



Written by [R. Cort Kirkwood](#) on July 22, 2011

NIH Funded Controversial Homosexual Anatomy Study

If you want to know whether homosexuals think size matters, the National Institutes for Health can tell you. That's because NIH dumped nearly \$1 million into a study of penis size among homosexuals, the Traditional Values Coalition has revealed.

The study, published in 2009, [Fox News reports](#), is titled "The Association Between Penis Size and Sexual Health Among Men Who Have Sex with Men" and involved 1,000 homosexuals and bisexuals.

[TVC says](#) the penis survey was included as part of a larger study that cost nearly \$10 million. The study was necessary, [Fox reports](#) of the study's claims, because "little research [was done] among men who have sex with men assessing the association between penis size and socio-sexual health."



{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Details

[TVC reported](#) that the NIH spent "[a]t least \$9.4 million for a 10-year study that included a survey of gay men to determine average penis sizes, 'to better understand the real individual-level consequences of living in a penis-centered society.' "

And [Fox offers](#) these details:

The study reported, among its findings, that gay men with "below average penises" were more likely to assume a "bottom" sexual position, while those with "above average penises" were more likely to assume a "top" sexual position. Those with average penises identified themselves as "versatile" in the bedroom.

Though it's difficult to trace exactly how much federal funding went to the project, the study was one of many linked to an \$899,769 grant in 2006. The grant was administered by NIH's [National Institute on Drug Abuse](#), and went first to a group called Public Health Solutions and a researcher with the [National Development and Research Institutes](#) before going to individual researchers.

Unsurprisingly, some Americans have a problem with using tax money to ask homosexuals about their endowment. TVC's [Andrea Lafferty \(pictured above\) uttered](#) the obvious to the network: "This country is broke and we cannot spend money on this kind of stuff. We're spending money on wacky stuff."

Then again, one of the study's defenders claimed that Lafferty is all mixed up. After all, [he told Fox](#), taxpayer money was not used to measure the appendages of homosexuals. Only the analysis of the "data" used tax dollars. He claimed "NIH funding was only used to help 'analyze and write up' data that had already been collected without the use of taxpayer funds."



Written by [R. Cort Kirkwood](#) on July 22, 2011

“The data were not collected using taxpayer funds,” [Jeffrey Parsons](#), a professor with [Hunter College](#), said in an email. “NIH funds were not used to measure anyone’s penis size.”

“This study was funded by the Hunter College Center for HIV/AIDS Education Studies and Training,” the National Institutes of Health said. “Dr. [Christian Grov](#) was supported as a postdoctoral research fellow at the time the research was conducted by a National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)-funded training grant.”

Parsons was also bent out of shape because Lafferty’s group, [he alleges](#), fumbled the figures: “To suggest that 9.4 million dollars was spent to study penis sizes is factually inaccurate and simply designed to create news,” said the study’s defender.

Lafferty obviously does not agree, but at any rate, the study also found out that well-endowed gay men have a greater chance of contracting what they used to call a “social disease.” [According to](#) Fox, “[t]he study found that men with larger penises were more likely to contract certain sexually transmitted diseases.”

Other Waste

Beyond exposing this appalling waste of taxpayer money (as well as assault on traditional moral sensibilities), [found](#) another study that cost \$154,500 and asked “individuals to mail in their toenails in an effort to research how much toenail nicotine is present versus saliva swabbing, at a cost of \$154.50 per batch of toenails. \$163,500 spent seeking to explain the ‘drug-using and sexual behaviors among men who have sex with men (MSM) during a circuit party.’”

As well, NIH [has spent](#) “\$1.2 million spent since 2003 trying to find out if a mother rat, if given cocaine, will abandon her babies.”

[Says Lafferty](#), “The NIH grant-making process is the opposite of transparent. Our research team, mining a labyrinth of thousands of applications designed to confound even the most experienced investigator, uncovered review panels approving sizable grants to members of that panel, regular grants to individual researchers and the biggest concentrations of grants going to NIH-favored causes.”



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe