

15

Sex School

Sex School

English, maths, science, history, geography, pornography... Pornography is on the curriculum in British schools under the guise of 'sex education'. Pornography is synonymous with school 'sex education' – 'sex education' *is* pornography! The term 'sex education' is itself a complete con, an innocuous-sounding euphemism which serves brilliantly to deceive many people – both parents and children – into thinking that 'sex education' must be a good thing because it is 'educational'. The term 'sex education' deceives many people into thinking that it must refer to a respectable and legitimate subject of study by children but this is not so. The simple placing together of the words 'sex' and 'education' to produce the term 'sex education' brought into being a powerful propaganda tool; the term's invention achieved a propaganda masterstroke and its coining was an act of devious genius from the twisted mind of the person responsible. In the perception of many people the word 'education' strongly implies something which is inherently good and valuable, something of positive benefit to its recipients, but in the case of 'sex education' nothing could be further from the truth. 'Sex education' is most definitely not a legitimate 'subject' (like English or mathematics) and it has no educational value whatsoever – indeed 'sex education' actually works in a manner directly contrary to all sound principles of teaching. Where 'sex education' is concerned, that which happens in the name of 'education' would be laughable if it were not so sad.

'Education' is the excuse for prostitution in the classroom just as 'artistic merit' was for so long the pornographers' defence. It would be more honest and accurate to re-name 'sex education' as 'Promiscuity & Perversion Indoctrination' because that is exactly what it really is. Since the 1970s 'sex education' indoctrination has done much to legitimise pornography in the UK by helping to make it a more generally socially acceptable part of mainstream culture. 'Sex education' indoctrination has fulfilled an important role in introducing and desensitising children to pornography and it continues to play that role to this day. Most 'sex education' indoctrination materials present children with graphic visual images of genitalia. Under the cover of 'education' children are subjected to material by 'sex educators'¹ which would otherwise readily be classified as hardcore pornography. Consider for example that the well-known 'sex education' indoctrination manual for children *Make It Happy* contains a photograph of two naked men 'flashing' their erect penises. Now, if the police were aware of adults showing hardcore pornographic magazines to schoolchildren in the street there would be no doubt that a criminal offence was being committed and the police would arrest the adults concerned, but when *at school* schoolchildren are shown so-called 'educational materials' indistinguishable from hardcore pornography this is not deemed to be a crime – a curious anomaly indeed! 'Sex education' indoctrination is more than 'mere' pornography: it is *hardcore* pornography. Make no mistake, given that visual 'sex education' indoctrination

¹ The term *sex-worker* is used hereafter as a synonym for 'sex educator'.

materials are to all intents and purposes indistinguishable from hardcore pornography, these materials have exactly the same harmful effects as hardcore pornography has upon children. Let no one be deceived, children's minds are imprinted with visual images of erect penises and gaping vaginas: 'sex education' is hardcore pornography plain and simple.

'Sex education' indoctrination in British schools really began in earnest during the 1970s (although it was around in the decade before). The authoritative *Longford Report* (1972) – which investigated the growing phenomenon of pornography in the UK – considered the 'sex education' textbooks and also the BBC schools programmes which were then in current use and concluded that the visual images then being presented to children were undoubtedly pornographic. According to the report: "...the photographs in many commercially sponsored sex education manuals are obviously intended to sell the manuals, and serve no instructional purpose. To obtain these photographs the boys and girls whose bodies are used must have been stimulated and posed in a sadly degrading manner. The deadpan presentation of these pictures to other boys and girls must tend to destroy their sense of respect for the human body and its God-given organs."

Furthermore the report concluded that: "...as it is widely practised, sex education is the tacit encouragement of sexual activity without the restraints of a moral order and without any sense of personal responsibility. It reduces what should be the most intense expression of human love into mere technique."

The State's sex agenda Matters are much worse now than at the time of the *Longford Report* over thirty years ago. In July 2000 the Government's document *Sex and Relationship Education Guidance* was imposed upon all English schools and health authorities. It dictates a central ideology that children should be given lots of information about sex and then encouraged to make 'informed choices' about sex – when, how, with whom – on the basis of what each child feels is right for them. Watch out for that term 'informed choice': sex-workers² are ultra keen on bombarding children with sexual information so that children make 'informed sexual choices'. Sex-workers are delighted if your fourteen-year-old daughter decides to have simultaneous anal and vaginal intercourse with two men – as long as it is her 'informed choice'.

'Sex education' indoctrination since the 1970s is directly responsible for the current crisis of out-of-control rates of unwanted pregnancy, disease and abortion which plague the present generation of British teenagers and young adults but despite this the UK Government still believes that the answer to the national sexual disease crisis and a scandalously high teenage pregnancy rate lies in 'sex education', 'sex education', 'sex education'. In fact it might fairly be said that the Government is obsessed with 'sex education'. Forget literacy and numeracy, if there's one thing that whips ministers and civil servants into a passionate frenzy it's the burning urgency to teach your five-year-old

² See previous footnote – if you missed it the first time!

about masturbation or encourage fourteen-year-old boys to try anal sex or teach your twelve-year-old daughter to put a condom on her boyfriend and perform oral sex.

The FPA & Co The British Government has a number of ‘friendly helpers’ who like to take lots of money from the public purse with which to lobby and encourage the Government that ‘sex education’ is the answer, thus leading them to ‘advise’ the Government to give them yet more public money to implement the ‘sex education’ they can provide! These ‘friendly helpers’ include the Family Planning Association (FPA), the Sex Education Forum, Brook Advisory Centres, Marie Stopes International³ and the British Pregnancy Advisory Service (though the British Abortion ‘Service’ would be more accurate⁴), amongst others. Organisations such as these are the chief culprits guilty of directly causing the crisis to begin with and furthermore have been at the forefront of making it much worse for forty years.

Within the NHS there are dedicated health promotion departments attached to primary care trusts and health authorities. The role of NHS ‘sex experts’ from these departments is to push ‘sex education’ resource materials into schools and they work closely with local education authorities to fulfil this objective. The majority of ‘sex education’ propaganda is produced and distributed by the FPA, Brook Advisory Centres, Marie Stopes International and the Health Development Agency (formerly the Health Education Authority). Over the last thirty years the FPA, HDA and Brook have produced an extensive library of ‘sex education’ publications. The HDA is a Government quango. Brook and the FPA are registered charities in receipt of and dependent upon large sums of public money – ie taxpayers’ money handed over by the Government – to fund their ‘sex education’ activities. Given that the FPA and Brook are so heavily subsidised by the State and that they directly form and implement public policy it can only be concluded that they are *de facto* agents of the State. Effectively they and the State are one, they work hand-in-hand with the State’s health and education bureaucrats as well as the State’s front-line staff like teachers and nurses to indoctrinate a common ideology and cement ‘condom culture’. The FPA in particular sets the agenda and defines State orthodoxy – the FPA *is* the NHS!

The *Daily Telegraph* (27.09.03) newspaper reported that the FPA had produced a sex manual for nine to eleven-year-old schoolchildren. *4 You* included a cartoon of a girl masturbating in a bath, stated that same-sex attraction is “totally normal” and included anatomical diagrams which identified in detail the constituent parts of the genitalia (such as the clitoris). Nick Seaton of the Campaign for Real Education said: “ ‘Parents will be

³ The *Catholic Times* (18.02.07) newspaper reported that the nine British abortion ‘clinics’ [is ‘clinic’ really an appropriate word where abortion is concerned?] operated by Marie Stopes International recorded their highest ever figure for abortions during January 2007: 5,992 people were murdered-in-the-womb by Marie Stopes abortionists in that one month alone. In the year 2006 the nine Marie Stopes ‘clinics’ in the UK notched up 61,983 murders-in-the-womb.

⁴ The *Evening Standard* (09.05.06) newspaper reported that about 50,000 abortions annually are performed under the auspices of the British Pregnancy Advisory Service.

horrified that this sort of pornographic material is being targeted at primary school children.’ ” The Director of Family and Youth Concern Robert Whelan said: “ ‘We do not think this kind of literature should be made available in primary schools. It could be disturbing for young children and it is an issue of concern for parents. Almost all the FPA’s funding comes from the state and the FPA basically represents the official point of view in the Health Department and the Department for Education.’ ”

4 You followed in the footsteps of a long line of previous publications targeted at primary schoolchildren such as the sex manual *Knowing Me, Knowing You* (1990) which encouraged teachers to tell children about masturbation, contraception, intercourse and homosexuality. The FPA has never seen anything objectionable about introducing primary schoolchildren to sex; indeed the FPA’s attitude is well-reflected by a 1990s-era FPA contraception leaflet with teddy bear illustrations aimed at children and with the title *It doesn’t matter how old you are*.

The Independent (26.10.93) newspaper reported that the *Primary School Workbook* published by the FPA provided a ‘sex education programme’ for four-year-olds which included labels naming the vagina, testicles and pubic hair [which four-year-olds don’t have or need to know about!] and for seven year olds a name game to think of alternative words for penis and vagina. The *Catholic Herald* (17.11.00) newspaper reported the republication in 2000 of Brook’s sex manual for children *Say Yes, Say No, Say Maybe?* (1991) which included one section entitled *The Good Grope Guide*. The *Catholic Herald* noted that Brook was heavily funded by the State. The *Daily Mail* (17.04.04) newspaper reported on the FPA’s publication *How Much? How Soon?* which offered guidance to teachers of children aged nine and ten. The publication stated: “To say that sex outside marriage is always wrong will inevitably contradict the experience of some pupils with regard to their own parents/carers’ lifestyles.” The FPA urged teachers to ‘respect diversity’ rather than to be ‘judgemental’.

The *Daily Telegraph* (10.06.05) reported on the FPA booklet *Love, Sex and Relationships* aimed at children aged thirteen to sixteen and which was being distributed to schools and youth groups. The booklet contained ‘advice’ about masturbation, homosexuality, anal and oral sexual activity and showed cartoon characters making statements such as “I like to dress up as a girl” and “I like to touch myself.” Regarding anal sex the booklet stated: “You can be straight, gay or bisexual. Some people enjoy it; others aren’t interested.” The booklet also gave ‘advice’ to children about how to get access to contraception and abortion without parental knowledge or consent.

Parents have no right to know – let alone consent! The attitude of the ‘sex education’, contraception and abortion organisations is that parents have no right to know if their children are being ‘advised’ by sex-organisation agents and no right to know about – let alone consent to – such sex-workers administering contraception to children or even arranging abortions! Sadly this travesty is sanctioned by the State.

The *Catholic Times* (29.01.06) newspaper reported a High Court ruling which decided to maintain the status quo that parents have no right to know if sex-workers advise or procure abortions for their underage daughters, or similarly provide contraception or treatment for sexual disease. After the court case the spokesman for LIFE Michaela

O’Sullivan commented: “ ‘For years now an arrogant elite of self-appointed reproductive health experts have been steadily undermining the family, despite the wealth of evidence demonstrating that married families are the best arena for bringing up children. This out of touch attitude was perfectly demonstrated by Natalie Lleven of the FPA earlier in the hearing when she described as ‘out-dated’ the idea that parents usually know what is best for their own children.’ ”⁵

— — —

Sex: it’s all just a matter of taste!

The message of ‘sex educators’ to British children is essentially that sex is ‘just a matter of taste’ and so morals are irrelevant. According to sex-workers, sex is entirely a matter of personal preference as to how, when, where, why and with whom – that there is a major moral dimension to sex is alien to ‘sex education’. The *Daily Mail* (13.02.06) reported on a sixty-four page booklet published by Co-ordination Group Publications which is used in numerous secondary school classrooms for the teaching of ‘Personal, Social and Health Education’. The booklet states: “There is no accounting for taste. Not everyone likes oral sex. Not everyone likes ham and cheese sarnies either.” In a sane society people who go round implying to children that having sex is essentially no different to having a ham sandwich should be locked up but there it is, the official line of ‘sex educators’ is that sex is just a matter of taste and nothing more, on the same level as a decision about whether or not to have a sandwich and if so what filling to have.

Allow me to demonstrate... Many British parents are unaware of (or do not understand) the full horror of what their children are being taught under the guise of ‘sex education’. Parents often wrongly assume that ‘sex education’ must teach children about sex on the basis of their own sexual morality and that it must be good because it’s presented as being ‘educational’ and is given by ‘trained professionals’ – but nothing could be further from the truth. Children unroll condoms down ‘condom demonstrators’ [models of an erect penis] in class and are told to buy condoms at the local supermarket for homework. Indeed ‘condom demonstrators’ are a common tool of the ‘sex educator’. There are board games such as *Contraception* which schoolchildren are required to play thus presenting them with lots of sexual information and forcing them to think and talk sexually; a life-size model of an erect penis is the main feature in the middle of the board in the *Contraception* board game. For ‘sex educators’ though, ‘contraception’ is very much the

⁵ The *Daily Telegraph* (30.01.06) newspaper reported the judgement of the High Court’s Justice Silber that “parents had no right to know unless the child decided otherwise.” It is a curious (tragic, and evil) anomaly that sex-workers’ dealings with underage schoolgirls are shrouded in *de jure*, State-sanctioned mystery – that a schoolgirl, a child, can have an abortion without the knowledge (let alone the consent) of her parents – and yet schools have to obtain parental consent to give a schoolgirl a paracetamol tablet! Furthermore it is a curious anomaly that parents are deemed not to have any role or responsibility in the welfare of a pregnant daughter contemplating an abortion but that those parents would be held accountable under the law if that daughter persistently truanted from school. British law is dangerously unbalanced and inconsistent and goes against parents’ God-given responsibility for all aspects of their children’s welfare.

‘name of the game’. Telling children about contraception is at the very heart of ‘sex education’ because sex-workers would have us believe that all children are at it, or will be sooner rather than later, and seeing nothing wrong in this, the message must be that children should be having so-called ‘safe sex’. In addition to contraception ‘sex education’ lessons introduce children to oral and anal sex, homosexuality and every conceivable perversion; lessons can involve children in homosexual role-plays and discussions about anal intercourse, sadomasochism and ‘having multiple partners’ (or in other words, being promiscuous).

A cunning plan The aim of ‘sex education’ is to develop attitudes, ‘values’ and skills which influence the way children behave. It definitely and purposefully intends to indoctrinate a relative value system to take the place of absolute morals and thus to influence behaviour. ‘Sex education’ operates from a core ideology in which children are no different from animals, functioning only on a crude biological level, meaning they will inevitably copulate casually and without restraint from the first stirrings of pubescent sexual desire. Of course this ideology is false so sex-workers have to work hard to make it so. Accordingly ‘sex educators’ aim to destroy childrens’ natural God-given modesty and get them to listen and talk and think about sex; sex-workers seek to desensitise and de-moralise children to the extent that they are comfortable with exposure to the most explicit mechanics of sex and contraception. Once sex-workers have enticed and encouraged children to become sexually active they can then ‘feel justified’ in telling children about contraception!

The obsession of ‘sex educators’ is with the mechanics of sex. The proper purpose and place of sex in life is disregarded; sex-workers see the only purpose of sex as selfish hedonism. Morality – which penetrates the emotional and spiritual and human and divine essence of sexual union – is utterly disregarded and by implication derided. As far as ‘sex education’ does address the context of sex in relationships it does not teach that marriage is the best and only proper setting for sex – if indeed marriage gets a mention at all. What is taught with great passion is that many different types of relationship or lifestyle are all equally valid and ‘as good as each other’, so that there is no difference between marital sex or cohabitee sex or casual sex or homosexual sex or prostitute sex or child sex or whatever the teenager feels is ‘right for them’ (provided the individual has made an ‘informed choice’). Sex-workers see sex as little more than a leisure activity – no more serious a matter than deciding whether to have a ham sandwich or a sausage roll – and so the thought that the only participants should be married adults is abhorrent and absurd. Sex-workers believe children have a ‘right’ to have sex, a belief which precludes the acceptance of an orthodoxy in which only married adults are sexually active.

The ‘sex education’ industry is keen to reassure parents that what it does is wholesome and good but this is as much a deception as that visited upon the children themselves. ‘Sex educators’ may talk about teaching ‘positive values’ within a ‘moral framework’ but it’s nonsense. ‘Sex education’ does *not* teach rights and wrongs and does *not* acknowledge any objective and absolute moral standards in regard to sex – rather it is up to individuals to decide what in their own opinion is right and wrong for them. All

persuasions are presented to children by sex-workers as being of ‘equal validity’ and furthermore it is rammed home that all opinions must be respected (no matter what they are) because the only thing that is not acceptable is to be ‘intolerant’ or ‘judgemental’ of the ‘diversity’ of ‘preferences’ practised by others made on the basis of a sincere ‘informed choice’. The only right that sex-workers deny is the right of anybody to tell anyone else what they should and shouldn’t do for their own good – the right to claim and speak truth. ‘Sex educators’ specifically deny that promiscuity and perversion are wrong because they believe that everybody should be ‘free’ to do exactly as they please on the basis that if it ‘feels right’ then it must be okay; children are encouraged to do what they want guided by how they feel. The whole point of the vague and ambiguous system of relative values found in ‘sex education’ is to confuse and corrupt children into believing that nothing is immoral.

— — —

The indoctrination techniques of ‘sex education’

‘Sex educators’ use a range of tactics and techniques to corrupt children: ‘values clarification’; ‘self-esteem’ decision-making; peer pressure; shock tactics; pornography; playing games; sophisticated psychological suggestion techniques; omission of information; implication; downright lies; embarrassment. It all amounts to the manipulation of immature and impressionable young minds. ‘Sex education’ aims to familiarise children with both explicit, crude sexual language and also graphic visual sexual imagery [pornography]. Furthermore ‘sex education’ encourages children to think, talk and listen about genitalia and the physical nature of sexual activity and intercourse.

Let’s all play a game! ‘Sex educators’ engage children in playing games to overcome their sense of embarrassment about sexual indecency which is the natural response of children (and parents) to ‘sex education’ pornographic materials. The sense of embarrassment is a God-given defence mechanism embedded in children’s conscience but ‘sex educators’ know that children must be unembarrassed if they are to be receptive to explicit images and information. Sex-workers set out to literally ‘unembarrass’ their victims and so children are coaxed into using indecent words and viewing indecent pictures. ‘Sex educators’ know that exposure by itself often starts the process of desensitisation and also that peer pressure amongst children works to sex-workers’ advantage because most children do not wish to appear perturbed by anything – to be ‘uncool’ in front of friends.

Sex-workers are cunning linguists and are fond of getting children to play sex word games such as a sex words brainstorm in which children must think of as many alternative words as possible for the sex organs or for masturbation etcetera. The purpose of such exercises is clearly to get children discussing sex as openly and graphically as possible; this desensitises children and overcomes their God-given sense of modesty in order to make children comfortable in talking and thinking about sex without any sense of shame. In fact children are ‘pornographised’; children are so stripped of their innocence that they come to speak and act in the same manner as pornographic-prostitutes do.

Sex word games and sex board games like *Contraception* with its model penis cause children to think of sex itself as nothing more than a game. The explicit imagery of ‘sex education’ inflames lust in boys and spawns fantasies of having sex with the girls in class. As for girls ‘sex education’ destroys the innate feminine sense of modesty which is their defence against promiscuous sex: a girl who has looked at pictures of erect penises in class or rolled a condom down a dildo in front of everyone else is inevitably vulnerable to pressure from boys to have sex because her credibility in presenting herself as modest is shot to pieces. Killing children’s natural defensive inhibitions and sense of embarrassment – or put another way, corrupting childrens’ core conscience – by the vehicle of playing games is actually a subtle form of child abuse.

‘Values clarification’ ‘Values clarification’, often involving a ‘values continuum’, is a sophisticated technique to corrupt children into the habit of thinking about morality in terms of relative values. It rips apart all of a child’s previous moral instruction by delving deeply into young teenagers’ immature and impressionable minds and forcing them to publicly expose their most private beliefs to the glare of peer scrutiny in the classroom. For example a class is asked to say how much they agree or disagree with certain statements thus forcing each pupil to give a response and run the gauntlet of mockery and humiliation from others without any guidance or protection from the adult authority figure of the teacher. Every child is asked to respond to a set of questions or scenarios such as “Sex outside marriage is wrong” from a range of response options such as ‘always’, ‘mostly’, ‘occasionally’, ‘sometimes’, ‘possibly’, ‘maybe’, ‘depends’, ‘not really’, ‘never’. ‘Values clarification’ presents children with impossible (and adult) moral dilemmas – often bizarre situations which would never normally be encountered – which they are too immature to cope with. Note that there is no proper *teaching* going on whatsoever but children are still publicly pressurised to ‘work out an answer’ – the ‘values clarification’ technique is actually a form of ‘anti-teaching’ concerned with destroying (moral) knowledge and understanding in order to produce children confused about the difference between right and wrong (or even whether such absolutes even exist).

Furthermore the presentation of a range of response options strongly suggests to children that sex is all down to personal ‘choices’ or ‘preferences’. The keyword and key concept of sex-workers is *choice* – and especially *informed choice* – because in the ‘sex education’ mindset everybody is ‘free’ to choose from the ‘menu of sex’ just like choosing whether to have a ham sandwich or a sausage roll. By giving children lots of information about the mechanics of sex and contraception children can make *informed choices* about when, how and with whom to have sex; in so doing sex-workers mistakenly believe they are educating children.

‘Self-esteem’ decision-making Whereas the ‘values clarification’ technique is concerned with confusing and corrupting childrens’ morals, the ‘self-esteem approach’ effectively sidesteps the issue of morality entirely. ‘Values clarification’ undermines absolute authority but the ‘self-esteem approach’ simply avoids the subject altogether by means of psychological suggestion techniques which encourage children to make ‘positive’ and ‘informed’ sexual choices on the basis that sexual activity is either

‘healthy’ or ‘unhealthy’ (but never right or wrong). ‘Sex educators’ seek to develop ‘positive’ or ‘high’ self-esteem in children as the basis for children to make ‘positive’, ‘healthy’ and ‘informed choices’ about sex; according to sex-workers children are naturally promiscuous and only make ‘unhealthy sexual choices’ because they suffer from ‘negative’ or ‘low’ self-esteem.

At the heart of ‘self-esteem technique’ is the need for an individual to ‘feel good’ about their own self. The idea is that those with ‘positive’ or ‘high’ self-esteem – those who feel confident and ‘feel good inside’ – will make ‘healthy sexual choices’ (like using a condom) but those with ‘negative’ or ‘low’ self-esteem will make ‘unhealthy choices’. ‘Self-esteem technique’ teaches that a ‘positive choice’ is not based upon making a right moral decision but is generated by subjective emotions and so whatever an individual feels will make them ‘feel good’ becomes a ‘positive choice’ for that person. ‘Positive’ or ‘high’ self-esteem is held to be the condition in which the individual ‘feels good’ regardless of how he behaves and because he ‘gets what he wants’; the individual who ‘connects with his inner self’ is mystically ‘empowered’ to make ‘positive choices’ in life as guided by the ‘intrinsic emotional intelligence’ of his own feelings. The root of the ‘self-esteem technique’ for the indoctrination of children into promiscuity is either humanistic psychology or New Age paganism – take your pick. It is a subtle form of brainwashing to bypass the mind and its safeguards of moral and rational considerations by focusing entirely upon feelings and by encouraging the anticipation of emotional satisfaction. It sounds good to talk about ‘feeling good’ and not to mention morals which might cause people to ‘feel bad’; ‘self-esteem technique’ sounds good but it isn’t, however it is a powerful deception method and that’s why sex-workers are keen to use it.

— — —

The mythology and methodology of ‘sex education’

‘Sex education’ is based on a set of false assumptions: (1) that children are naturally promiscuous; (2) that children are unaware of the risks attached to promiscuous sex; (3) that because children will inevitably engage in casual sex it is therefore essential that children are ‘educated’ in how to have ‘safe sex’.

‘Sex educators’ falsely believe that children are little different to rabbits and inevitably want to copulate as soon as they hit puberty. Furthermore ‘sex educators’ are happy for children to be sexually active because ‘sex educators’ think that children have a ‘right’ to have sex which nobody should deny them (since in the ‘sex education’ mindset sex is devoid of a moral dimension and because ‘sex is so much fun’).

But children are not naturally promiscuous. Everybody is born with a God-given conscience and the core ‘moral law of God’ written upon their heart. Everybody instinctively grasps the concept that there is ‘right and wrong’ (and even those who deny God and His moral standards still have a – perverted – sense of right and wrong, with reference to their own selves as their own ‘final authority’ on moral matters, in place of the God they have rejected). Children know that promiscuity is wrong and do not readily engage in casual sexual activity without first being corrupted by the lies of ‘sex educators’ and without being inflamed with lust by the temptations of our pornographised

society. Young pubescent boys know instinctively that there is ‘something naughty’ about the ‘lads’ mags’ on the supermarket shelf and feel ashamed by the process of buying one. Even more so than boys, young pubescent girls have a natural, God-given aversion to premature and promiscuous sexual activity because of girls’ awareness of the possibility of pregnancy and also because of girls’ sensitivity to the significance of losing their virginity under wrong and dishonourable circumstances.

Just as with the essential guarantee of pornographers’ to despatch their products to customers in discreet packaging (without which their trade would decline) the reason why the ‘sex education’, contraception and abortion industry needs children to be able to access its clinics and ‘services’ in secrecy, without the knowledge or consent of parents, is because even children that have been coaxed into becoming sexually active by the ‘sex educators’ still feel guilty and ashamed to be doing what they know in their hearts to be wrong. Despite subjection to the propaganda lies of ‘sex education’ most children retain their awareness of sexual right and wrong and accordingly resist the pressure placed upon them to be promiscuous.

Facts, facts and more facts (but *not* the truth) The Teenage Pregnancy Independent⁶ Advisory Group’s *Annual Report 2007/08* stated that: “Contraception, abortion and homosexuality are all legal in this country and therefore all children and young people should be able to learn the correct facts.” ‘Sex educators’ go to great lengths to perpetuate the myth (which they created) that children are ‘sexually ignorant’, the myth that children do not appreciate ‘the facts’ about sex – ‘facts’ which children ‘need to know’ since (as ‘sex educators’ think) children are so promiscuous. The myth of promiscuous but sexually ignorant children provides ‘sex educators’ with a flimsy excuse for telling children in great detail about the mechanics of sex (including showing them explicit photographs and films) and above all for telling children about condoms so that children can make an ‘informed choice’ about just what ‘condom-protected’ sexual activity they want to engage in.

‘Sex educators’ are very keen on presenting lots of ‘facts’ about sex to children and the reason is not hard to understand. Many people confuse ‘facts’ with ‘truth’ but the two are not the same because truth always has a moral quality whereas facts do not. ‘Sex educators’ do not present children with the truth about sex because truth teaches and affirms to children the morality of sexual conduct and that would be contrary to the purposes of ‘sex educators’; instead ‘sex educators’ give children lots of ‘facts’ because by this approach the truth can be conveniently avoided. Just what is achieved by hitting kids with ‘the facts’? Well, if you’re seeking to corrupt and deprave children’s minds, as ‘sex educators’ are, the answer is there is much to be gained by hitting kids with ‘the facts’. Consider the following extract from the book *Lessons in Depravity* (2003) in which the author Dr. E.S. Williams brilliantly demonstrates the difference between sexual facts and sexual truth: “The *facts* that children are being taught about contraception do not represent truth – the truth is that children who remain chaste do not need

⁶ So-called ‘Independent’. The claim to be ‘independent’ is extremely dubious indeed!

contraception. The *facts* that children are being taught about sexually transmitted diseases are not truth – the truth is that these unpleasant diseases are the consequence of sexual immorality. Chaste children gain no benefit from having the *facts* about pubic lice, gonorrhoea and genital warts forced on them. The *facts* that children are taught about sexual orientation are not the truth – the truth is that homosexuality is a perversion, and children gain no benefit whatsoever from being taught the *facts* about sexual perversions. While sex education gives children *facts* about sex, it does not tell them the truth about God’s standard of sexual behaviour and the consequences that flow from rejecting God’s moral law. The sexual *facts* imparted by sex education are designed to undermine sexual purity and invite lustful thoughts. The *facts* compel children to turn their innocent minds to sexual matters, to focus on sex, to think about that which is immoral, unclean, depraved and perverted. The real purpose of the *facts*, so beloved by the sex educators, is to promote pornographic ideas and images, gradually introducing children into the perverted, sex-obsessed mindset of the sexual revolutionaries. The unsolicited *facts* of the sex educator invade the innocence of childhood, and what is so shocking is that schoolchildren are a captive audience who have no way of escaping the deluge of facts thrust on them in the name of sex education.”

Abstinence versus Chastity: Spot the Difference! ‘Sex education’ ideology invariably carries within it an abstinence element but – BEWARE – abstinence and chastity are *not* the same! Sex-workers tend to ‘advise’ children to abstain from sex until they decide that they feel ready and want to have sex (at the same time as telling children all about how to have ‘safe sex’ when they do feel ready). There is no moral message here at all. The abstinence message of sex-workers does not encourage what is right and discourage what is wrong. The abstinence message is not “Don’t be promiscuous, it’s wrong and it’s bad for you. Do wait to marry before you have sex, that’s the right thing to do and what’s best for you.” The abstinence message is simply “Wait if you want to, have sex when you want to. The choice is yours, nothing is wrong as long as you do what you feel is right for you.” It is clear that the ‘pro-choice pragmatism’ of the abstinence message – the ‘advice’ of ‘sex educators’ to children to “Wait for the ‘right’ moment, your feelings will tell you when” (which carries with it the heavy implication that ‘It’s only a matter of time’) – is rooted in the value system of postmodern philosophy (which does not recognise that there are any absolute rights and wrongs but only relative values based upon vague feelings).

In contrast to the abstinence message, the chastity message does not say “Wait until you want to” but rather “Wait until you’re married” – spot the difference? The chastity message is a moral message which says “Have sex only after you marry and only with the person you marry – to do anything else is totally wrong.”

The ‘safe sex’ myth Perhaps the biggest myth of all peddled by ‘sex educators’ is the myth of ‘safe sex’. By ‘safe sex’ the ‘sex educators’ mean that promiscuous sex is fine so long as condoms are used – which is a grotesque and dangerous lie (as the many who have fallen for it can testify). Condoms are NOT 100% reliable in preventing pregnancy or the transmission of disease, even when used properly 100% of the time; the failure rate of condoms due to slippage or breakage is (very conservatively) 5%. Of course most

people – and especially immature teenagers – practising promiscuous sex do not use condoms 100% of the time anyway and so it inevitably follows that the promotion of ‘condom culture’ only leads to ever more unintended pregnancies and the spread of disease. The vast majority of teenage girls that become pregnant know all about contraception beforehand but either do not bother with contraception or else fail to use it properly or consistently for every act of intercourse. A small-scale study of 147 teenage girls with unintended pregnancies reported in the *British Medical Journal* (24.06.95) found that 80% claimed to have been using contraception! Teenage children and the effective, consistent application of contraception do not go together! The stupidity of the British Government’s dogged support for ‘sex education’ would be laughable if it were not so sad; the more kids are ‘educated’ about condoms the worse the British crisis of teenage pregnancy and disease becomes.

‘Sex education’ misleads children into thinking that they will inevitably become sexually active sooner or later and that there is nothing wrong or harmful about this provided they use condoms. Of course offering condoms to children and arousing their natural inquisitiveness simply encourages them to go and have sex – and with the mistaken belief that a condom means no consequences. Furthermore, it should be remembered that because ‘sex education’ comes to children with the full support of the State through teachers, nurses and ‘sex visitors’ at school, and because the National Health Service provides free contraception to children, it is hardly surprising that children are persuaded that if the authorities condone and do nothing to discourage promiscuity then ‘surely it can’t be such a bad thing, can it?’

In addition the notion of ‘safe sex’ fails to point out that condoms do not prevent broken hearts, that condoms do nothing to prevent the psychological trauma and emotional anguish which so readily troubles promiscuous teenagers. The *Daily Mail* (22.03.07) carried a feature written by Jill Parkin under the title: “I want my child’s school to protect her – not send her home with a bag of condoms.” Following an incident in which Jill described that her fourteen-year-old daughter had come home from school with “a goody bag” of condoms given to her by sex-workers from a sex-clinic at the end of a ‘sex education’ class, Jill wrote: “I do object to the condoms, which simply amount to a bagful of encouragement. If we’re talking traffic lights, they are a green light for under-age sex. ...Sex is being portrayed to our children as somehow irresistible, so seductive that you might as well get on with it and just do your best to escape any consequences. The reality of teenage sex is usually disillusionment – perhaps someone should try telling them that. But no one ever describes the downside of early sex that can’t be fixed by condoms, pills and abortions. No one tells these girls that it can be confusing, that you can feel coerced, hurt and used. No one tells them the heretical truth – that in all probability it will be no fun at all.”

— — —

Conclusion

‘Sex education’ is evil and should be banned. British children today are most definitely not ignorant about sex, indeed the problem is that they know far too much whilst far too

young. Young teenagers should be worried about getting spots – not genital warts. ‘Sex education’ causes and aggravates the very problems it is supposed to solve and this is unsurprising because the real purpose of ‘sex education’ is to indoctrinate children into habitual sexual promiscuity and perversion. The ‘sex educators’ of today are the inheritors of the ideological tradition of the early twentieth century sexual revolutionaries; sex-workers are descendants in direct lineage from Marie Stopes and her motley crew of contemporaries – the amoral anti-Christian humanists, socialists, feminists, eugenicists, perverts and libertines which have already been considered in this book. ‘Sex education’ grooms children to become precociously promiscuous. Online paedophiles are prosecuted for the crime of grooming underage children for sexual activity but this is exactly what is going on in British classrooms under the guise of ‘sex education’. In a sane society sex-workers should be locked up – not let loose in a classroom!

Anybody with an ounce of sense can see that ‘sex education’ isn’t actually educational at all; the term *sex education* is a misnomer – it is an abuse of the word ‘education’. Good education – *real* education – inculcates in children that discipline, knowledge and wisdom which is tried, tested and proven to be trustworthy by the incontrovertible experience of preceding generations. Bad education does the exact opposite; ‘sex education’ denies the absolute truth about moral and immoral sexual decisions despite the mountain of overwhelming evidence which confirms that truth. It is no wonder that we have a generation of broken and damaged teenagers and a chaotic, self-destructing society in a state of constant crisis.

British schoolchildren are today being taught that there is no right or wrong and that they can and should do whatever they please. In terms of relationships children are being taught that there is no normative family structure along with a specific denial of the truth that the commitment and responsibility of marriage is the proper and best setting for a man and a woman to have sex and the best environment in which to raise a family. Indeed ‘sex educators’ and associated sex-workers are passionately against marriage and parental authority and there is no clearer proof of this than that they deliberately seek to drive a wedge between parents and children by ‘helping’ children in the pursuit of a promiscuous lifestyle by the provision of contraception without parental knowledge or consent. ‘Sex educators’ avoid telling children about the importance of the marriage-based family on the flimsy pretext that to do so might upset the children of unmarried parents. This attitude is not only stupid but worse it is evil (to deny or to omit the truth). It is precisely those children from broken homes with dysfunctional family backgrounds who most want and need to hear that something better awaits them in the future, that they can grow up to experience the love, joy and security of marriage and that their own children need not suffer the same deprivation.

Children should be allowed to be children and not rushed into growing up too soon. Commercial interests are the driving force behind much of the sexualisation of children. Just what are young girls doing with T-shirts, pencil cases and bags bearing the *Playboy* bunny logo? How long until the appearance of *Durex* branded pencil cases? ‘Sex education’ plays an important part in generating money for a variety of individuals and

organisations. It provides sex-workers with taxpayer-funded jobs. It is an opportunity to profit from the production and supply of the books, videos and other paraphernalia used for 'sex education'. It produces the necessary supply of victims to keep the abortion clinics busy and making lots of money. It generates demand for condoms and contraception which makes lots of money for condom and contraception manufacturers. The list goes on of people out to profit from the sexualisation of children and who therefore stand to gain from 'sex education'.

'Sex education' should be banned. It serves no good purpose that 'sex educators' indoctrinate children into condoms, pills and abortions. It is for parents alone to teach their children about the serious issues of morality, responsibility and commitment which surround intimate relationships between men and women. As for the 'mechanics of sex', no decent parent talks to a pubescent child in detail about positions or techniques, not least because it is completely unnecessary since everybody quite naturally works all that out when the time comes! In regard of the physical nature of sex, pubescent children need only to know the basic 'birds and the bees' biology which amounts to little more than that a man and woman have sex when a man puts his erect penis into a woman's vagina and ejaculates semen, which may result in the woman becoming pregnant if a sperm fertilises an egg. Pubescent girls also need some guidance about menstruation. That's about it though as far as what pubescent children genuinely *need* to know about the physical nature of sex and parents are perfectly capable of teaching their own children such basics without any outside interference. Indeed good parents have a responsibility to protect their children from exposure to the evil and danger of 'sex education' indoctrination and to warn their children against sex outside marriage.

If schools must play a role in an area of adolescent development which is properly the preserve of parents – and which is almost always done best by responsible parents – then it can be argued that it is acceptable for children to be taught basic biological information about human reproduction provided it is set in the proper moral context that human sexual activity is meant to take place only between a husband and wife; furthermore children should be warned of the consequences of doing anything other than that which is morally right and thereby be discouraged from doing wrong (as opposed to 'sex education' which does the direct opposite and actually introduces children to what is bad and then leads them into doing what is bad).

'Sex education' tacitly prepares children to become promiscuous with its utterly fraudulent suggestion of 'safe sex' and a broad range of sophisticated deception techniques by which it desensitises and literally *de-moralises* children at the same time as it arouses curiosity and inflames lust. It serves no genuine educational purpose whatsoever. It is a poisonous evil which is deeply destructive – its many thousands of victims can testify to the broken hearts, diseases, abortions and other sad consequences. The insanity of indoctrinating children into promiscuity at school must stop. So-called 'sex education' should be banned. There is only one message which children urgently need to hear, loud and clear, and that message is not condoms but CHASTITY!