticism is not the X, Y, and Z business that you outline in your second paragraph: it is an appeal to do a more accurate job in future gathering of facts, and a more inclusive job as to the facts which it is essential to gather; and then to put the material in a form in which adequate samples can be reworked more intensively.

I stand by my criticism of those behind the study for their failure to guide Kinsey more wisely and firmly. I make this criticism with some knowledge of what has gone on behind the scenes. Dean Long of Yale and John Romano have told me. And I know that there has been a continual struggle both with Kinsey and within the Committee. There has been justified and growing concern over his choice of assistants who are without critical judgment of their own; and his best friends say that in recent years he has become increasingly reluctant to accept criticisms or suggestions. But the main defect is that he has not understood the problems of sex deeply enough even to know what the questions are which should be asked in such a study. Here is where you and the N.R.C. have failed him. You could have insisted on an advisory board of analysts to work out the data which each interview should have covered, and to evaluate and test his technique.

I find no basis for your impression of widespread "resentment" on the part of analysts. I have talked with many and have encountered no such resentment, but much grave and justified concern. As old John J. Abel used to say, "It is no addition to science to count the number of paving blocks between the monument on one side and the Hopkins on the other." Even among taxonomists Kinsey has long been criticized for his lack of critique about the individual samples that he enumerates. As Gallup polls have taught, fewer samples more carefully and accurately studied can be infinitely more illuminating than vast

numbers of inaccurate data, however accurately set down and charted. Furthermore, psychoanalysts have offered help which he has rejected. I know men who have offered to make intensive studies of samples. I know that Rene Spitz offered him the opportunity to make direct observations on infants. Kinsey will have none of anything except his own limited and inaccurate technique: and this is a tragedy, because as a result a vast and valuable enterprise is mis-carrying.

The one thing that analysts do resent, and rightly, is Kinsey's distortions of their point of view, their theories and their practices. This resentment they share with all other psychologic and psychiatric disciplines. When Kinsey came to see me in March about my review, he first denied that he had ever written what I quoted from him (i.e. that analysts claim that everybody has had incestuous relations). He forgot that he had already written me a letter defending this very bit of nonsense. I then read it to him from his own book. This embarrassed him; so I asked him to give me the names of a few of the analysts who had said that to him. He hesitated, became even more embarrassed, and finally said, "Well, there was one." I asked him the name of that one. This also he refused to tell me; so I asked him to ask the man for permission to give me his name, explaining that some people claim to be analysts who are not, and that maybe he simply had been misled into thinking that the man was an analyst. However, Kinsey refused even to ask this hypothetical analyst for permission to reveal his identity to me!

Finally, I would ask you to reread my discussion of the conception of abnormality. This is far more than a verbal issue. To the medical scientist "normal" is not a statistical concept. Ninety-nine percent of the population may have dental caries, but that does not make dental caries normal. Moreover, the real difficulty underlying Kinsey's "justification by numbers" is due to his unconscious bias that in sexual matters, "the more the merrier". He has a passion for quantity in sex, and he still has no conception of the fact that every instinct, whether it is sex, or sleeping, or eating, can be compulsively over-driven. Thus his obstinacy and ignorance lessens the effective leverage of his report and of his work; because society will never be willing to substitute for laws which incorporate phobic inhibitions, new traditional attitudes which hold up compulsive sexual over-drives as a goal for all to emulate. Nor should it.

How about a dinner some evening to talk it all over?

Lawrence

Lawrence S. Kubie, M.D.

LSK:vp