

Asked by President Reagan to report on the dangers of AIDS, Surgeon General Everett Koop has responded by proposing instruction in buggery for schoolchildren as young as the third grade on the spurious grounds that the problem is one of ignorance and not morality

## Sex Education Is Just No Business Of The Government

BY ROBERT W. LEE

**I**N FEBRUARY, President Reagan asked U.S. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop to evaluate AIDS and report to the American people on the scope of, and methods for coping with, that burgeoning and deadly disease. The Koop Report was released on October 22, 1986.

Much guesswork, tempered by political considerations, has been mixed with the scientific pronouncements of the Koop Report. For instance, we are assured by the Surgeon General at one point: "There is no danger of infection with AIDS virus by casual social contact." Elsewhere, however, he is more specific: "There is no *known* risk of non-sexual infection in *most* of the situations we encounter in our daily lives." (Emphasis added.) Needless to say, simply because a risk may not be known with scientific certainty is far from conclusive proof that it does not exist.\* And "most" is a cru-

**January, 1987**

cial qualifier, especially since even the Koop Report admits that "AIDS is still a mysterious disease in many ways . . ."

In another nod to homosexual politics, statistics cited by the Surgeon General in a statement accompanying

\*Similarly, the Koop Report states: "Although the AIDS virus has been found in tears and saliva, no instance of transmission from these body fluids has been reported." It also claims: "There are no known cases of AIDS transmission by insects, such as mosquitoes." Yet it continues to acknowledge at least three instances where health-care workers tested AIDS-positive after accidentally sticking themselves with needles used in the care of AIDS patients. If needles, why not mosquitoes which, after dining on AIDS victims, promptly flit to others? Indeed, last August, Jean-Claude Chermann of the Pasteur Institute in Paris reported discovery of the AIDS virus in insects captured in Zaire.

## CONSERVATIVE DIGEST

the Koop Report are used to magnify heterosexual responsibility for AIDS well beyond anything that is even remotely justified. For instance, a total of 26,199 cases of AIDS had been reported to the Centers for Disease Control as of October 20, 1986. Of these, about two-thirds (17,197) involved homosexual or bisexual males. Another seventeen percent (4,452) were intravenous drug abusers. And yet another eight percent (2,063) were homosexual male drug abusers.

Four percent (999) of the cases were classified as "heterosexual." But a footnote informs us that the number includes "446 persons (74 men, 372 women) who have had heterosexual contact with a person with AIDS or at risk for AIDS and 553 persons (446 men, 107 women) without other identified risks who were born in countries [such as Haiti and in Central Africa] in which heterosexual transmission is believed to play a major role although precise means of transmission have not yet been fully defined."

In other words, every one of the so-called "heterosexual" cases involved persons who either had contact with someone already having AIDS (or at high risk for AIDS), or are from pathetically poor countries with virtually no public sanitation where it is only guessed that their AIDS was heterosexually transmitted. As *Washington Times* columnist Wesley Pruden has noted, "Moving them from a separate category to 'heterosexual' might, in fact, be correct. But

it was a political decision, not a medical one."

**Sex Training.** When it comes to protecting pre-adolescents from AIDS, Dr. Koop declares: "We can no longer afford to sidestep frank, open discussions about sexual practices — homosexual and heterosexual." He claims that what is needed is more sex education in the schools, starting "at the lowest grade possible . . ." Indeed, Koop claims, there "is now no doubt that we need sex education in schools" which "should include information on sexual practices that may put our children at risk for AIDS."

No doubt? What there is "no doubt" about is that neither Dr. Koop nor anyone else can point to any community in the country where school sex instruction has improved sexual behavior. To the contrary, the massive increases in sexual delinquency, venereal disease, illegitimate births, abortions — and now AIDS — have occurred in the very period during which sex education has been most extensively provided in schools throughout the nation.

In the Fifties, for instance, the government ("public") schools in Washington, D.C., were among the first in the nation to institute a kindergarten-through-12th-grade program of sex education. In the Seventies, the National Capital became the first major U.S. city where the number of out-of-wedlock births exceeded those born within the marriage covenant, and where the number of unborn babies killed by abortion exceeded the number of live births.

## GOVERNMENT SEX EDUCATION

And it was also in the Seventies that the "San Francisco School Board . . . unanimously approved inclusion of gay lifestyles studies in high school sex-education classes." (*Washington Star*, May 26, 1977) As the nation's homosexual heartland, San Francisco has been hit especially hard by the AIDS plague. And in all of California (as of July 1986) "there were 5,200 reported AIDS victims," and "State public health officials estimate as many as 500,000 people may have been infected with AIDS and developed antibodies to the disease." (*Washington Times*, October 30, 1986)

A lack of information is not the problem. Physicians, for example, know more about the physical and emotional aspects of sex than just about anyone else, yet there is no evidence that *they* are sexually better adjusted than, say, accountants, editors, lawyers, taxi drivers, or teachers. Problems such as AIDS result from a lack of moral training and restraint of the sort which the schools are neither qualified nor (at least in the case of government schools) *allowed* to advocate. It is the right and responsibility of *parents* to instruct their children in this unusually sensitive area, and if some parents neglect that duty, commandeering the rights of all parents is hardly the solution.

School sex classes tend to erode the spiritual values and moral stability of children, while weakening the family relationship. After all, children in the same grade may be roughly the same age chronologically, but they will inevitably differ widely in their

mental age, emotional maturity, and moral beliefs and attitudes. The potential harm likely to occur to some members of a grade or class, when all are subjected to the same degree of sex training, should be apparent.

Even the best-intentioned projects can have dreadful consequences, as when the birth of hamsters in one first-grade class turned from joy to horror as the new mother, apparently excited by the spectators, suddenly devoured her offspring. The mother of one child (who had favored school sex education, by the way) subsequently told a reporter that the grisly experience "created doubts about mother love that a six-year-old isn't prepared to handle." Indeed, her daughter "kept drawing pictures of animals eating their babies."

What sort of pictures will third-graders be drawing in the wake of graphic descriptions of the sort of homosexual perversions which lead to AIDS?

**Instruction.** It is simply not necessary to discuss the explicit details of either "normal" sex or perversions to keep young people from being seduced or perverted. Indeed, public discussion of sexual intimacy tends to promote, rather than inhibit, immoral behavior. Group instruction about sex embarrasses some pupils, creates callousness in others, and encourages others to experiment. Today, there is more sex education in more schools than ever before, yet problems related to sexual improprieties are more extreme and threatening than ever before — much more so than

## CONSERVATIVE DIGEST

before the national crusade was launched nearly three decades ago to subject students to sex training under the guise of dealing with the consequences of sexual license.

Clearly, the evidence to date, if it leads to any conclusions at all, points to school sex education as part of the problem, not the solution. Adding AIDS, and details about how it is contracted, to the list of values-neutral and graphically described sex-education topics could be (indeed, is likely to be) a disaster. Especially when we are talking about providing such instruction to very young children.

When government assumes the authority to compel parents by the full force of law to send their children to school, it must guard against exposing those children to instruction which parents have reason to find morally abhorrent. A positive step in that direction occurred in Tennessee on October 24, 1986, when a federal judge ruled that schools could not compel children to read textbooks containing themes offensive to their family's religious beliefs. Attempts to provide instruction in pederasty and buggery will undoubtedly be met with court action.

Meanwhile, what screening process exists to determine if a teacher is an appropriate sex instructor? It is entirely possible that the very teachers most likely to volunteer for the job are the ones least likely to be personally modest and view sex as a subject involving personal morality. What barriers keep verbal exhibitionists away from the classroom? Remember, it

takes doctors and nurses and years of education, training, and experience to develop the matter-of-fact, scientifically unemotional attitude toward sex which many advocates of sex education in the schools expect teachers and children to have when the topic is discussed in the classroom.

It is crucial to keep in mind that dishonest or ignorant information dispensed by teachers can do *far* more longer-lasting harm than anything a youngster might pick up from friends or even on the street. Information received in school, from such a significant authority figure as a teacher, is presumed to be correct. But not so with that gleaned from schoolmates and other peers, whose accounts tend to be discounted and taken with the proverbial "grain of salt."

**Ethics And Morality.** This whole business is a bucket of worms. Sex education predicated on situation ethics rather than a God-centered morality has already affected even some court decisions. A few years ago, for instance, the New Mexico court of Appeals ruled that a 23-year-old woman, by engaging in sexual intercourse with a 15-year-old boy, contributed to his sex education, rather than to his delinquency. The judge who wrote the opinion in the case noted: "Today sexual intercourse is recognized as normal conduct in the development of a human being. As a result, this subject is taught to children in the public schools." And he ruled: "A consensual act of sexual intercourse engaged in by a young man is nothing more than sex education and necessary in his growth

## GOVERNMENT SEX EDUCATION

toward maturity and subsequent domestic family life."

Which undoubtedly reminded some observers of Alexander Pope's oft-quoted quatrain: "Vice is a monster of so frightful mein,/As to be hated needs but to be seen;/ Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,/ We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

Now note that the introduction to the Surgeon General's Report asserts: "At the beginning of the AIDS epidemic many Americans had little sympathy for people with AIDS. The feeling was that somehow people from certain groups 'deserved' their illness. Let us put those feelings behind us. We are fighting a disease, not people." In a very real sense, however, we are "fighting" both: a "disease," to be sure, but one inflicted on our society by "people" who have arrogantly and irresponsibly engaged in licentious patterns of sexual behavior, which many even now refuse to modify, and which portend to cost society a fortune, most of which will be extracted from citizens whose "sexual preferences" neither created nor contribute to the AIDS epidemic.

The Report predicts: "The changes in our society will be economic and political and will affect our social institutions, our educational practices, and our health care. Although AIDS may never touch you personally, the societal impact certainly will."

With that in mind, it may be difficult indeed for most Americans to take the Koop Report's advice not to use AIDS "as an excuse to discriminate against any group or individual."

Is it wise to propagandize in the schools for toleration of perversions and those who practice them? Compassion is commendable, to be sure, but are we not already experiencing many of the wildly destructive effects of modifying our reaction towards perversion from one of disgust to toleration? Indeed, hasn't that switch itself tended to undermine an important protective defense against possible *involvement* in perversion? As one medical doctor phrased it, "The excessive tolerance of perversion is not in the best interests of schoolchildren or society."

**The Educrats.** It is no secret that contempt for strong religious values within families, and for parents who strive to instill those values in their children, permeates the writings and comments of key sex educators. Even a U.S. Commissioner of Education (James B. Allen, who served in the Nixon Administration) angrily declared on one occasion: "The biggest problem in sex education is not the children, but the damn parents!"

A symposium on sex education at the University of California Medical School, published in 1967 under the title *Sex Education & The Teenager*, contains an essay by Dr. Ben Ard, then a Professor of Counseling at San Francisco State College. This essay is typical of the anti-morality tirades of the "experts" who have shaped American sex education. According to Dr. Ard: "Certainly most of the problems with regard to sex education would be resolvable if people could only become free of their moralistic judgments regarding sex . . . ."

## CONSERVATIVE DIGEST

"We need to avoid the sanctimonious, sacred, saccharine, sentimental approach to sex education which has been with us for so long . . . In other words, we need to get away from sex education which emphasizes the reproductive, repressive, religious approach.

"Essentially I have been suggesting that if we want our sex education to be better and more effective in the future than it has been in the past, then we must change the underlying value assumptions from those of our traditional, moralistic sex code to a more rational, pluralistic sex ethics."

So emphatic was Dr. Ard in his denunciation of conventional moral and religious traditions that, in answer to what individuals can do to provide appropriate sex education of the young, he counseled: "Ignore all opinions that are moralistic and try to draw your conclusions from data rather than from dogma."

And you wonder why we are today confronted with so many crises (and in the case of AIDS, a potential catastrophe) related to sexual ethics?

Writing in *The Humanist* for November/December, 1986, sex educator Sol Gordon\* updated the anti-moralistic pitch as follows: "There is a vast difference between being moral and being moralistic . . . For example, a teacher could state that it is a health hazard for young people to smoke. This is a statement of a moral position. It would be moralistic for the teacher to declare, 'It is a sin to smoke.' Moralistic statements clearly are inappropriate for public schools . . ."

Perhaps so, which is yet another

reason why AIDS education in such schools would likely be harmful rather than helpful. The perversions primarily responsible for the transmission of AIDS, for instance, *could not be* condemned as morally wrong or sinful. Unwise, perhaps, or potentially unhealthy, or whatever other purely pragmatic argument might come to mind. But *morally wrong or sinful*? Pity the poor teacher who attempts to make the Biblical case *for* chastity and *against* sodomy, fornication, and/or adultery.

**A Campaign.** So what is this all about? One week following release of the Surgeon General's Report, the Committee on a National Strategy for AIDS (comprised of sundry scientists and public-health experts) released its own findings and proposals in a 277-page report which called for the expen-

\*Dr. Gordon retired last year as Director of Syracuse University's Institute for Family Research and Education. In the Seventies, he authored (among other things) the notorious "Zing Sex Comix," about which Dr. Susan Huck (herself a Syracuse University graduate, who is today a CONSERVATIVE DIGEST Contributing Editor) has written: ". . . these things were uniformly cheap, dreadfully drawn, and extremely offensive. At a glance one saw the boorish jokes, subhuman characters, sick messages, and the dash of radical political propaganda. Later, actually *reading* the stuff, I found it appalling trash . . . The idea of children having dirty comic books thrust upon them by the schools, so that they could read about, for instance, 'oral and anal sex,' was something I found quite . . . sickening . . ." (*American Opinion*, September 1974, Page 15)

## GOVERNMENT SEX EDUCATION

diture of around \$2 billion annually on AIDS research and education by 1990. The report also proposed the creation of a national commission on AIDS to track the epidemic and coordinate anti-AIDS activities, *as well as a new federal office exclusively devoted to AIDS-prevention education.*

And, lest there be any remaining doubt that the AIDS problem is being used by collectivists to push for ever-more government spending and bureaucracy, the AIDS project's director, Dr. Roy Widdus (who is also director of the international health division of the Institute of Medicine, which sponsored the study along with the National Academy of Sciences) asserted that the Committee believes everyone who contracts AIDS deserves health care, but "[u]nfortunately we recognize that many AIDS patients — particularly intravenous drug users — are not employed and thus do not have adequate health insurance."

Which is undoubtedly true, so taxpayers are expected to pay. One possibility cited by Dr. Widdus would be national catastrophic health insurance, "an issue being considered by [*the federal Department of*] Health and Human Services." Another would be for *states* to provide insurance. "We need to move rapidly in this area," Dr. Widdus claimed.

Regarding Surgeon General Koop's call for sex education in the schools, Dr. Roy Widdus declared: "Debating about what grade to start it in is irrelevant. The critical thing is to get this information to people [*children*] as they become *sexually active* or

before that time." As soon as possible.

Let us pause to consider that fascinating phrase "sexually active." We have no idea who first coined it, but suspect that he or she is first cousin to the semantic sabotage artist who first applied the term "gay" to homosexuals. In both instances, language has been perverted in a way which tends to camouflage and promote illicit sex. "Sexually active" is white-wash for what is in fact fornication, buggery, adultery, pedophilia, sodomy, and/or other terms which properly apply to the sundry manifestations of premarital and extramarital sexual license. Applying such a positive phrase to such irresponsible behavior tends subtly to *promote* that behavior. After all, who would not prefer to be known as "sexually active" rather than the implied alternative — "sexually comatose"?

The time has come to condemn the phrase "sexually active" and to use more precise terms.

In a recent letter to the *Washington Times*, one righteously (and rightly) indignant mother wrote: "We have kindergarten through 12th-grade Death and Suicide Education, Drug Education, Sex Education, Child Molestation Education; and now we'll have AIDS Education. Good Grief! By the time a child is 10 years old, he or she will be suffering from manic-depression and neurosis just from going to school. All of this will undoubtedly be used to justify the bringing of kindergarten through 12th-grade Stress Education once the children are thor-

## CONSERVATIVE DIGEST

oughly depressed from these non-academic topics."

**Lessons Of History.** Historian Will Durant once observed: "No one man, however brilliant or well-informed, can come in one lifetime to such fullness of understanding as to safely judge and dismiss the customs or institutions of his society, for these are the wisdom of generations after centuries of experiment in the laboratory of history. A youth boiling with hormones will wonder why he should not give full freedom to his sexual desires; and if he is unchecked by custom, morals, or laws, he may ruin his life before he matures sufficiently to understand that sex is a river of fire that must be

banked and cooled by a hundred restraints if it is not to consume in chaos both the individual and the group."

That is one of the Durants' *Lessons Of History* (the title of the book from which that warning is excerpted) which has been widely flouted in this so-called "modern" age. And as American philosopher and novelist George Santayana perceptively pointed out, those who refuse to learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat them.

The new drive for increased sex education in the schools to cope with AIDS should be opposed by conservatives without compromise.



### Britannia Rues The Waves

THE SEAS WERE enormous as Queen Victoria made her way toward Ireland. One wave was so gigantic, in fact, that the ship shifted violently and almost knocked her Britannic Majesty to the deck. As the monarch recovered she told a nearby attendant: "Go up to the bridge, give the admiral my compliments, and tell him he's not to let that happen again."



### The Long And Short Of It

ONE OF THE richest members of the legendary Rothschild family was asked: "How did all the members of your family amass such fortunes?" With a smile, the Baron said: "By always selling too soon."



### A Lame Duck Flies To The South Pole

A CONGRESSMAN seeking re-election had been badly beaten just before he was to speak to the Dutch Treat Club in New York. Frank Crowninshield did his best to introduce the lame duck. "Gentleman," he began, "our next speaker bears a strong resemblance to the earth. You will recall that the earth is not a perfect spheroid, because it is flattened at the poles. That's precisely what happened to our next speaker."