

17

A Rash Of Complaints

A Rash of Complaints

The contemporary epidemic of premature and promiscuous sexual activity amongst British youth has led not only to the teenage pregnancy crisis but also to a plague of sexually-transmitted disease. An estimated 64,000 teenagers aged 15-19 were living with HIV by the end of 2005. According to the Health Protection Agency's *Annual Report* (2007) there were 7,600 new diagnoses of gonorrhoea in teenage girls in 2006 (representing 40% of all new gonorrhoea diagnoses that year). The *Daily Mail* (24.11.07) newspaper reported that: "65% of cases of chlamydia, 55% of genital warts and 48% of gonorrhoea diagnosed at clinics in 2006 were in those aged 16-24. 75% of chlamydia infections in women were in under-25s. There was a 16% rise in herpes among teenage girls [aged 16-19] between 2005 and 2006."

The *Daily Mail* (21.07.07) reported that: "Sexual infection rates have been rising almost continuously since the 1990s, with the highest increases seen in the 16-24 age group." The Government's response to the teenage STI crisis was given by a Department of Health spokesman who said: "We will continue to promote safe sex messages through initiatives such as the Condom Essential Wear campaign..." The *Daily Telegraph* (11.11.06) newspaper reported that in November 2006 the Government launched a £4 million advertising campaign to promote the use of condoms to the 18-24 year old age group. The 'Condom Essential Wear' campaign featured television advertisements in which teenagers were seen undressing each other whilst their jewellery and underwear displayed slogans like "I've got gonorrhoea." A website was also set up to provide information. The glamour-pornographic 'lads' mag' *Front* (no.111, November 2007) contained a full-page NHS advertisement as part of the Government's 'Condom Essential Wear' campaign. The advertisement's photo-image (set in a nightclub) was of a young woman wearing a top which bore the slogan "I'll give you one." The advertisement explained: "It's not this easy to tell who's got a sexually transmitted infection. That's why they're spreading fast. So watch what you pick up and make sure you use a condom." Given that the real reason "why they're spreading fast" is promiscuity isn't advertising in a pornographic magazine (which encourages promiscuity) just a little bit stupid? The underlying assumption and the implication of the Government's advertisements is that promiscuity is the accepted norm for most young people. It is an approach bound to fail because it does nothing to discourage promiscuous behaviour.

At the same time as the Government launched the 'Condom Essential Wear' campaign in November 2006 the *Leigh Reporter* reported that Wigan Council Youth Service held an event called "Sexpedition" at Lowton Civic Hall in Lancashire to promote condoms to local teenagers. The event was opened by Wigan's mayor and featured workshops run by staff from Brook, Connexions and Wigan Council's Teenage Pregnancy Unit. Six months later opposite the Asda supermarket in Leigh there was a huge hoarding carrying an NHS advertisement aimed at teenagers, which read: "CHLAMYDIA ... Be safe use a condom ... Be sure get a test." [A misleading message because condoms do not give

failsafe protection against chlamydia]. In August 2007 the *Salford Advertiser* carried a full-page advertisement placed by Salford's NHS Primary Care Trust for its sex clinics. This sort of heavy promotion of a 'condom culture', the 'morning-after pill', abortion and sexual health services is going on throughout the nation. Condom classes at the civic hall! NHS sex adverts on hoardings and in newspapers! Pause to ponder: how could it have come to this? Could it be that condoms are not the cure?

A headline in the *Daily Mail* (16.07.08) reported the: "Record rise in sexual diseases among promiscuous young adults." Though 16-24 year olds constitute only an eighth [12.5%] of the total British population this age group accounted for about half of new diagnoses of (all types of) sexual disease in 2007. 16-24 year olds accounted for 65% of new chlamydia diagnoses, 50% of new gonorrhoea diagnoses and 55% of new diagnoses of genital warts in 2007. Nearly 75% of new chlamydia and gonorrhoea diagnoses in women in 2007 were attributable to girls and young women aged 16-24.

The Chief Executive of the Family Planning Association Julie Bentley said: " 'Education, information, accessible services and widespread STI testing are imperative in improving the sexual health of the population and especially the 16 to 24-year-old age group.' "

But Norman Wells of Family and Youth Concern said: " 'The answer does not lie in yet more sex education and contraceptive schemes, but in honestly telling young people the only sure way to avoid being infected with an STI is to keep sexual intimacy within the context of a lifelong, mutually faithful relationship with an uninfected partner.' "

The FPA and the other organisations which comprise the 'sex education', contraception and abortion lobby continue to say the same old thing year after year despite the fact that the period in which the problem first emerged and then proceeded to become worse and worse aligns exactly with the time in which this lobby has held sway over public policy. It is no coincidence that teenage pregnancy, abortion and disease have gone up throughout the 1960s, the 1970s, the 1980s, the 1990s and even unto today in the same era in which the FPA and its friends have had free rein to do whatever they've wished and all funded by millions upon millions of pounds of public money with which to pursue their pro-promiscuity and perversion agenda. The FPA and its friends have a long history of failure and of being blind to the obvious reason for that failure but these organisations will continue to thrive and will carry on doing what they've done for decades until there is the political will from the Government to 'get out of bed with them' – including cutting off all public funding – in favour of a radical new policy of discouraging promiscuity whilst at the same time encouraging sex only within marriage.

The FPA and friends: a forty year track record of failure

The years 1930 and 1970 had almost identical crude birth rates of around 16 per 1000. In 1930 there was no free contraception, no 'sex education' and abortion was illegal. Sex was kept within marriage by the majority and it was unthinkable that teenage children might have sex. In 1930 the total number of British illegitimate births was 27,000 out of 630,000 [4.3%].

In 1970 contraceptive pills and condoms were freely available, 'sex education' was widespread and abortion was available on demand. Promiscuity had become permissible for a growing number of young people. In 1970 the total number of illegitimate births was 64,000 out of 789,000 [8.1%] – not to mention 120,000 abortions (mostly for young single women).

In the early 1970s 'sex education' television programmes were broadcast to schools, there was a large increase in the number of contraceptive clinics and the [so-called] Health Education Council and the [so-called] Family Planning Association produced and distributed a large amount of public information about contraception. The 'sex education' and contraception industry predicted that the result of all these efforts would be a fall in the rate of teenage abortions however, unsurprisingly, the rate all but doubled. For twelve to eighteen-year-old British girls the number of abortions increased from 11.3 per 1000 in 1970 to 21.8 per 1000 in 1975.

Following the coming into force of an NHS Reorganisation Act in 1974 contraception henceforth became freely available to all with provision regardless of age or marital status by the NHS. This included children under the age of consent and furthermore the Act allowed doctors to give contraception to schoolgirls without even the knowledge, never mind the consent of parents! Agents of the State could usurp the authority of parents over their own children in a matter of the greatest importance – even keep parents in absolute ignorance – and this has remained the case ever since.

In a letter to *The Times* (16.06.86) newspaper in 1986 the House of Lords peer Lord Buckmaster noted the: "...all too frequent coupling of sex education with the provision of contraception, in the mistaken belief that the wider availability of contraceptives reduces unwanted teenage pregnancies. In fact, it would seem to encourage experimentation. Furthermore, a young girl makes a poor candidate for the regular, daily administration of the pill, which, incidentally, causes 150 different hormone changes in her body. During the decade up to 1984 the number of illegitimate births to girls under 20 increased by almost 60 per cent – and this at a time when organisations like the Brook Advisory Centres and the Family Planning Association were peddling the pill as never before, with substantial support from public funds."

In 1976 the FPA set itself targets to halve the number of abortions and illegitimate births within a decade. The FPA's annual report for 1986 stated that the organisation had distributed over fifty million items of contraception information since 1976 but for some reason neglected to comment on its targets set ten years before. In 1976 there were 130,000 abortions in England and Wales but in 1986 there were 172,000 abortions. In 1976 there were 19,600 illegitimate births to teenagers but ten years later the number had doubled to 39,600. Far from achieving reductions the enormous efforts of the FPA to 'sex educate' the population had only made matters worse but, for some strange reason, the FPA was allowed to continue doing more of the same and all funded by large amounts of public money.

Statistics in the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists' (RCOG) report *Unplanned Pregnancy* (1991) were commented upon by Dr. James le Fanu in the *Sunday Telegraph* (06.10.91) newspaper thus: "In the first year of the Abortion Act of 1968, there

were 4,000 abortions among the under-20s, a figure which, two years later, had risen to 15,000. In an attempt to combat this rising trend, the RCOG in 1972 called for more sex education and universal free access to contraceptive services for all women to be provided by a network of nationally funded family planning clinics. These were set up in the following years, but by 1977 the number of teenage abortions had reached 28,000. Since then the numbers have continued to rise and the most recent statistics reveal there are now 40,000 teenage abortions a year. It thus appears that sex education and universal access to contraception, far from reducing the number of abortions, has actually increased them.”

The following extract from an article in the *Daily Telegraph* (28.03.93) grasped the truth that the school ‘sex education’ industry and the contraception industry are the root cause of rising teenage pregnancies, abortions and infections: “In 1976, for example, 23 in every thousand girls under 16 visited clinics for contraceptive services, 7.9 got pregnant and 4.2 had abortions. In 1990, 67 took the advice, 10.1 got pregnant and 5.1 had abortions. The trend is so persistent that one wonders if the contraceptive propagandists really believe their own argument that more condoms will reduce unwanted pregnancies, or whether they are just in favour of contraception for other reasons... The current idea of sex education in schools would be laughable if it were not so sad.”

‘Condom culture’ By 1992 annual UK sales of condoms had arrived at the 150,000,000 mark, which was an increase of 110% since 1980, but the more ‘condom culture’ expanded the worse the problems of unwanted pregnancies and sexual diseases became. The development of a ‘condom culture’ in the UK since the late 1980s is thanks in large part to the hysteria and panic surrounding AIDS whipped up by the AIDS lobby of vested interest groups. AIDS is an incurable disease of the immune system caused by the (usually sexually acquired) HIV virus which results in a sufferer’s death from infections which his body’s immune system is no longer able to fight off. AIDS was first identified in 1982 and the mooted possibility of an AIDS epidemic became a major public concern in 1986 (and for several years afterwards). The truth is that the AIDS threat emerged from amongst and was spread by promiscuous homosexuals but because it is possible to contract HIV through heterosexual intercourse with an infected person the UK Government launched a national ‘safe sex’ condom campaign in 1986-87 including the *AIDS: Don’t Die of Ignorance* television advertisement and the BBC broadcast what it called ‘public information films’ about condoms.

This was a cynical farce from start to finish because AIDS was overwhelmingly a danger only to homosexual perverts; the likelihood of acquiring HIV from heterosexual intercourse in the UK was tiny. However the AIDS lobby – which comprised ‘sex education’ organisations, ‘gay rights’ pervert organisations and condom manufacturers – managed to whip the British Government into a frenzy with scare-stories of an impending AIDS epidemic and estimates of tens of thousands of HIV infections by the mid 1990s. The AIDS lobby went into overdrive promising that AIDS was a public health threat of enormous magnitude which would likely kill thousands upon thousands of normal heterosexual people within a few years if nothing was done. The AIDS lobby implacably

denied that AIDS was primarily a 'gay plague' and firmly insisted firstly that AIDS was a major threat to the heterosexual population and secondly that the only answer was condoms and 'sex education'.

Of course the predicted epidemic never materialised and the estimates trumpeted in the 1980s were shown up for the wild exaggerations that they were. In fact only 2,741 HIV infections were diagnosed in the UK in 1992 (of which only 143 cases were due to heterosexual acquisition in the UK). But the AIDS lobby stood to benefit enormously from its elaborately orchestrated deceit. It was a great way to sell more condoms and to get the Government to hand over millions of pounds to any organisation promoting a so-called 'safe sex' message. Despite the fact that the chance of HIV infection through heterosexual intercourse in the UK was minimal the AIDS lobby propagandists delighted in their 'Anyone Can Get AIDS' scaremongering as the Government threw money at them to impose their vision of a 'condom culture'. In August 1990 'National Condom Week' was launched to advance a 'condom culture' in which buying and carrying condoms is the everyday norm. The condom barons were understandably delighted. All this happened despite the fact that condom promotion was obviously a root cause of the problem of sexual disease transmission and not the solution.

The naked opportunism lying behind the AIDS lobby was never better exemplified than by the businessman Richard Branson who launched his own condom campaign (in parallel with the Government's) with ITV advertisements to promote his Virgin Group's *Mates* condom brand which went on sale in shops and vending machines in every public place possible. Branson (and others) cashed in on the fear of AIDS in order to profit from the sale of condoms by means of condom advertising techniques which condoned and encouraged promiscuity as the social norm. The message was not avoid promiscuity but rather use our condoms to have promiscuous 'safe sex'. Of course in promoting promiscuity to sell condoms (since condoms hold little appeal to the chaste or the faithfully married) and because condoms are far from failsafe, the businessmen who sought to profit from AIDS hysteria were actually working directly against their ostensibly noble, publicly-stated aims of containing the AIDS threat because the promiscuous behaviour they promoted was the root cause of disease transmission. However behind the façade of social responsibility, and though 'safe sex' condom ideology was an obvious nonsense, the condom businessmen made lots of money and since that was the real purpose of their endeavours in that regard they were entirely successful.

Ten years on from the initial hysteria it was clearly obvious by 1997 to anyone willing to be honest that the promised heterosexual AIDS epidemic of the 1990s had not happened. Though it had been forcefully predicted that AIDS would kill up to 15,000 people annually by the late 1990s in fact there were only 508 AIDS-related deaths in the UK in 1998. Furthermore, according to the AIDS/HIV quarterly surveillance tables of the Health Protection Agency (no.58, May 2003), since AIDS was first identified up to the end of 1997 the vast majority of British AIDS diagnoses were the 10,672 homosexuals who caught the disease. By contrast over the same period only 291 people were diagnosed with AIDS on account of exposure to a presumed heterosexually infected

partner in the UK. Put another way, over the whole period of the supposed British heterosexual AIDS epidemic there was an average of just nineteen new cases of AIDS annually as a result of promiscuous heterosexual intercourse within the UK! It cannot be denied that far and away the highest risk group for HIV was promiscuous homosexual perverts but regardless of this the NHS allocated over £52 million to ‘AIDS prevention’ in 1997, much of which money was thrown in grants at any organisation which dished out condoms or pushed the ‘safe sex’ lies of ‘sex education’ ideology. Furthermore, despite the probability of schoolchildren getting AIDS being about as likely as a lottery win, the Government determined that every British secondary schoolchild should be taught how to use a condom.

‘Emergency contraception’ The rise of so-called ‘emergency contraception’ is perhaps the ultimate testimony to the failure of ‘sex education’ and ‘condom culture’. By definition it means that the practice of contraception has failed. ‘Emergency contraception’ first became available from General Practitioners in 1985 but in January 2001 the Labour Government made it available over the counter from pharmacists for girls (and women) aged sixteen or more. In 1989 the total number of prescriptions issued in England was 157,000; in 1994 there were 460,000 prescriptions; in 1997 there were 770,000 prescriptions. In the year 2000 ‘family planning’ clinics issued 240,000 prescriptions for ‘emergency contraception’ (of which about 25,000 were for girls under sixteen). In the same year General Practitioners issued 550,000 prescriptions (but there is no record of how many were for underage girls). Clearly ‘emergency contraception’ was already being used on a large scale when the Government decided to make it more easily available via pharmacists in 2001. In England alone the annual number of prescriptions for the ‘morning-after pill’ is now running in excess of the million mark.

The ‘safe sex’ con (and its close relative the ‘safer sex’ con)

There is no such thing as ‘safe sex’ in the sense in which ‘sex educators’ and contraceptive advocates mean, namely that promiscuous sex is safe provided condoms are used. Even the slightly different claim that promiscuous sex with condoms amounts to ‘safer sex’ (though not such an obvious outright lie) is a misleading and dubious claim and, perhaps ironically, because it is more subtle (by being less obviously untrue) it is in a certain sense arguably more deceitful and therefore potentially more dangerous. The truth is that the only truly safe sex is that which takes place between two uninfected partners who have never had sex with anyone else (and never will). It hardly needs to be said that two virgins who marry and remain faithful for life epitomise safe sex. The problem of the ‘un-safety’ of sex plagues only the promiscuous. Good sex – the sex that takes place in a faithful marriage – is perfectly safe. Sex in the right setting is never a problem. It is not sex in itself that is dangerous but *promiscuous sex* (and perverted sex) that is inherently dangerous.

Woman Alive (February 2004) magazine reported that: “A recent workshop on the growth of STIs concluded that there is no evidence that the spread of Human Papilloma Virus (HPV), which is responsible for 98% of cervical carcinoma, is reduced by the use of condoms. Equally, there is no evidence that condoms check the spread of other common

STIs such as chlamydia and herpes. Why are condoms so ineffective? They break, slip or are forgotten during sexual intercourse, particularly when drugs or alcohol are involved. A study in 2001 in the medical journal *The Lancet* reported that failure rates are significantly higher in younger users and those who are cohabiting rather than married. In people whose primary contraceptive method is condoms, there is an unintended pregnancy rate of between 6 and 14%.”

The number of sexual partners is the key risk factor in whether or not a person will catch sexual disease – not whether that person does or does not use condoms. A key conclusion of the National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (2000, Johnson et al) was that the: “...benefits of condom use were offset by increases in reported partners.” Even when used correctly and consistently (100% of the time) without any burst or tear or other misfortune, condoms are not a reliable form of protection against viral infections such as hepatitis and HIV. Bear in mind that the HIV virus is a fraction the size of a spermatozoa. And of course even during 100% consistent use condoms *do* burst and tear and slip; the conservative figure for condom failure is 5%. [Incidentally we are here concerned with condom performance in relation to normal vaginal intercourse; condoms are virtually useless where perverted anal penetration is concerned.]

Condom failure then is a commonplace experience even in consistent use but of course the overwhelming majority of promiscuous people do not use condoms consistently at all. The inconsistent use of condoms does not effectively decrease the transmission of many sexual diseases which is alarming because well over two-thirds of promiscuous British men and women only use condoms on an inconsistent basis. Even consistent use of condoms tends only to delay – but does not prevent – the transmission of many sexual infections including for example the human papilloma virus, herpes simplex and genital warts. In the case of regular, ongoing promiscuous sexual intercourse as ‘protected’ by the consistent use of condoms, the ‘protection’ afforded by condoms often delays but rarely prevents the transmission of gonorrhoea, chlamydia and syphilis; consistent condom use means that these diseases tend to be transmitted within several years (rather than within several months where condoms are not used consistently or not used at all).

Many in the younger generation not only start having sex earlier than ever before but furthermore they will probably have more lifetime sexual partners and also often engage in riskier sexual activities. For those born about 1930 the average age of loss of virginity was twenty-one; for those born about 1950 it was nineteen; for the current 16-24 age group (those born about 1990) the average is between fifteen and seventeen and it should be stressed that it is now not uncommon for fifteen-year-olds to have sexual experience – perhaps as many as a third of today’s fifteen-year-olds have had sex. Many young men will now have twelve lifetime sexual partners and many young women will now have seven lifetime sexual partners. That the current 16-24 generation has a markedly higher number of different sexual partners and an earlier sexual debut compared to previous generations explains why it is the generation most plagued by sexual disease – regardless of condom habits.

The solution to the crisis caused by ‘safe sex’

The solution to the present British disease crisis is to kill promiscuity because that is the root cause. Increasing the availability and easy accessibility of sex-clinics is not the answer to the disease crisis and neither is dependence upon the promotion and distribution of condoms but these measures are all the current Labour Government has to offer given its refusal to pursue a moral policy of encouraging good sexual behaviour whilst discouraging bad sexual behaviour. In fact with its ‘sex education’ agenda to indoctrinate British schoolchildren with ‘safe sex’ condom mythology the Government remains hellbent on continuing to condone and encourage bad sexual behaviour! The British Government’s current policy regarding sexual health is based upon the Department of Health’s *National Strategy for Sexual Health and HIV* (2001) [and also the Teenage Pregnancy Strategy]. The reduction of promiscuity is not an aim of the National Strategy and neither does it aim to encourage true safe sex (that is mutual monogamy with an uninfected partner). Indeed the National Strategy does not even mention the word *marriage*! It is a strategy which has failed since its inception and inevitably it will continue to fail because the strategy does nothing to deal with the chief cause of the problem – high and increasing levels of promiscuity. In fact in going about things in the wrong way the National Strategy actually contributes to making matters worse!

The *only* workable political policy that could succeed in solving the crisis, if any Government ever implements it, would be a prolonged public health campaign to modify sexual behaviour with a heavy emphasis on discouraging promiscuity (and perversion) whilst at the same time encouraging sex within marriage (on the basis of chastity before marriage and faithfulness thereafter). Repeat: the discouragement of promiscuity and the encouragement of the practice of marriage morality is the *only* solution that will ever work. The experience of other countries proves this, not least Uganda. In a January 2003 press release (*The ‘ABCs’ of HIV Prevention*) the United States Agency for International Development noted that: “Recent data from Uganda and other countries where HIV prevalence has been reduced or stabilized suggest that an ‘ABC’-based approach can alter patterns of personal behaviour... Successful prevention programs in places like Uganda, Senegal and Jamaica have employed a multi-pronged approach to behaviour change, involving promotion of abstinence or delayed onset of sexual debut and fidelity/partner reduction, along with condom use especially for higher risk sexual encounters.”

Uganda has been remarkably successful in reducing the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases and HIV in particular, in stark contrast to the abysmal failure of the UK. Uganda’s success is thanks to a strong commitment to the promotion of an ‘ABC’ approach to sex and relationships, that is: *Abstinence, Be faithful, or use Condoms*. This approach is both moral and pragmatic; the emphasis is heavily placed upon encouraging ‘A’ and ‘B’ – with ‘C’ being simply the pragmatic advice given to those who choose to act irresponsibly by engaging in promiscuity. By pursuing this ‘ABC’ policy with its heavy emphasis upon reducing promiscuity the number of people acquiring HIV in Uganda went into steep decline. Between 1991 and 1998 HIV prevalence in Uganda

declined (nationally) from 21% to 9.8% and the single most important factor in this was the 65% decrease in non-regular sexual partners which took place between 1989 and 1995. Interestingly many other African countries which began to implement Western-style 'sex education' and 'condom culture' policies saw HIV cases go up at the same time as Uganda saw its HIV cases go down because of the big drop in the number of sexual partners amongst Ugandans.

— — —

We have seen that children going to *Sex School* leads to *Babies having Babies* and *A Rash of Complaints*. Homosexuals have much to complain about, not least HIV. The *Daily Mail* (24.11.07) reported that HIV: "...transmission among gay men continues to rise as they ignore safe sex messages." In one sense it is unsurprising that gay men "ignore safe sex messages" because gay men know more than most that there is no such thing as 'safe sex' where promiscuous sexual activity with condoms is concerned. Gay men know that condoms are virtually useless and presumably that is why most don't bother to use them. Though many homosexuals suffer from 'condom-o-phobia' this fact has never prevented the militant homosexual lobby from being one of the loudest advocates in support of the promotion of 'condom culture' to schoolchildren by means of 'sex education'. Hypocrisy and homosexuality have always walked hand-in-hand; hypocrites are people who pretend to be something they are not, and so are homosexuals (since they pretend to be of the opposite gender to their actual gender)! 'Condom-o-phobia' doesn't bother the militant homosexual lobby but so-called 'homophobia' does. If there's one thing that brings militant gays out in a rash of tantrums it is perceived 'homophobia' and so the prevention of 'homophobia' is just one reason amongst many why the gays are so keen on 'sex education' because it is an effective means by which to queer children's minds into thinking in the same perverted way.

In 1999 *The Sun* (13.11.99) newspaper reported that a video and accompanying information pack produced by Avon Health Authority and presented as "a guide to challenging homophobia" had so far been bought by seventy-six schools across the UK. The 'sex education' programme encouraged children to act out homosexual perversions in class including, astonishingly, pretending to be homosexual men touting for sex in public lavatories! Other role-plays for children to try included pretending to be a bisexual granny, a wheelchair-bound lesbian and a pain-freak. Children were 'advised' to: "Try experimenting with other boys and girls and see who you feel most comfortable with." The "Spot the Heterosexual" lesson required children to look at nine faces and guess at sexual preferences. A spokeswoman for the Authority claimed the video promoted 'tolerance'.

In July 2007 the social and political campaigning section of the Maranatha Community reported in its *Trumpet Call!* publication that: "A pilot scheme has been launched in UK schools, introducing books dealing with gay issues to children aged 4 to 11. It is argued

that it is necessary to make homosexuality seem normal to children. Books with titles such as 'King & King' and 'Asha's Mums' will be released as a result of funding amounting to £600,000 from the Economic and Social Research Council. Significantly, the Director of the 'No Outsiders' Project, Elizabeth Atkinson said 'I know how powerful children's literature is in shaping social values and emotional development.' Parents are worried about this and do not believe homosexuality should be forced on young children."

Homosexuals however are very keen indeed that "homosexuality should be forced on young children"! Homosexuals see no reason at all why children should not place *An Onus On Anus...*