



The

Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 14, NO. 7, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

FEBRUARY, 1981

What's Wrong With Sex Education?

The major goal of nearly all sex education curricula being taught in the schools is to teach teenagers (and sometimes children) how to enjoy fornication without having a baby and without feeling guilty.

This goal explains why the courses promote an acceptance of sexual behavior that does not produce a baby, such as homosexuality and masturbation. This goal explains why they encourage abortions and all varieties of contraception. This is why they promote the acceptance of the propositions that a "sexually active" lifestyle is normal for all teenagers, and that no sex act is abnormal.

This is why the courses shred the girls of their natural modesty (a psychological defense against fornication) by forcing them to discuss sexual acts, techniques, devices, and parts of the body, with explicit vocabulary in a coed classroom. This is why they censor out from sex education courses both moral training and the truth about the physical and psychological penalties for sin.

The reason we are able to state so bluntly what are the real goals of sex education is because the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Center for Disease Control, headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia, gave a large federally-funded contract to a think-tank called Mathtech, Inc. of Bethesda, Maryland, to make the most comprehensive survey of sex education in the United States. The survey was designed, and is being widely used, to *promote* sex education courses in all the public schools from Kindergarten through Grade 12.

Called "An Analysis of U.S. Sex Education Programs and Evaluation Methods," the Mathtech report was written by Douglas Kirby, Judith Alter and Peter Scales. It is identified by Contract No. 200-78-0804, and was published in July 1979. This survey describes in five volumes of detail the real goals of sex education. Those goals are quite shocking, and almost completely unknown to parents or taxpayers.

"Sex education is very different from many other classes," the Mathtech report explains. "The purpose of sex education is not simply to fill the gaps in the knowledge of adolescents. . . . The goals of sex education are much more ambitious; they involve . . . the changing of attitudes and behaviors."

The Mathtech report describes with unconcealed enthusiasm how current sex education courses are "changing" students' attitudes. The goals of these

changes are identified by Mathtech as "broadly humanistic."

Whether the courses are at the junior or senior high school or at the college level, the students who take sex education courses become more "liberal or tolerant of the sexual behavior" of others. They develop "a greater acceptance of homosexuality and masturbation."

They become "more comfortable" with the idea of their future marriage partners having had sexual relations with someone else. It is no accident that this is the effect on students because, as Mathtech reports, "with near unanimity, the experts believed that the discouragement of all nonmarital activity was unimportant," and some experts think it is "counterproductive."

This antagonism to premarital chastity is echoed again and again throughout the Mathtech report. The Mathtech authors warn bluntly that the goals of sex education professionals "will, of course, conflict with the belief held by some people that sex should be enjoyed only within the context of marriage. . . . Thus, policymakers and sex educators should realize that some values conveyed in sex education classes are not supported by all members of society."

That's right, they are not. But the question is, do the "members of society" whose children are being subjected to this "changing" of their values know what are the real goals of the sex professionals? Do they know that the "sexperts" are teaching tolerance for homosexuality but antagonism to premarital chastity?

The more controversial and private the topic, the more the "experts" believe that it should be covered in depth and "not superficially." For example, when contraception is discussed, it is suggested that the lecture should include the advantages and disadvantages of each method, the fears and fallacies of each method, and the addresses of the places where contraceptives can be obtained.

Outside of the self-serving use of the words "experts" and "professionals" to describe those involved in teaching or promoting the Mathtech brand of sex education, the next most used word is "values clarification." That's the jargon which identifies the use of educational facilities to change the students' values and attitudes rather than for the traditional purpose to impart knowledge.

Another favorite word in the Mathtech report is

"nonjudgmental." That means that sex education courses should promote "a reduction of sexual guilt" (for committing immoral sex acts) and "an acceptance of alternative lifestyles" (such as homosexuality).

It is clear from the Mathtech report that sex education, as conceived by the experts, extends from kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12), and that it is integrated throughout many different courses so that parents will find it more difficult to identify. Obviously, it is easier to bring about "attitudinal change" in youngsters if the professionals can start at the earliest age and prevent the parents from knowing the goals.

One of the quickest ways to see how values and attitudes are changed is to read the questionnaires given to the pupils. The multiple-choice questions about what is assumed to be their "sexually active" lifestyle are pornographic in their explicitness. They could not help but encourage a chaste youngster to get busy and find out what he or she has been missing.

One of the major defects of sex education courses is that they *assume* that all teenagers are "sexually active," thereby exerting tremendous peer pressure to turn the assumption into a fact. But the assumption is false.

The eleventh annual opinion survey of the top five percent of the 6½ million students who were high school seniors and juniors during the 1979-80 academic year shows clearly that high achievement goes hand in hand with good moral character. The poll was taken among the students who excel in academics, extracurricular activities, community service or athletics in the nation's 20,000 public, private and parochial high schools.

More than three-fourths (76 percent) of these high school leaders have not had sexual intercourse, and 59 percent say they would not live with someone prior to marriage. Teenagers should be encouraged to imitate the good character of their own peer leaders, rather than be dragged down to the assumption of the sex education courses.

Cause of Teenage Pregnancy

The prevailing liberal dogma is that "sex education" is the solution for teenage pregnancy, one of the nation's growing public health problems. On the contrary, it is more probable that sex education is a principal cause of teenage pregnancy.

That's the conclusion of research by Dr. Rhoda L. Lorand after reading a mammoth collection of sex education materials put out by Planned Parenthood, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, public health departments and drug companies. Dr. Lorand, Ph.D., is a practicing psychotherapist in New York City, a Diplomate in Clinical Psychology of the American Board of Professional Psychology, an expert witness before many Congressional committees, and the author of *Love, Sex and the Teenager*.

Most parents have the naive idea that sex education means telling children the anatomical and biological facts of life. Not so, Dr. Lorand says. "The message beamed to school children, often from the fifth grade up, is that everyone has the right to engage in sexual intercourse, the number of sexual partners purely a matter of personal preference."

The child is taught in explicit detail all the varieties of normal and abnormal sexual activity and sensual arousal. The child is taught that moral standards and judgments should have little or nothing to do with sexuality.

In addition to eliminating morality, the sex education advocates have deliberately concealed from the children the medical evidence of the dangerous consequences of early and permissive sexual behavior — facts which would cause any reasonably normal teenager to abstain from sexual activity, even if he had no moral scruples.

For example, there is a mountain of corroborative evidence of the direct connection between early coitus and cervical cancer in females. Yet the sex education advocates have censored all this evidence out of the materials they thrust at teenagers.

Some sex education materials mention venereal disease, but within the context of an unquestioning acceptance of promiscuity and the assertion that VD is curable.

None of the sex education materials examined by Dr. Lorand mentions the painful and dangerous VD, genital herpes, which is not curable, or that some strains of gonorrhea are penicillin-resistant and sterility may occur during the time a cure is sought. Nor do the materials tell about Cytomegalovirus, another incurable sexually-transmitted disease which cripples and retards more infants than German measles.

"The emotion of fear," Dr. Lorand points out, "is a fundamental life-protecting response to the perception of danger." It is very healthy for a young girl to be deterred from promiscuity by a fear of contracting a painful, incurable disease, or cervical cancer, or sterility, or the likelihood of giving birth to a dead, blind or brain-damaged baby (even 10 years later when she may be happily married).

It is shocking that the sex education advocates promote the "everybody's doing it" syndrome without warning of the tragic consequences. It is a cheat on our teenagers who are thus led into mistakes for which they may have to pay a bitter price all the rest of their lives.

Graphs on VD in Sweden and the United States indicate that sex education is a cause of the epidemic rise in VD. Sweden started a steady upward climb in 1954, the year sex education became compulsory. In the United States, VD declined until the mid-1960s, when it began a sharp rise upward. That was when U.S. schools introduced Swedish-style sex education.

Sweden is certainly not a model our country would want to follow. In 1976, the illegitimacy rate in Sweden was 33 percent of all live births, even though half of all teenage pregnancies ended in abortion.

Planned Parenthood is the principal agency pushing for the most extreme Swedish-style sex education in the schools. In its Annual Report for 1978, Planned Parenthood speaks openly of its "role as agent of social and attitudinal change."

What masquerades as sex education is not education at all. It is selective propaganda which artificially encourages children to participate in adult sex, while it censors out the facts of life about the unhappy consequences. It is robbing children of their childhood.

Forcing Kids to Face Facts

Visiting recently in Dallas, I was struck by a front-page banner headline which covered two news stories with equal billing: "DISD wants to force kids to face facts." (DISD stands for Dallas Independent School District.) The left-side story announced the plan to face Dallas kids with the comprehensive facts about sex and sexuality, while the right-side story announced the plan to face them with the facts that, if they can't read by the end of the third grade, they will

be flunked.

School Superintendent Linus Wright predicted that the anticipated failures will be a "tough pill to swallow." No pun intended, but the left-side article told of plans to teach pupils that the pill is "the most reliable non-surgical method" of birth control.

The Dallas public schools have found it difficult to teach reading (46 percent of third graders perform below their grade level), so they now want to teach sexuality instead. It's so much easier, it requires less concentration, and the learning process continues so rapidly in non-classroom hours because the homework doesn't have to be assigned.

The teaching of reading requires adherence to some standards of accuracy and accountability. The teaching of sexuality, as contemplated in the Dallas and other public school programs, is not required to conform to standards of accuracy, accountability, truth, or morality. The sexuality course lets pupils set their own sexuality standards. "These standards should be arrived at on a personal basis -- each person should arrive at his/her own selective standard," says the curriculum guide. "It is important that we not impose our sexual standards and biases on other people."

So the children are taught about dating, parenthood, reproduction, homosexuality, and abortion, but without any moral standards or biases. Nobody can flunk a sexuality course because there are no wrong answers.

Sex Education Check List

1. Does it omit all references to moral standards of right and wrong, teaching only animal-level sex?

2. Does it urge boys and girls to seek help from or consult only or primarily public agencies rather than their parents or religious advisers?

3. Does it require instruction and discussion to take place in sex-integrated (coed) classes rather than separate classes for boys and girls?

4. Does it require boys and girls to discuss private parts and sexual behavior openly in the classroom, with explicit vocabulary, thereby destroying their natural modesty, privacy, and psychological defenses (especially of the girls) against immoral sex?

5. Does it omit mentioning chastity as a method (the only absolute method) of preventing teenage pregnancies and VD?

6. Does it try to eliminate all guilt for sin?

7. Does it assume that all boys and girls are engaging in immoral sex, thereby encouraging them to accept promiscuous sexual acts as normal?

8. Does it omit mention of the spiritual, psychological, emotional, and physical benefits of premarital chastity, marital fidelity, and traditional family life?

9. Does it omit mention of the spiritual, psychological, emotional, and physical penalties and risks of fornication, adultery and promiscuity?

10. Does it require boys and girls to engage in role playing (pretending one is pregnant, pretending one has to admit having VD, pretending to use various types of contraceptives), thereby encouraging peer pressure to be exerted on the side of fornication rather than chastity?

11. Does it fail to stress marriage as the most moral, most fulfilling, and/or most socially acceptable method of enjoying sexual activity?

12. Does it encourage boys and girls *not* to tell their parents about the sex-ed curriculum, or about

Stop Textbook Censorship

1. Inform yourself about the subject of sex education and about how moral values and the truth are **censored** out of sexuality courses. An excellent place to begin is to order the packet on "Sex Education" and on "Humanism" at \$5.00 each from the Mel Gablers, P.O. Box 7518, Longview, Texas 75607.

2. Find out what sex education is being taught or proposed to be taught in your local schools. This may be difficult because sex education courses are often disguised as "family living," or so integrated and dispersed throughout many other courses (history, health, biology, etc.) that they are difficult to identify. Keep looking.

3. You have certain rights as parents and taxpayers. However, that is something like a pedestrian's rights -- some motorists do not seem to know that pedestrians have any rights. Your "rights" won't do you any good after you are dead, so it pays to be alert and cautious. Don't be belligerent. Tread carefully until you are absolutely sure of your facts.

4. Use the Sex Education Check List below to evaluate the curriculum proposed in your schools. If the answer is yes to many of these questions, don't be surprised if teenage pregnancies and VD are epidemic in your community.

5. If you would like to serve on Eagle Forum's STOP TEXTBOOK CENSORSHIP COMMITTEE, write us and volunteer, stating your experience and qualifications.

their sexual behavior or problems?

13. Does it present abortion as an acceptable method of birth control?

14. Does it use materials and references from the pro-abortion Planned Parenthood?

15. Does it present homosexual behavior as normal and acceptable?

16. Does it omit mention of the incurable types of VD which today affect millions of Americans? Does it falsely imply that all VD can be cured by treatment?

17. Does it give respectability to VD by listing famous people who had it?

18. Does it omit mention of the danger of cervical cancer in females from early promiscuity?

19. Does it use a vocabulary which disguises immorality? For example, "sexually active" to mean fornication, "sexual partners" to mean sex in or out of marriage, "fetus" to mean baby, "termination of pregnancy" to mean killing a preborn baby.

20. Does it require boys and girls to draw or trace on paper intimate parts of the male and female bodies?

21. Does it ask unnecessary questions which cause boys and girls to doubt their parents' religious and social values ("is there a need for a wedding ceremony, religious or civil")?

22. Does it force advanced concepts and vocabulary upon five to eight year old children too young to understand or be interested? (For example, selection of mate, Caesarian, pregnancy prevention, population control, ovulation, VD, sperm, ovum.)

23. Does it constantly propagandize for limiting the size of families by teaching that having more children means that each gets fewer economic benefit?

24. Can the sex-ed curriculum reasonably be described as a "how to do it" course in sexual acts (instruction which obviously encourages individual experimentation)?

What is Humanism?

I received a telephone call from a byline reporter for a major metropolitan newspaper. "I'm not calling for an interview," he said, "but just for some information, and I thought phoning you would be the easiest way to get it." Then he blurted out his questions.

"What is humanism? What's wrong with it? And what has it got to do with politics? I always thought that it had something to do with being humanitarian or with studying those college courses called the humanities."

I explained that, no, the humanism he was inquiring about doesn't have any relation to either of those things. Humanism is a secular "religion" professed by humanists whose creed is enunciated in the Humanist Manifesto I of 1933, the Humanist Manifesto II of 1973, and the Secular Humanist Declaration of 1980. Its views on current trends are made known in the publications of the American Humanist Association.

The Humanist Manifestos are just as dogmatic and unequivocal as that statement of fundamental Christianity, the Apostles Creed. Here is a summary of the dogmas of the religion of Secular Humanism, as revealed in its published Manifestos.

Humanism denies and rejects God, theism, deism, faith, prayer, all divine purpose or Providence, all religions which "place God above human needs," the existence of life after death, a supernatural, Heaven and Hell, "traditional religious morality," religious attitudes about sex, "natural sovereignty," and a "profit-motivated society."

To replace the tenets of traditional religion, humanism proclaims its own set of self-serving, unproved dogmas. Humanism asserts that the universe is "self-existing and not created," that man is the product of evolution, that the "joy of living" and the "satisfactions of life" are the supreme goal of man, and that ethics comes from "human experience" not from God.

Humanism recognizes and accepts abortion, euthanasia, suicide, and all varieties of "sexual exploration" and immoral "lifestyles." Humanism works for the establishment of a "secular society," a "socialized economic order," world government, military disarmament, and population control by government.

The secular humanists offer no proof for their dogmas. They accept no final arbiter of governmental or moral standards except their own arrogant elitism. They wrap their ideology in the word "scientific" but use it as a witch doctor uses a magic talisman, to confer a fake prestige on their mythology and hope that simple people will fail to discern that it is empty of evidence.

What lifts Secular Humanism out of the class of an obscure cult is the big names who have publicly signed the Manifestos, thereby witnessing to its religion. The list includes some of the most influential names in education and philosophy in the last half century: John Dewey (father of progressive education), Alan Guttmacher (president of Planned Parenthood), Vashti McCollum (famous for her Supreme Court case which removed "released time" religious classes from public schools), Lester Mondale (brother of the Vice President), B.F. Skinner (Harvard professor of psychology),

Lester A. Kirkendall (known as the father of the sex education movement), and Betty Friedan (known as the mother of the women's liberation movement).

The reason Humanism has become something reporters need to be informed about is that alert parents have discovered that Secular Humanism has become the Established Religion of the U.S. public school system. Many parents believe that the Humanist Manifestos, like the Rosetta Stone, provide the key to decipher the code languages of progressive education, values clarification, sexuality curriculums, situation ethics, and the various rationales that have caused the public schools to eliminate prayer, moral training, and the teaching of basics.

Humanism doesn't deal directly with politics, as the reporter's question implied. But Humanism has everything to do with public school education, and it is clear that the remedy for the wrongs in that area is at least partially political.

The particular election-eve timing of the 1980 Secular Humanist Declaration indicates that the Humanists themselves are reacting politically to the threat to their ideology posed by the emergence of fundamentalist Christian groups as a force in the 1980 elections. The Humanists should be worried -- because the public has begun to see through their hypocrisy in fastening their atheist ideology on the public schools, all the while the Humanists are loudly proclaiming as "imperatives" not only "the separation of church and state" but even "the separation of ideology and state."

Phyllis Schlafly taught all her six children to read at home by the phonics method, and then entered them in school in the second grade. Their subsequent records in schools and colleges testify to the success of her "home and phonics" plan.

Mrs. Schlafly earned a B.A. with honors from Washington University in St. Louis in three years while holding a 48-hour-a-week job as a gunner and ballistics technician at the largest ammunition plant in the world. She received her M.A. from Harvard University in 1945 and her J.D. from Washington University Law School in 1978. She is a member of the Illinois Bar, Phi Beta Kappa and Pi Sigma Alpha, and has an LL.D. from Niagara University.

In addition to her principal occupation as wife and mother, Mrs. Schlafly is the author of nine books, the publisher since 1967 of the *Phyllis Schlafly Report*, writes a syndicated newspaper column twice a week, and gives television commentaries on Cable News Network five times a week. She has testified before ten Congressional and thirty State Legislative committees, and has lectured on a hundred college campuses.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: \$10 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.