

## Education for Sex or Immorality

Within the past 15 years our nation has experienced a sexual revolution that has altered life-styles of millions of Americans. Today there are a proliferation of flourishing free-love groups; experimentation with group marriages; extensive pornography; free and open homosexuality, college coed dormitories; sex commercialization by newspapers, magazines, books, billboards, radio, television, movies, and plays.

In 1964 the National Education Association and the American Medical Association jointly endorsed a proposal that students from kindergarten to high school should receive health education including full information on sex and family life. By 1969 at least 60 percent of American schools had incorporated some formalized sex education program. Then in 1969 a bitter controversy arose among various groups concerning school sex education. The controversy focused primarily on SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.), which has been in the forefront of the promotion of sex education and has served as a clearinghouse for sex information.

### SIECUS Goals

SIECUS has proclaimed this as its purpose:

To establish man's sexuality as a health entity; to identify the special characteristics that distinguish it from, yet relate it to, human reproduction; to dignify it by openness of approach, study and scientific research designed to lead toward its understanding and its freedom from exploitation; to give leadership to professionals and to society, to the end that human beings may be aided toward responsible use of the sexual faculty and toward assimilation of sex into their individual life patterns as a creative and re-creative force.<sup>1</sup>

*Newsweek* stated in 1969, "SIECUS has no more subversive objective than promoting healthier attitudes toward sex among youngsters and adults alike."<sup>2</sup> In contrast to what SIECUS proposes as a healthy attitude

toward sex, a SIECUS study guide, *The Sex Educator and Moral Values*, by Isadore Rubin, reveals this organization's true attitude and purpose:

Whether we like it or not, it has become increasingly clear that most of our sex values have left the core of our culture and entered the arena of competing alternatives. For the first time the monopoly once held by an absolutistic, religiously based sex ethic has now been destroyed. Today, a number of contending value systems exist side by side in the open market place of ideas, competing for the minds of young and old alike. . . .

Merely to mention the various aspects of sexual behavior is to indicate how broad are the disagreements about their morality and about the extent to which they should be proscribed by law and social regulation: masturbation, contraception, abortion, sterilization, artificial insemination, petting, premarital intercourse, homosexuality, the double standard, pornography, and so on. . . .

Since no one at present can see with any certainty what is best sexually in all respects for both the individual and society, it seems best at the present time to follow the counsel of David R. Mace and encourage the open and honest expression of opinion by people of widely differing viewpoints; to create a genuine open forum. No possibility of consensus exists in a country as large and diverse as we are, and it does not seem fruitful to try to attain it.<sup>3</sup>

Since a wide range of opinion currently exists concerning various sexual acts, even those that were once regarded as strongly immoral, SIECUS attempts to promote a nonjudgmental attitude. Dr. Mary Steichen Calderone, executive director of SIECUS, describes her philosophy: "Sex is not something you do but something you are. To me, there is no controversial subject in sex. Anything that exists is here, and therefore we must explore it, understand it, and learn as much as we can about it."<sup>4</sup>

While speaking to a group of boys at Blair Academy in New Jersey, Calderone said, "What is sex for? It's for fun." When newspaper reporter Gloria Lentz questioned Dr. Harold I. Lief, a SIECUS president, about Calderone's statement, Lief said that "her speech was taken out of context" and neither he nor SIECUS advocated free love. Upon further questioning, Lief responded about premarital intercourse, "We believe

in responsible relations. Now, those can occur premaritally. We're not saying that they can't. Very often kids think they're being responsible, but they're not. There are situations in which premarital intercourse may be growth producing—there are many in which the relations may be destructive.”

### **Three Basic Value Systems**

Lief believes that students should be instructed in the three basic value systems: “The traditional morality, situational ethics of Joe Fletcher, and the anything goes, fun morality. They all should be taught—they all should be examined. Every child should know there are these three basic value positions and should be allowed to figure out for himself what ought to guide his behavior.”<sup>5</sup> As I examined sex education literature from more than 50 organizations, they reflected the same nonjudgmental concepts as SIECUS. The prevailing moral philosophy is situational ethics: There are no moral absolutes; each situation determines the rightness or wrongness of an act. Therefore, any sex act mutually consented to is permissible and good; however since such an act can lead to VD (venereal diseases) and unwanted pregnancy, an extensive sex education program is needed. This “new morality” is promoted in schools across America.

### **A Teenage Sex Education Magazine**

SIECUS materials are written primarily for educators, but materials are available for adolescents. *What's Happening* is a teenage sex information magazine published by Emory University School of Medicine, Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics Family Planning Program, Atlanta, Georgia. It puts sex education principles as promoted by SIECUS and other organizations into practical terms for today's youth.

In the article “Dr. Caplan Talks to Teens,” the doctor answers the questions “Should I have sex? How do I decide?” with this counsel: “The best way to decide whether or not to have sex, is to learn what sex means to you. Learn what you think is right or wrong. This means accepting that we are all equally capable sexually, and ought to decide the issue for our own reasons and not someone else's

“REMEMBER: SEX NEVER PROVES ANYTHING. And that's what can make it so nice.”

Sex education literature usually presents both positive and

negative views. Dr. Caplan warns teens: “It pays to understand ourselves and know why we are having sex with others. If we do it for someone else’s reasons (pressure from a partner, going along with the crowd, the only way to get loving, etc.) we are not being fair to ourselves and will often end up getting hurt. It is RIGHT to say ‘no’ if it’s not in your own best interests to have sex.”

Then Dr. Caplan presents the positive view for unmarried teenagers: “If we have sex for our own reasons, and have carefully considered birth control, VD risks, and other consequences, and if we feel good about it, then there is nothing wrong with sexual activities.”

The magazine discusses various subjects related to sex education.

### **Masturbation**

If you have guilt feelings, don’t masturbate. If your choice to masturbate is based upon facts, “then you are perfectly free to do whatever feels right at any time.”

### **Methods of Birth Control**

Various birth control methods are pictured and information is presented concerning their use and effectiveness. They are: condoms, foam, IUD (intrauterine device), birth control pills, diaphragm with jelly or cream, rhythm method, and withdrawal. In describing the rhythm method the article says, “A teenager, who has regular 28-30 day cycles can use a fairly simplified version of the rhythm method. She can limit intercourse to the first two-three days after her period and to the three-four days just before her period when she can tell the period is coming soon.”

### **It’s Your Right to Decide**

The subtitle is “What to do About an Unwanted Pregnancy.” Three choices are presented: Keep the baby, put the baby up for adoption, or have an abortion. The writer stresses, “EARLY ABORTIONS ARE SAFER ABORTIONS.”

### **Homosexuality**

To the question “Is homosexuality unnatural?” the author writes, “Some experts say no, others say yes. Some say it is a natural variation

of human sexuality, while others note that it goes against the instinct to reproduce.” In answer to the question “Are homosexuals sick?” the article states, “No. Calling homosexuality a sickness comes from a value judgment, not medical evidence. Some gays do have psychological problems (just like straights do), often caused by the pressure of being ‘different’ in an intolerant society. Homosexuals use the word ‘gay’ to mean being free from shame, guilt, misgivings, or regret over being homosexual—liking who you are and what you do.”

#### VD—True Stories from Three Teens

Facts and fables concerning syphilis and gonorrhea are presented. In describing an incident the author says, “When a girl like Missy starts having intercourse regularly, sometimes she can get an infection with some of the symptoms of VD without her having VD at all. Her body has to adjust to this new part of her life. Missy’s boyfriend was too quick to think that she was being unfaithful.” Advice is offered to prevent VD; the author adds, “AND MOST IMPORTANT: It is old fashioned to be ashamed of having VD, and to be too embarrassed to go to the doctor. Most doctors are understanding and treatment is confidential.

“The only thing dirty about having VD is spreading it.”

### **Sex Words**

There is an alphabetical listing of various sex words. The definition of *virgin* states, “VIRGIN usually refers to a woman who has not had sexual intercourse. Approximately 50% of U.S. teenage women have not ever had intercourse. It is not ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ to be a virgin. Each person must decide what is best for them.”

In the article “Sex Is More Than Getting Down,” a story is told about a group of students sitting together on school steps talking about sex. Anthony gives his reasons why a boy has sex: to show a girl he digs her, to discover whether she really likes him, and sometimes to get a feeling. The boys and girls talk freely about loneliness, using protections, becoming pregnant, getting a baby to get back at mama, and receiving instruction from father about using a rubber.

Darlene tells why she has sex: “Yeah, well I like it when a boy tries ‘cause it makes me feel like I’m pretty and sexy, but I won’t do it unless we’re pretty tight and we have some protection.”

Then David looks at Diane and says, “When two people care about

each other, and take responsibility for what might happen, sex can be beautiful.”

The message children receive is this: Have all the responsible sex you desire, but avoid pregnancies or contracting VD. The dream for these “sex for fun” advocates is to see developed a vaccination against VD and a pill capable of painlessly aborting any unwanted pregnancies. Society can then live in sexual utopia!

Perhaps the best description of a sex educator’s concern is a centerfold picture of a pregnant man with this question: “Would you be more careful if it was you that got pregnant?” Beneath the picture are the words “Protect Your Lover—Wear A Rubber!”<sup>6</sup>

### **Sex Education Material**

These excerpts were taken from “For Kids Only,” by William Block; the material was developed for New Jersey’s K-12 sex education curriculum.

#### **Sex Life Skill Sheets**

Draw the world’s largest penis. Do a guided imagery on your own, using the following idea: . . . If I had the world’s largest penis. . . .

Copy the picture of mother and father making love. . . . For those who want to dig deeper into their minds and want help with an explicit lovemaking film. . . . A guided sexual imagination trip. . . . You are ready for genital sex. . . . Feel your nakedness against the sheets of your bed. . . . Feel another body alongside yours.<sup>7</sup>

In Howell, Michigan, the following was presented to seventh-grade through ninth-grade children in their sex education course.

The man has something that we call a penis. It is something like a finger and it hangs in front of his body between his legs. Most of the time it hangs there quite loosely. But, when he is attracted to his wife in love, then the penis becomes hard and firm and it stands erect, kind of right angles with the rest of his body. And this happens so that it will be able to fit easily into a special

place in a woman's body that was made for it. This special place in a woman's body we call the vagina. It's an opening between her legs. And when she wants him to show her that he loves her the vagina becomes kind of wet and slippery so that it will be easy for the penis to enter it. . . the penis moves back and forth inside the vagina until from the end of the penis there comes a kind of milky fluid and we call this, when this happens, we say that the man is having an ejaculation. And this makes the man feel real good. And the woman, too. . . she feels good all over, too.

As for the creams, foams, and sprays, they are notoriously unsafe. It is surprising that they are being sold as safe contraceptives. Finally, there is the oldest safe commercial contraceptive on the market, the condom or rubber, as it is commonly called, which is used by the man. These are quite safe. But accidents result from careless use or a defect in the very thin latex rubber that they are made from.

Only you can decide for yourself whether you want to take the chances that are involved in finding the ultimate sexual satisfaction.<sup>8</sup>

### **Nonjudgmental Sex Education**

Many sex educators fail to realize the grave dangers in trying to teach sex from a nonmoral point of view. They believe that by presenting all the facts and letting children decide their own moral values in an atmosphere of freedom they are imparting valuable knowledge. But when teachers are nonjudgmental concerning pornography, prostitution, premarital sex, abortion, and homosexuality, in reality they are condoning them as acceptable adjuncts to traditional sexual behavior. *No individual can claim moral neutrality. One is either for or against responsible sex; nonjudgmental sex education is immoral sex education.*

Dr. Melvin Anchell tells how, under the guise of freedom, "students are encouraged to go overboard in a tolerance for perverts." A normal person has a natural reaction of shame and disgust to perverted sexual acts, but "when disgust turns to sympathy," notes Anchell, "the normal individual becomes defenseless."<sup>9</sup> *Time* reports that in 1969, 42 percent of college students believed homosexuality morally wrong, as opposed to only 25 percent five years later. In 1969, 57 percent of the noncollege

youngsters held that premarital sex was wrong; five years later, only 34 percent.<sup>10</sup>

## Sex Stimulation

When students receive sex information without proper moral guidance, many will put into practice John Dewey's philosophy of "learning by doing." After receiving detailed instructions on the mechanics of sex, they will take the next step and try out their newly acquired knowledge. One does not put a 12-year-old behind the wheel of a Corvette to train him to drive a car when the legal age for driving is 17. Once he feels the surging of the engine and the exhilarating effect of controlling a car on a superhighway, he will never be satisfied until he drives the car himself. Training should coincide with the legal age for driving; at 12 years of age a child should be taught the dangers of attempting to drive without a license, not how to drive.

Just because some young teenagers may have stolen a car and gone joyriding provides no reason for schools to begin driver education to children entering their teens. Schools should teach the dangers of premarital sex, not the techniques of sex. Besides, this free discussion of intimate sexual experiences between boys and girls breaks down their ingrained modesty and wall of inhibition that civilized people have upheld for thousands of years to prevent premarital sexual experimentation.

Some sex educators discredit the claim that sex education stimulates experimentation. Mary Susan Miller, trustee of the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors, says, "Parents are afraid that sex education will lead their children to promiscuity." But, Miller declares, "The opposite is true. The person who is truly sex-educated is able to make a lasting and satisfying relationship because he is confident of his ability to love and to be loved; he has come to terms with his sexuality."<sup>11</sup>

When Antioch college instituted coed dorms, associate dean Jean Janis rationalized, "The more responsibility you give students, the more they are able to assume." As *Time* noted, "Most school officials maintain that coeducational living does not lead to increased sexual activity. According to Stanford Psychologist Joseph Katz, an incest taboo develops in coed dorms as a result of a brother-sister relationship between the residents."<sup>12</sup> However, five years later *Time* disclosed that coed dormitories had become so popular "that more than half the nation's resident college



students now live in them,” and that at one eastern college “47% of the women had sex in the dorms” and “42% of the men.”<sup>13</sup>

Sex was so abundant at another college that a law student dismissed sexual relations as a legitimate reason for living together. “After all, sex is pretty freely available,” he said. “You don’t have to start living together to have sex.”<sup>14</sup> George Thorman, assistant professor at the Graduate School of Social Work, University of Texas, cited sex education as one reason why so many college students were living together: “Delaying sexual relations and gratification doesn’t make much sense to a generation sophisticated in the knowledge of contraception. Given the ready availability of birth control techniques, couples are more inclined to become sexually involved and to experiment with a wider range of sexual behavior, including living together.”<sup>15</sup>

In the *New York Daily News* Ken McKenna tells about a worker who spent more than 20 years caring for girls with unwanted babies. The worker found that the girls’ overconfidence with sexual knowledge had convinced them “that they know all about sex, so they experiment. Then, they go too far with their experiments.”<sup>16</sup>

A 24-year-old London school teacher taught her grammar school pupils about sex. One day 20 of the boys in her sex education class put into practice what they had learned in the classroom—they raped her.

“I didn’t know what to do,” she said, in describing the incident. “There they were, coming at me, naked, excited. . . .”

“We didn’t think we were doing anything wrong,” said one boy when questioned about raping the teacher. “Didn’t she spend the whole year telling us how to do it, when to do it, and how much fun it would be?” Two hours later the principal found her on the floor.

When the young teacher applied for the position in London, she was not overly concerned when told that part of her job would be sex education. “Now that I look back on it all,” she said, “I guess it is a bit stupid. There I am describing all their sexual functions in a great amount of detail—so it’s only natural that they should get ideas.”<sup>17</sup>

## **Sex Education Results**

As a result of another sex education course in Phoenix, Arizona, *U.S. News & World Report* says, a mother “was ‘turned off’ when she saw her son, aged 12, trying to demonstrate on his 4-year-old sister what he had

learned in classroom about intercourse.”<sup>18</sup>

Sex education lobbies have existed in Sweden since 1954. Ten years later the Los Angeles Times stated, “The King’s physician, Dr. Ulf Nordwall, and 140 eminent Swedish doctors and teachers signed a concern over sexual hysteria in the young. The petition asserted that this problem appeared to be a product of sex education, and it was now the business of the schools to correct it.”<sup>19</sup>

Professor Jacqueline Kasun of Humboldt State University says, “In Sweden, for example, where sex education has been mandatory since 1956, the illegitimacy rate (the number of illegitimate births per thousand families of childbearing age), which had been declining, subsequently rose for every age group, except for the older group which did not receive the special sex education. Swedish births out of wedlock are now about 31 per cent of all births, the highest proportion in Europe, and two and a half times as high as in the United States.”<sup>20</sup>

Professor Kasun reports, “In Humboldt County [California], where we have several ‘model’ programs and government family planning, expenditures per person have been much higher than in the nation, and adolescent pregnancy has increased ten times as much as in the nation. The reason this increase in pregnancy has not resulted in an increase in births is that Humboldt County has had a greater than one-thousand percent increase in teenage abortions during the past decade, more than fifteen times the rest of the nation.”<sup>21</sup>

In Denmark pornography was legalized in 1967, three years later sex education was compulsory, and in 1973 abortion on demand up to 12 weeks was permitted. Laws against homosexuality, indecent exposure, and statutory rape were eliminated. These are the results within the past ten years: Assault rape increased 300 percent; abortions increased 500 percent; illegitimacy doubled; VD among those over 20 years of age increased 200 percent; in those 16 to 20 years of age VD increased 250 percent; and in children under 15 years of age VD increased 400 percent.<sup>22</sup>

### **Sex Educators’ Claims**

Many persons are deceived by claims of sex educators. Leaders say sex education should be sound, thoughtful, responsible, and productive of a positive self-identity. A beautiful concept, but public school sex

education has adopted moral relativism, which produces the exact opposite results: By releasing sexual inhibitions it has helped to create the rampant adolescent sexual activity. Educational leaders, instead of stopping this immoral sex education, cite the extensive sexual activity they helped to create as a rationale to provide *more* sex education!

Sol Gordon, professor of child and family studies at Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, and director of the Institute for Family Research and Education, says, “Now for a statistic that may shock: Current research suggests that more than 50 percent of adolescents in this country will have engaged in sexual intercourse by the time they are graduated from high school.”<sup>23</sup>

*U.S. News & World Report* states, “The National Alliance Concerned With School-Age Parents reported that the highest increase in pregnancies was occurring among white girls under 15, while Planned Parenthood’s Alan Guttmacher Institute found that one fourth of American 15-year-olds and one tenth of 13-year-olds have had sexual relations. In Washington, D.C., and other major cities, adolescents—some as young as 12 or 13—are joining the ranks of streetwalkers.”<sup>24</sup>

Sol Gordon feels that Americans should face the facts and attempt to fathom the reasons behind adolescents’ premarital relations, instead of severely chastising children for such affairs. “Thus, our society seems to succeed only in barring children from the information they seek about human sexuality, from the contraceptives that perhaps they should have, from the laws that would protect their interests.”<sup>25</sup>

Rosalie Cohen, a media-center coordinator of New Rochelle, New York, public schools, and Claire Rudin, a health services coordinator of Nassau County, New York, admonish with regard to the venereal disease pandemic, “If the schools fail to heed the warning, about two million youngsters will have been allowed to run the risk of blindness, arthritis, sterility, and pain caused by gonorrhea, and some 250,000 will have risked insanity, paralysis, heart disease, disfiguration, and death from syphilis.”<sup>26</sup>

When sex education was heatedly debated in 1969, *Newsweek* reported, as “perhaps the most persuasive case” for sex education, a warning by Dr. Charles W. Socarides, a Freudian analyst specializing in treating serious sexual orders: “No aspect of life is untouched by the rich benefits and rewards of fulfilled sexuality, or conversely by the

impoverishment and disability which emerges from disturbed sexuality. In doing away with sex education we may be throwing away untold benefits that will probably come from the programs, including a decrease in crime, violence and lives blighted by sexual maladjustments.”<sup>27</sup> Sex education remained in schools; the appalling, unprecedented increases in criminal and immoral behavior speak for themselves.

The *Washington Evening Star* cautions that if there were no sex education programs we would have “the back alley and the washroom, with its guarantee of misinformation, anxiety, and needless, lasting guilt.”<sup>28</sup> But what has sex education done? It has taken backalley sex and coated it with respectability. Previously, students knew immorality was from the gutter; now, by the attempted nonjudgmental teachings of sex educators, it has gained social approval.

### **Introducing Sex Education**

Sex educators have deceived many parents with their subtle promotional tactics. Initially, a soft approach is utilized to incorporate the program. Then, when the beginning opposition fades and sex education is secure, the program becomes enriched and introduced into other schools. Once established, it is extremely difficult to remove. As a high school teacher and parent I was ignorant of the extent of high school sex education.

It is no wonder that objectors to public school sex education have been labeled extremists, called closed-minded, accused of possessing sexual hangups and of being misled by rumor-spreading fear groups. The literature produced by sex educators could easily delude its readers. Some of the program titles are: Science and Health; Family Life and Sex Education; Family Life Program; Health Instruction; Family, Personal, and Social Health Education; Sociology, Marriage, and the Family; Human Growth and Development; Toward Maturity; Preparation of the Individual for Life; Personal Growth; Social Hygiene; Family Living; Preparation for Parenthood; For Life and For Love; Human Relations. Or sex education may be hidden in a biology or hygiene course.

In 1969 sex education ignited tempers in numerous school districts across the nation. At that time educators were planning to introduce sex education into New York City elementary schools. As a parent, I attended a meeting at our local elementary school to hear a speaker describe the

program; the prospect of having my children take sex education courses caused me no great alarm. I was given the *Public Schools of New York City Staff Bulletin* on “Family Living Including Sex Education.” (Note the careful approach used to introduce sex education.) “The immediate spark for the formal initiation of work in this new curriculum area was touched off on April 19, 1967. On that date, the Board of Education unanimously adopted a resolution,” which authorized “the preparation of ‘a suitable program of instruction for all pupils in appropriate grades in the area of family living.’ The resolution further stated, ‘this course of study shall include a sensitive presentation of the importance of understandings of sex as it relates to wholesome living; to ethical, emotional and social maturity; and to the reproductive process.’”

The *Bulletin* also contained a message by Bernard E. Donovan, superintendent of schools:

In order that our students may develop the background and understanding needed to arrive at sound answers, we again ask the full cooperation of each district superintendent and unit administrator in using the District Advisory Committee to build firm ties with the home, religious institutions, area groups and other responsible agencies in order to involve more students and their parents in the program. We also ask that, at the local level, emphasis be placed on adequate teacher-supervisor training and on closer cooperation with colleges, health centers and hospitals.

The possibilities for helping young people through the program of “Family Living, Including Sex Education” are unlimited. By adapting the curriculum so carefully designed with the help of recognized outside authorities, a sensitive teacher can build the sound values, the basic knowledge, and the social and emotional stability which students will need—without infringing on those areas that are not primarily within the prerogative of the school but reserved for the home or religious institution.<sup>29</sup>

Can fault be found with such a program? Parents generally favor sex education, and it should come as no great surprise that a 1969 Gallup poll showed 71 percent favored public school sex education.<sup>30</sup> However, upon investigating the program, I discovered that the

overriding issue was not sex education per se, but the moral framework educators used to teach sex.

### **Sex Educators' True Objectives**

Six years later when I investigated the current sex education program one of my children was to have in hygiene, I was shown the New York City curriculum guide, *Family Living including Sex Education*. Above the topics “Unhappy marriages, divorce, venereal disease, prostitution, out-of-wedlock pregnancies, abortion, homosexuality, pornography and mass media influences sexual behavior” an asterisk referred to a small-typed statement at the bottom of the page: “Important: Develop from a factual point of view.”<sup>31</sup>

Previously the curriculum guide had stated, “It is difficult to be non-judgmental and somewhat objective about sex. Yet, the teacher’s non-judgmental objectivity is a requirement for helping youngsters to sort out confusions and to develop slowly a set of internally integrated values which may be relied upon as bases for important decision making immediately and in the future.”<sup>32</sup> If teachers must be “non-judgmental” and “develop from a factual point of view” the subjects of venereal disease, prostitution, pornography, out-of-wedlock pregnancies, abortion, and homosexuality, then they are in reality forbidden by the board of education to say that these matters are improper.

When Robert Johnstone, chief of the New York State Education Department’s Bureau of Elementary Curriculum Development, was asked how a school handles a discussion about premarital relations, he said, “We can tell the children that premarital intercourse is illegal but we can’t tell them it’s right or wrong.”<sup>33</sup>

When I was investigating the schools, I became a substitute teacher at Evander Childs High School in the Bronx. I took a science class to the library, where approximately 250 students were assembled to view a VD film produced by the New York State Education Department.

“I like my sex,” remarked a boy in the film. The boy discussed what he would do if he got into trouble when having sex. He said that if he liked mountain climbing and became injured, he would not stop mountain climbing—he would just be more careful.

The film presented a family scene in which a mother discovers that her son has VD. She rages and marches furiously about the house cleaning

everything her son had touched. In her fury she wants to throw her son out. The understanding father enters the room and calms the mother. He then has a heart-to-heart talk with his son.

After discussing the problem, the father asks, “What are you going to do the next time?”

“Next time you got to check the chick out,” the son answers.

With this the film ended. A nearby girl loudly remarked, “What an ending!”

At this school I questioned some girls about their sex education courses. One said that on controversial subjects the teacher did not give his opinion. In her class she had to role-play a prostitute. When the subject of prostitution was discussed, she said most students favored it.

Is it any wonder informed parents vehemently oppose sex education as currently taught? Public school sex education is a perfect course for parents who are unconcerned whether their child engages in premarital sex, prostitution, or homosexual relations. Undoubtedly, many teachers discourage such acts, but if they do, they violate board of education guidelines.

Though this repugnant “sex for fun” philosophy has proliferated in our nation’s schools, millions of Americans repudiate these immoral concepts and hold to our historic ethic that sexual relations belong only in marriage. Children once heard from parents, ministers, and teachers that sex belongs only in marriage, and it was the neighborhood degenerate who advocated premarital sex. Today, schools have joined the degenerate in promoting sexual license.

### **Sexual Abstinence Until Marriage**

If sexual abstinence until marriage were taught, there would be no need for an extensive kindergarten to grade 12 sex education programs. Children should be taught to abstain from sex, instead of being shown how to have “safe sex” by the use of the pill, condom, IUD, diaphragm, jellies and foams—and then if they do get caught how to diagnose and obtain help for VD or to abort the fetus. Furthermore, if teachers would discourage premarital sex instead of encouraging it by their nonjudgmental instructions, thousands of youth would be spared the crippling effects of VD and the torturous decision whether to kill or retain their unwanted child.

Donn Byrne, professor of psychological sciences and chairman of the social-personality program at Purdue University, says: "There are 11 million teenagers in America today who have sexual intercourse from time to time. No more than 20 percent of them use contraceptives regularly. The result is almost 700,000 unwanted adolescent pregnancies a year, followed soon after by 300,000 abortions, 200,000 out-of-wedlock births, 100,000 hasty and often short-lived marriages, and nearly 100,000 miscarriages.

"One might think that increased availability of contraceptives, together with competent sex education programs, would reduce these figures substantially." However, since research proves otherwise and our nation is experiencing an epidemic of sexual experimentation, Professor Byrne suggests: "A simple call to celibacy is not likely to help much; effective contraception seems more promising. And since information, emotion, and imagination all influence the use of contraceptives, we should use all three in our educational efforts.

"Accurate, complete information about contraceptives should be a part of everyone's education before and during adolescence. The information should be specific and include considerations of the problems of unwanted pregnancy and explicit details about obtaining and using each type of contraceptive.

"Any child-rearing, educational, or therapeutic practices that lessen guilt and anxiety about natural sexual functions should be encouraged. This can be done without advocating any particular lifestyle. The assumption should be simply that human beings would be healthier and happier if they could react to sex without fear and self-blame."<sup>34</sup>

As Professor Byrne points out, the present sex education program is a failure. What should educators do now? Teach traditional values of chastity, the sure cure? Never! We must now provide "complete information about contraceptives" to every pupil "before and during adolescence." But in order to free students from religious hangups, sex educators must rid them of their feelings of "guilt and anxiety about natural sexual functions."

No longer should educators provide just sex information. They should teach children the immoral value that they should react to premarital sex "without fear or self-blame." Initially, sex education was to be nonjudgmental, but since this has failed, the program should now be



taught positively: Get rid of your guilt and anxiety when engaging in natural sex; you will be “healthier and happier.”

### **Opposition to Current Sex Education Programs**

As one author aptly said, “It is one of life’s little ironies that the very people who share the most responsibility for the problems are now being called upon to furnish the remedy. It’s a little like trying to cure a sick man by giving him more of the medicine that made him sick!”<sup>35</sup> But *Newsweek* points out, “The opposition to sex education has won the support of some prestigious professionals. Dr. Rhoda Lorand, a New York child analyst and author of a psychology book on sexuality for older adolescents, ‘Love, Sex and the Teenager,’ believes that many of the teaching materials used in the courses are overstimulating—if not downright pornographic—and can do untold harm to the child’s sexual development.”<sup>36</sup>

Lorand states in an article, “The Betrayal of Youth,” that the increase in illegitimate births is a cause for concern. However: “Scare headlines have created the erroneous impression that there is an ‘epidemic’ of teenage pregnancy. The Alan Guttmacher Institute, an affiliate of Planned Parenthood, has issued a report entitled: 11 MILLION TEENAGERS, *What Can be Done About the Epidemic of Adolescent Pregnancies in the United States?* Those who did not examine the report naturally assumed from the title that 11 million teenage girls were pregnant.

“Investigation discloses, however, that the statistic of 11 million refers to the total number of boys and girls between 15 and 19 years of age who are estimated to have had sexual intercourse, of whom 4 million are girls.

“The heading appearing in the report, ‘one million teenagers become pregnant each year’. . . . The Guttmacher Institute obtained the shockingly high figures by including the entire population of females between 15 and 19. Thus, of the one million pregnant teenagers widely assumed to be unwed, close to half were married (of the 430,000 married teenagers included in the figure, 100,000 gave birth within 8 months of marriage).”

Lorand tells how in 1976 “almost 70 percent of white teenage girls were virgin,” and in 1971 “approximately 80 percent had been virgin.” She adds: “The resistance by the majority of girls in the United States

to the ubiquitous and insistent pressure to have intercourse, reveals the depth of the feminine need for love, devotion and commitment as prerequisites for sex. Revealed too, are the strength and prevalence of the Judeo-Christian ethic, despite the unceasing efforts of the sex lobby to convince parents, teenagers and educators that it is obsolete.

“It would be a tragic mistake for our schools and government agencies to continue to go along with the thinking of the sex lobby (for whom, it must be conceded, an epidemic of chastity would be an unmitigated financial disaster) and attempt to convince young boys and girls that premarital coitus is inevitable.”<sup>37</sup>

Lorand also unmasks what sex educators fail to teach: “Most revealing and instructive are the *omissions* from this very detailed discussion of sexual activity and its possible consequences. They are: the great risks of sterility, especially to girls, from gonorrhea and from IUD-caused pelvic inflammation. No mention is made of the fact that the latest VD scourge, genital herpes is not only painful and dangerous, but incurable at the present state of medical knowledge. Not only does it make a girl eight times more likely to develop cervical cancer, but it may result in her giving birth to a baby that is blind, brain-damaged, suffering from other central nervous system impairment, or dead, even ten years in the future when she may be happily married. One finds no reference to those facts nor to the proven connection between early teenage coitus and cancer of the cervix, coitus *under age 18 having been found to be crucial*. One looks in vain for a word of warning about other proven facts: the risk of cervical cancer is greatly increased by multiple partners, by frequent coitus and by coitus with promiscuous males.”<sup>38</sup>

*Time* gave this report on “herpes, an incurable virus”:

After chastity slouched off into exile in the ‘60s, the sexual revolution encountered little resistance. Indeed, in the age of the Pill, Penthouse Pets and porn-movie cassettes, the revolution looked so sturdily permanent that sex seemed to subside into a simple consumer item. Now, suddenly, the old fears and doubts are edging back. So is the fire and brimstone rhetoric of the Age of Guilt. The reason for all this dolor: herpes, an ancient viral infection that can be transmitted during sex, recurs fitfully and cannot be cured. Also known as the scourge, the new Scarlet

Letter, the VD of the Ivy League and Jerry Falwell's revenge, herpes has emerged from relative obscurity and exploded into a full-fledged epidemic.

Spurred on by two decades of sexual permissiveness, the disease has cut swiftly through the ranks of the sexually active. "The truth about life in the United States in the 1980s," says Dr. Kevin Murphy of Dallas, one of the nation's leading herpes researchers, "is that if you are going to have sex, you are going to have to take the risk of getting herpes." An estimated 20 million Americans now have genital herpes, with as many as half a million new cases expected this year, according to the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta.

Those remarkable numbers are altering sexual rites in America, changing courtship patterns, sending thousands of sufferers spinning into months of depression and self-exile and delivering a numbing blow to the one-night stand. The herpes counterrevolution may be ushering a reluctant, grudging chastity back into fashion.<sup>39</sup>

Creeping over the horizon is another epidemic. Back in 1979 doctors in New York and California began to see young homosexual men with a rare cancer found only in men over 50 and a rare form of pneumonia. By April of 1981 doctors began to realize that a new epidemic was emerging; they reported their findings to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta. Four months later 70 homosexual men were found to have contacted the disease—of these, half died. By the end of 1981 the disease spread to 180 people in 15 states, included were 15 heterosexual men and women.

By June of 1982 other unusual cancers were discovered among homosexual men. CDC warns that among homosexual and heterosexuals it is reaching epidemic proportions. Doctors believe that drug use and sex with strangers contribute to the spread of the disease. In July, 1982, the disease was officially given a name: Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS). They also discovered that Haitian immigrants and hemophiliacs have come down with the immune disorder.

AIDS now has claimed 450 victims; three new ones are being reported every day. Among those who have contacted the disease- 19 percent have

died within one year of diagnosis, 70 to 80 percent after 2 years. Less than one year later, CDC claims 1,450 victims- 558 deaths. The epidemic has now been doubling every six months.<sup>40</sup>

Besides the dangers of contacting diseases because of promiscuous sex, Dr. Max Levin, psychiatrist at the New York Medical College, further emphasizes the dangers of the current sex education programs: “But, sadly, many of our sex educators, even among those who are highly respected, seem (in my opinion) to be confused and they are leading our youngsters astray. I disagree with the SIECUS position that sex education ‘must not be moral indoctrination.’ . . . I speak not as a clergyman but as a psychiatrist. There cannot be emotional health in the absence of high moral standards and a sense of human and social responsibility. I know that today morality is a ‘dirty word’ but we must help our youth to see that moral codes have meaning beyond theology; they have psychological and sociological meaning.”<sup>41</sup>

Dr. Melvin Anchell, author of *A Second Look at Sex Education*, wrote: “Today’s sex education . . . the type that the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors has in mind . . . causes irreparable harm to the sexual and mental development of young people.”

“Comparing civilized sexuality with the sexuality proposed by sex educators shows that each diametrically opposes the other.

“The most fundamental psychological principles regarding human sexuality are completely disregarded in the sex training foisted on students by the new hierarchy of sex educators.”<sup>42</sup>

### **Homosexuality—The Alternative Life-Style?**

Viable societies have condemned premarital sex, adultery, homosexuality, prostitution, pornography, and other acts of sexual abuse. Today, militant gays want not only to pursue their own life-style, but they also want to propagate their behavior as an acceptable alternative. The “Gay Rights Platform,” drawn up by A National Coalition of Gay Organizations in Chicago, demands “Federal encouragement and support for sex education courses, prepared and taught by Gay women and men, presenting homosexuality as a valid, healthy preference and lifestyle as a viable alternative to heterosexuality.”<sup>43</sup>

The San Francisco School Board banned discrimination due to sexual orientation. Then two years later they voted that the family life curriculum

was to recognize homosexual life-styles.<sup>44</sup> The New York City Board of education and the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) declare they will protect the rights of homosexuals to teach in the schools. Initially, New York City's "Family Living Including Sex Education" course was to promote "a sensitive presentation of the importance of understanding of sex as it relates to wholesome living";<sup>45</sup> less than ten years later, the New York City Gay Teachers Association claims to have 300 members in city public schools.<sup>46</sup> And Dr. Howard L. Hurwitz reports: "There is the teacher at the Louis D. Brandeis High School, in Manhattan, who flaunts her moral pyromania and is indulged by the school's principal, Murray A. Cohn. The teacher states in the Gay Teachers Association 'Newsletter' (Feb. '83) that she has been successful in the 'subversion' of her school and hopes to encourage others.' Her 'subversion' consisted of pressuring the school librarian into placing 18 pro-homosexual books on the library shelves."<sup>47</sup>

A minister explains that parents' concern about homosexuality "is not centered on psychiatry, pedagogy or prejudice but on morality. Main-line Christians and Jews see homosexual practice as sharply offensive to God's order, leading to personal alienation and misery." He then points out, "Teachers *are* role models to children. As homosexual teachers 'come out of the closet,' pride in their practice will be explicit—especially if new civil rights laws guarantee their positions. . . . Parents have every right—without prejudice—to resist classroom influences that flatly contradict their decisions in the moral education of their children."<sup>48</sup>

In support of preventing homosexuals from teaching children the United States Supreme Court let stand a Washington State court ruling that allowed a Tacoma high school social studies teacher to be dismissed on the grounds of "immorality" when school officials discovered he was a homosexual.<sup>49</sup> Dr. Melvin Ancheli warns, "Sex educators and Pornographers are taking over the sexual indoctrination of children." Then he states, "Misinformed sex-educators must be stopped from filling the minds of our forthcoming generations with perverted sexual ideas."<sup>50</sup>

### **Proper Sex Education**

Parents should not be deceived by the warm, loving approach of sex educators in their promotion of "freedom of choice." Their soft manner

betrays the heinous message that is destroying the values of American youth. Sex education programs that advocate moral relativity should be replaced with the historic American ethic of chastity. To support the need for intimate instruction, sex educators tell of unwed pregnant girls ignorant of human reproduction. The fact that some parents are negligent in training their children in sexual matters does not license public schools to promote an extensive non judgmental sex education program.

In traditional biology or science courses children can be taught the facts of birth and the dangers of pregnancy and VD, without delving into the controversial subject of birth control. Should such efforts fail, parents should withdraw their children from public school sex education programs. The action may cause their children initial embarrassment, but it is better that they learn to stand for moral convictions than hear instructors teach the acceptance of immorality.

Perverted sex acts should be condemned as defined by state legal statutes. *U.S. News & World Report* discloses that “32 states still have laws on their books defining sodomy as a crime, and the Supreme Court last year upheld the constitutionality of such laws.”<sup>51</sup> There are also state statutes that make sexual relations outside of marriage criminal offenses. When schools teach that adultery, fornication, homosexuality, and prostitution are acceptable life-styles, they are in effect teaching children to engage in criminal behavior and impairing the morals of minors.

Youth as well as adults need information about sex. Our entire being pulsates with its message, and a proper understanding of sex is essential to human happiness and fulfillment. Some people endeavor to portray sex as evil, but sex is amoral. It is what one does with sex that determines whether it becomes evil or good. The rampant commercialization of sex, the epidemic of VD, and the extensive increase in unwed mothers show the vital need for proper sex education.

“For more than 25 years I have worked with teen-age girls in trouble,” states Eunice Kennedy Shriver, executive vice president of the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation. “And I have discovered that they would rather be given standards than contraceptives. Indeed, only recently I went to a center for teen-age girls where the teacher asked what they would like to discuss most. Human biology? Infant care? Physiology of childbirth? Family planning? The girls showed no interest. Then the teacher asked: ‘Would you like to discuss how to say ‘no’ to your boy friend without

losing his love?’ All hands shot up.

“These girls want to believe in values. They are thirsting for someone to teach them.” Shriver then adds, “Teenagers want their parents, their teachers, their political leaders to stand up strong for values. And this includes the values of love and sex.”<sup>52</sup>

Schools should teach boys and girls to love and respect one another by upholding the high ideals of sexual restraint. The advantages of controlling the fiery sexual urges till marriage disciplines the individual with regard to future sexual temptations. One of the reasons our nation is suffering an epidemic of family breakdowns is that many husbands and wives have never been trained in their youth to discipline their passions. What will happen to tomorrow’s families if children are being trained to accept pornography, premarital sex, prostitution, adultery, and homosexuality as normal? How can healthy families exist?

But this is teaching morals. Of course! Since when is upholding morals evil? Telling a child not to cheat, lie, steal, or kill is also teaching morals. Likewise, when educators teach from a nonjudgmental view, they are also teaching morals. They are teaching the philosophy of moral relativism: There is no universal right or wrong; each individual chooses his own standards. When sex is taught in the concept of moral relativism, it is no longer just an innocent sex education course; it is rather an education for immorality.

The choice is not whether to teach morals or not; it is which morals will be taught. Educators should teach proper values as contained in their state laws and from our historical theistic heritage. When they do so, schools will once again be bulwarks for morality.