

CSE 101:

An overview of Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE)

- I. What is Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE)?**
 - a. The Deceptive CSE Agenda**
 - b. Why CSE is NOT Traditional Sex-Ed**
- II. Disturbing Examples from CSE Curricula**
 - a. Controversial Excerpts from International Curricula and Standards**
 - The International Guidelines on Sexuality Education**
 - World Health Organization Sexuality Education Standards**
 - b. Controversial Excerpts from U.S. CSE Curricula and Guidelines**
 - The National Sexuality Education Standards**
 - Advocates for Youth CSE Curricula**
- III. The History Behind the Deceptive CSE Agenda**
 - a. Alfred Kinsey, the Father of the Sexual Rights Revolution**
 - b. From Kinsey to Planned Parenthood to SIECUS to the UN to Children Across the World**
- IV. Core False Philosophies Behind CSE**
- V. False Claims Often Made About CSE**
- VI. How CSE Harms Children**
- VII. How CSE Violates and Undermines Parental Rights**
- VIII. Why CSE is Not Evidence Based: What the Research Shows**
- IX. Who Promotes or Profits from CSE?**
- X. Protect Children from Harmful CSE**

I. What is Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE)?

According to the American College of Pediatricians, so-called *Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE)* is one of the greatest assaults there has ever been on the health and innocence of children. Now she gave it to me verbally This is because, unlike traditional sex education, comprehensive sexuality education is highly explicit and promotes promiscuity and high-risk sexual behaviors as healthy and normal for children.

Ironically, although CSE programs are labeled “comprehensive,” they are anything but comprehensive as they fail to teach children about all of the emotional, psychological and physical health risks of promiscuous sexual activity. Instead, these programs have a narrow, almost obsessive focus on teaching children how to obtain sexual pleasure in a variety of ways.

The ultimate goal of CSE is to radically change society by changing sexual and gender norms. They do this by encouraging and normalizing sexual activity among children, and indoctrinating them with the idea that they are sexually autonomous beings with “sexual rights” that must be realized.

In order for alleged sexual rights to be fulfilled, activists claim governments must provide children with unfettered access to “comprehensive” sexual information that from a young age encourages them to explore and experiment with any and all forms of sexual activity. Some programs even encourage sexual exploration for children as young as age five.

Many CSE programs also (i) promote acceptance and exploration of diverse sexual identities and orientations, (ii) enlist youth to advocate for abortion and other controversial alleged “sexual rights,” and (iii) encourage children to fight against traditional values and gender norms regarding marriage and sexuality, which children are taught to label as “heterosexism,” “homophobia,” and “transphobia.”

For all of these reasons, CSE could be more accurately called “abortion, promiscuity, and LGBT rights education.” In reality, CSE’s so-called comprehensive and “rights-based” approach does little more than promote radical sexual rights to children at the expense of their sexual health.

a. The Deceptive CSE Agenda

Comprehensive sexuality education is usually disguised with innocuous sounding names, such as “human rights education,” “gender equality education,” “sexual and reproductive health education” or “reproductive health information.” CSE is typically taught to children from the time they enter school—at the age of four or five—often without the knowledge or consent of their parents.

As opposition to CSE has increased as more parents are learning about its explicit nature, CSE advocates have become better at disguising it. For example, some CSE programs are called “abstinence,” or “abstinence plus” programs; they have little or no focus on abstinence.

Be forewarned that just because a program is not specifically labeled “comprehensive sexuality education” does not mean it is not CSE. So, while some education programs may be called “sexual education,” “sexuality education,” “sex education,” or a number of other things, they can still be based on the harmful, pleasure and gratification-based, sexual-rights philosophy that is at the center of CSE.

Regardless of what a program may be called, if a sex education program has any of the **15 Harmful CSE Elements that are typically found in CSE programs**, that program should be considered CSE and should be opposed (see “How CSE Harms Children” under section VI of this document).

b. Why CSE is NOT Traditional Sex-Ed

Although CSE instruction may include concepts covered by traditional sex education programs, these radical programs are vastly different from standard sex ed instruction. This is because CSE usually only mentions abstinence education in passing, and then goes into great detail about sexual acts, often using sexually explicit materials and visuals. In fact, an underlying goal of CSE is to desensitize children to sexual things.

Planned Parenthood, one of the largest purveyors of sexuality education in the United States, reveals on its website that sexuality education addresses among other things, “values exploration,” “safer sex,” “sexual attitudes and values,” “sexual orientation,” and “sexual pleasure.”¹

The following excerpt from a presentation at the United Nations by Miriam Grossman, MD, one of the foremost experts in the United States on sexuality education,² further illustrate how CSE is radically different than traditional sex education:

I’ve discovered that the vision of groups such as Planned Parenthood and SIECUS—the groups at the helm of sexuality education in the U.S.—is not sexual health. It is sexual freedom. These large and powerful organizations believe in sexuality that extends from cradle to grave. They tacitly endorse early sexual activity and multiple partners as well as sexual experimentation, which are the very behaviors that fuel the epidemics of sexually transmitted diseases, HIV/AIDS, abortion and emotional distress.

Those people who practice the lifestyles endorsed by these groups have more doctors’ appointments, not less . . . I’ve studied the history of sex education and one of the things you need to understand is that sex education is a social movement. Its goal is to change society. That was true 50 years ago when it began, and it’s still true. The objective is to change my society, and now, yours.

Quoting UNESCO’s International Guidelines on Sexuality Education, Dr. Grossman stated:

¹ See: www.PlannedParenthood.org

² See: <http://www.miriamgrossmanmd.com/>

One of the learning objectives [of sexuality education] is to ‘change social norms.’ [Those who advocate for comprehensive sexuality education] envision a world without sexual taboos and restrictions—a world free of Judeo/Christian morality where each individual, regardless of age, should be free to make his or her own sexual choices...and no judgment [is] allowed.... It’s an ‘anything goes as long as you use a condom’ philosophy of sex education.

In other words, comprehensive sexuality education is a recipe for sexual anarchy.

II. Disturbing Examples from International and U.S.-Based CSE Curricula

a. Controversial Excerpts from International Curricula and Standards

Most people have a hard time believing that there is actually a movement to sexualize children and indoctrinate them into a sexual agenda through CSE. Yet, even a cursory review of actual excerpts from harmful CSE materials can show parents and policymakers how true this is. The following are highly controversial excerpts from UN-endorsed CSE manuals.

Excerpts from UN-Funded or -Supported Sexuality Education Programs

The International Guidelines on Sexuality Education referred to above is a publication issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in collaboration with other UN agencies including UNICEF, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and the World Health Organization (WHO). These Guidelines maintain that children have a right to receive instruction in sexual pleasure, masturbation and homosexuality, among other things.

The publication is promoted under the guise of the prevention of unwanted pregnancy, coercive or abusive sexual activity, and sexually transmitted infections (STIs), including HIV/AIDS. The International Guidelines are intended to drive sex education programs taught to children in schools worldwide and give “Learning Objectives” for various age levels, including the following:

Learning Objectives for Level I (ages 5-8)

- “Girls and boys have private body parts that can feel pleasurable when touched by oneself.” (p. 43)
- “Bodies can feel good when touched.” (p. 48)
- “Masturbation is not harmful, but should be done in private.” (p. 48)

Learning Objectives for Level II (ages 9-12)

- “Both men and women can give and receive sexual pleasure.” (p. 43)
- “Relationship between excitement and vaginal lubrication, penile erection and ejaculation.” (p. 44)
- “Many boys and girls begin to masturbate during puberty.” (p. 44)
- “Definition and function of orgasm.” (p. 49)

Learning Objectives for Level III (ages 12-15)

- “Both men and women can give and receive sexual pleasure with a partner of the same or opposite sex.” (p. 50)
- “Everyone is responsible for their own and their partner’s sexual pleasure and can learn to communicate their likes and dislikes.” (p. 50)
- “Access to safe abortion and post-abortion care.” (p. 52)

One of the most dangerous concepts promoted by the Guidelines is that sexual behaviors among children are without risk of unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections.

The UNESCO sexuality education guidelines also refer readers to the “The Pleasure Project,” which includes “Global Mapping of Pleasure: A directory of organizations, programmes, media and people who eroticize safer sex.”³ This website has the tagline, “Putting the sexy into safer sex since 2004. Because sex education is rarely sexy. And erotica is rarely safe.” It outlines activities to “*break the inhibitions...with terms around sex, sexuality and pleasure*” and describes a group activity to learn about words for describing “*sexual acts, sexual organs and pleasure.*”

These Guidelines ultimately will increase the very negative consequences of sexual behavior in youth they claim to prevent. So, what UNESCO labels “comprehensive education on human sexuality” is very dangerous indeed.

UNESCO’s most recent version includes a title change: *International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education*. Due to public outcry, some of the worst parts of the original publication have been toned down; however, it still contains disturbing material including referring children to the “The Pleasure Project.”

The World Health Organization’s (WHO) Standards for Sexuality Education in Europe

One of the most egregious examples of harmful CSE standards for children comes from what has been known as one of the most respected health organizations in the world, The World Health Organization (WHO). Sadly, at least some parts of the WHO have been seized by sexual rights activists, which is evidenced by the following excerpts from their sexuality education standards for Europe.⁴

These standards instruct educators to:

(For Children Age 0-4 years)

- “Give information about enjoyment and pleasure when touching one’s body
- [Provide information on] “**early childhood masturbation**”
- “Enable children to **gain an awareness of gender identity**”
- “Give the right to **explore gender identities.**”

³ Available at <http://thepleasureproject.org/global-mapping-of-pleasure/>

⁴ See: http://www.oif.ac.at/fileadmin/OEIF/andere_Publikationen/WHO_BZgA_Standards.pdf

(For Children Age 4-6 years)

- “Give information about **early childhood masturbation**”
- “Give information about **same-sex relationships**”
- “Help children develop respect for **different norms regarding sexuality.**”

(For Children Age 6-9 years)

- “Give information about...**different methods of conception**”
- “Give information about enjoyment and pleasure when touching one’s own body and **early childhood masturbation**”
- “Give information about friendship and **love towards people of the same sex.**”

(For Children Age 9-12 years)

- “Give information about **different types of contraception...enable children to use condoms and contraceptives** effectively in the future”
- “Give information about **pleasure, masturbation, orgasm**”
- “Give information about **sexual rights as defined by the International Planned Parenthood Federation** and the **World Association for Sexual Health.**”

[It should be noted that International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), in their “Healthy, Happy, and Hot” brochure, tells HIV-infected youth that their sexual rights include a right to not have to disclose their HIV status to their sexual partners. And WHO is sending 9-year-olds to IPPF. Go to InvestigateIPPF.org to learn more about the harmful things IPPF is teaching young, impressionable children about sex and sexual rights.]

(For Children Age 12-15 years)

- “Give information about **gender identity** and **sexual orientation**, including coming-out/homosexuality”
- “Give information about **pleasure, masturbation, orgasm**”
- “Enable teenagers to **obtain and use condoms and contraceptives effectively.**”

(For Age 15 and up)

- “Help teenagers to develop a **critical view of different cultural/religious norms** related to pregnancy, parenthood, etc.”
- “Help teenagers to develop a change from possible negative feelings, disgust and hatred towards homosexuality to acceptance and celebration of sexual differences.”

b. Controversial Excerpts from U.S. CSE Curricula and Guidelines

In tandem with what is happening in the international arena—and often at the hands of the same entities, or their partners—CSE is being forcefully pushed and is finding tremendous inroads in the United States as well.

The National Sexuality Education Standards

The National Sexuality Education Standards: Core Content and Skills, K-12 (NSES) is a set of guidelines and standards created for U.S. schools by sexual rights advocacy groups, including Advocates for Youth, NEA-Health Information Network, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), Answer Michigan Department of Education and several others.

Additional reviewers of the standards include among others, Columbia University, Guttmacher Institute, Widener University, SexEtc.com, and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Division of Adolescent and School Health, Planned Parenthood of the Southern Finger Lakes and many others.

Although from the title of these standards, it appears that they are government-endorsed and thus authoritative for all U.S. schools; nothing could be farther from the truth.

The “Standards” are basically a marketing piece for the organizations that created them, as they refer teachers to the authors’ own websites and programs. More troubling still is the fact that the “Standards” refer young students to highly controversial “resources,” such as Advocates for Youth, Answer’s Teen to Teen Sexuality Education initiative, Sex Etc. and others.

The “Standards” contain some helpful guidelines for what might be appropriate to teach youth at about sex at various ages, but these teachings are interlaced with subtle and not-so-subtle controversial concepts. They encourage teachers to subtly manipulate children by asking them to question societal expectations about sex and gender. One of the hidden underlying goals of the “Standards” is to get impressionable children to internalize their principles and then to become advocates for abortion and controversial gender and sexual ideologies. For example, the Standards state:

By the grades 9-12, students will learn how to differentiate between biological sex, sexual orientation and gender identity and expression and analyze the influence around them on those issues. Advocacy within the school will be further cemented in these grades. Students will also be taught to identify the laws surrounding reproductive health care services [Read abortion], Finally, these students will be taught pregnancy options including abortion.

Also students are encouraged to:

Analyze external influences that have an impact on one’s attitudes about gender, sexual orientation and gender identity. Access accurate information about gender identity, gender expression and sexual orientation. Communicate respectfully with and about people of all gender identities, gender expressions and sexual orientations.

Students also are asked to:

Describe human sexual response cycle, including the role hormones play.

This is a euphemistic way of saying children will be taught about sexual pleasure, orgasm, ejaculation etc., as the organizations that wrote these standards all publish *or promote curricula that go into detail about all of these elements.*

In sum, the end goal of the specific CSE programs promoted by the authors of these “Standards” is to desensitize children to sexual language and sexual acts, get them to embrace controversial and medically inaccurate sexual and gender ideologies, and to turn youth into sexual rights advocates.

c. Other U.S.-Based CSE Curricula

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE FOLLOWING EXCERPTS FROM CSE CURRICULA ONLY SCRATCH THE SURFACE OF THE MANY HARMFUL CSE PROGRAMS THAT ARE BEING IMPLEMENTED ACROSS THE UNITED STATES.

Rights, Respect, Responsibility (3Rs)

This CSE program was created by Advocates for Youth and implemented in California schools and includes the following controversial excerpts:

- “Choose activities with **little to no risk like oral sex.**” (For ages 14 and up, high school book, pg. 60)
- “People can reduce their STI risk further by **using flavored condoms** or other barriers like dental dams.” (For ages 14 and up, high school book, pg. 78)
- **Queer***—“This term can be used in a number of positive ways: Someone may feel like the other categories are too restrictive and don’t describe them accurately, or someone may wish to take back the negative meaning of the word and use it as a positive way of describing who they are. (Students often struggle with this term due its prior negative use.)”
- “... **bisexual and pansexual people may say, “I am attracted to people of all genders, but I tend to prefer being in relationships with _____.”**” (For ages 13-14, 8th grade book, pg. 21)

- **“Point to the clitoris** and say, ‘This is the clitoris, located above the urethral opening, and it is very sensitive.’” (For ages 11-12, 6th grade book, pg. 21)
- Scenario to consider: “Your boyfriend or girlfriend invites you and two other couples over on a night when their parents are out. You are all in one main room together and each couple is kissing. At some point you hear someone say, ‘I think we all need some more privacy,’ and soon both of the other couples disappear. Your boyfriend or girlfriend looks at you and says, ‘Now that we’re alone, maybe we can finally take things to the next level.’” (For ages 13-14, 8th grade book, pg. 138)
- **“Dry sex, or when two people rub their genitals together, is very low risk...—** If they are completely clothed, there is zero risk. If they are naked, there is more risk.” (For ages 13-14, 8th grade book, pg. 78)
- “So tongue kissing is very low risk for transmitting an STI, and **mutual masturbation** and using a public toilet cannot transmit STIs.” (For ages 13-14, 8th grade book, pg. 78)
- **“Tell students that dental dams are flavored because they are designed specifically for safer oral sex.”** (For ages 14 and up, High school book, pg. 85)
- “A cut-open, flavored ‘male’ **condom** can be used for oral sex.” (For ages 14 and up, high school book, pg. 83)
- “A person can choose to let people know their gender in whatever way feels comfortable or right to them.” (For ages 11-12, 6th grade book, pg. 44)
- **“What I’d like you to do now is think about what you perceive would be different if you were a different gender.”** (For ages 11-12, 6th grade book, pg. 3)
- **Items used for condom demonstrations:** “wooden penis model and several external (i.e., ‘male’) condoms,” “internal (i.e., female) condom,” “speculum from the Birth Control Kit” (For ages 13-14, 8th grade book, pg. 82)
- Role Play Scenarios: **“Mateo has begun to hint that he’s ready to have sex. Plan a role-play in which Mateo talks with Hannah about having sex and they make a decision.”**
 “Andrea and Diana are **two girls who just met last weekend at a party.** They had fun together, and now they’ve hooked up again this weekend. They’re alone in Andrea’s basement. **Plan a role-play in which Diana asks Andrea about having sex and they make a decision.**” (For ages 14-18, high school book, pg. 29)
- “In California, anyone of any age is allowed to get birth control—including condoms and also methods that require a prescription—**without notifying parents or getting their permission.**” (For ages 14 and up, high school book, pg. 68)

Federally Funded HHS Teen Pregnancy Prevention (TPP) Program Curricula

The following excerpts are from *IT'S YOUR GAME: KEEP IT REAL!*, which was federally funded under the TPP Program for Fiscal Year 2016 and is designed to be taught to middle school students, ages 12 to 14.

EXCERPTS FROM ROLE PLAY SCRIPTS - CONDOM GAME

Sexual activity between children is normalized as students repeat and respond to "pressure lines," such as:

- *"She is really hot and I've been thinking that maybe it will be OK to mess around a little more than just kissing."*
- *"I think we should do more than just kissing and touching."*
- *"I just feel so close to you. That's why I want to have sex with you."*
- *"If we use a condom, it will spoil the mood."*
- *"You just need to do it, and then you'll realize sex is no big deal."*
- *"They were making out and he started feeling on her, you know, 'down there.' And then she started to feel on him, too."*
- *"Well, I was at a party a couple of weeks ago, and I, ah, ended up having sex with this guy."*

The federally funded *Teen Outreach Program*:

- Teaches children to express "sexual feelings and desire," such as by "erotic talking on the phone."
- It tells teachers to encourage children to masturbate as a "common means of achieving sexual pleasure and release," even though they admit, "people whose religion or culture has taught them masturbation is wrong may feel guilty that they masturbate."
- Children are taught to "experiment with sexual behavior," as long as they don't have sexual intercourse that would put them at risk for STDs and pregnancy. This includes mutual masturbation and anal sex.

Another federally funded program called *Cuidate!* was created for Latino children, beginning at age 11 or 12.

This program tells children to:

- "Have fun with condoms: Giftwrap them."
- "Pretend you are different people or in different situations" or "tease each other manually while putting on the latex condom," or to increase sensitivity "put lubricant on the tip of the penis."
- *Cuidate!* does not tell children to avoid premarital sex or to wait at least until they are legal adults. Instead, it asks 13-year-old children things like: "What are some of the things that you should consider to help you decide if you are 'ready' for sex?" and tells them, "You shouldn't have sex until you are ready—and until you decide."

III. The History Behind the Deceptive CSE Agenda

a. Alfred Kinsey, the Father of the Sexual Rights Revolution



According to two leading international experts, **Judith Reisman**, Ph.D., author of *Sexual Sabotage*, and **Miriam Grossman**, M.D., author of *You're Teaching My Child What?*, the roots of the sexual rights revolution that spawned the comprehensive sexuality education movement can all be traced back to the fraudulent research led by one perverted man—Alfred Kinsey, Ph.D.

In 1947, Kinsey founded the Kinsey Institute at Indiana University to conduct “research” into human sexuality. Kinsey set out to prove that children are sexual from birth and that promiscuous sexual behaviors of all kinds are prevalent in society among all ages and therefore are normal and healthy. He believed his research would change all of the gender and sexual norms of society. And it has.

The false philosophies on human sexuality that were developed based on Kinsey’s “sex research” have provided the foundation and rationale behind today’s comprehensive sexuality education programs. Kinsey’s “research” has also been widely used to liberalize laws restricting sexual behavior, to reduce punishments for sex offenders, and to promote masturbation, premarital sex, and homosexuality, among other things, as healthy and normal.

However, it is now widely known that Kinsey’s research was fraudulent. Although his findings were based largely on interviews with incarcerated criminals, prostitutes and pedophiles, rather than normal, healthy members of society, Kinsey claimed his findings applied to the general population.

Kinsey’s findings were also based on the sex abuse of children by pedophiles. In fact, table 34 in Kinsey’s own book, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, documents the abuse of a number of infants, toddlers and older children who were sexually abused by pedophiles to induce what Kinsey claimed were orgasms. These so-called orgasms included incidents of crying, convulsing or screaming, which were timed with a stopwatch over a 24-hour period.

Kinsey claims he never asked the men to abuse the children; he just reported on the “scientific research” they sent to him. Kinsey claimed this “research” showed that children derived sexual pleasure from their sex abuse. In his biography of Kinsey, James Jones writes that Kinsey was a deeply disturbed individual with bizarre sexual fetishes and that Kinsey, an admitted bisexual, engaged in masochistic sexual behavior.

AGE	NO. OF ORGASMS	TIME INVOLVED	AGE	NO. OF ORGASMS	TIME INVOLVED
5 mon.	3	?	11 yr.	11	1 hr.
11 mon.	10	1 hr.	11 yr.	19	1 hr.
11 mon.	14	38 min.	12 yr.	7	3 hr.
2 yr.	{ 7	9 min.	12 yr.	{ 3	3 min.
2½ yr.	{ 11	65 min.	12 yr.	{ 9	2 hr.
4 yr.	4	2 min.	12 yr.	12	2 hr.
4 yr.	6	5 min.	12 yr.	15	1 hr.
4 yr.	17	10 hr.	13 yr.	7	24 min.
4 yr.	26	24 hr.	13 yr.	8	2½ hr.
7 yr.	7	3 hr.	13 yr.	9	8 hr.
8 yr.	8	2 hr.	13 yr.	{ 3	70 sec.
9 yr.	7	68 min.	13 yr.	{ 11	8 hr.
10 yr.	9	52 min.	14 yr.	{ 26	24 hr.
10 yr.	14	24 hr.		11	4 hr.

Table 34. Examples of multiple orgasm in pre-adolescent males

Some instances of higher frequencies.

Kinsey's infamous Table 34

The Kinsey Institute today continues its sex "research" and was recently granted consultative status at the United Nations, which they intend to use to advance their radical sexual agenda throughout the world. To learn more about what the Kinsey Institute is doing today, go to www.StoptheKinseyInstitute.org

b. From Kinsey to Planned Parenthood to SIECUS to the UN to Children Across the World

International Planned Parenthood Federation and SIECUS, organizations that both hold consultative status at the United Nations, have used that status to become world leaders in developing and promoting Kinsey-inspired comprehensive sexuality education programs for children worldwide.

Speaking at the United Nations, internationally recognized expert and medical doctor, Dr. Miriam Grossman, asked:

Who came up with the notion that it's necessary to teach the world's children about high-risk sex acts their parents never heard of? Planned Parenthood and the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS). These groups portray themselves as guardians of our children's health and claim to provide students with all the information and skills they need to make smart choices. Their curricula, they declare, are comprehensive, age-appropriate, ideologically neutral, and medically accurate.

Mary Calderone, M.D., a Kinsey enthusiast, had been the medical director for Planned Parenthood when, in 1964, using seed money from Hugh Hefner (the founder of “Playboy” magazine); she founded SIECUS.

Like Kinsey, Dr. Calderone believed there was an urgent need to break from traditional views of sexuality. She believed sex education had too much negativity—too much focus on unwanted pregnancy and diseases. The real problem, she insisted, was that society is puritanical and repressed. According to Calderone, proper sex education would teach children that they are sexual beings and that the expression of their sexuality is positive, natural and healthy at all ages.

Referring to Kinsey’s research, Calderone stated, “Professionals who study children have affirmed the strong sexuality of the newborn.” In a book written for parents, she said, “Children are sexual and think sexual thoughts and do sexual things.”

Another founding board member of SIECUS was Kinsey disciple Wardell Pomeroy, who had been Kinsey’s co-author and a former Kinsey Institute director. Pomeroy believed that religious taboos were too restrictive, and that society’s entire belief system needed to be reconsidered. He claimed that traditional religion wooed people into prescribed boundaries for thinking and that boundaries were no good. He also asserted that physical pleasure has worth as a moral value.

A 1980 *Time* magazine article, “Attacking the Last Taboo,” referred to Pomeroy as part of the “pro-incest lobby” and quoted him as saying: “It is time to admit that incest need not be a perversion or a symptom of mental illness...Incest between...children and adults...can sometimes be beneficial.”

To date, SIECUS and Planned Parenthood have been the world leaders in creating and promoting comprehensive sexuality education programs that incorporate Kinsey’s controversial sex philosophies and that encourage children and adults to explore their alleged sexual desires without constraints.

In sum, in 1947, sexologist Alfred Kinsey founded the Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University now known as the Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction. The Kinsey Institute then inspired the formation SIECUS (that also has ties to Planned Parenthood) as an educational arm dedicated to mainstreaming the application of Kinsey’s fraudulent sex research into sexuality education for children worldwide.

IV. Core False Philosophies Behind CSE

Some of the false core philosophies upon which CSE programs are based, largely stemming from Dr. Alfred Kinsey's discredited research, include:

- Children are naturally sexual from birth, therefore any restrictions on their sexual expression or sexual activity violates their sexual rights.
- To have good health, children and adults alike should be having regular sexual experiences either alone (masturbation) or with persons of either gender.
- A right to sexual pleasure, even at the youngest ages is a primary human right that trumps other rights.
- Children have privacy and confidentiality rights that trump the rights of their parents to guide their education in the area of human sexuality.
- Children have a right to abortion and other sexual services and commodities, sexual information, and to sexual relations without the knowledge and consent of their parents.
- Most societal sexual and gender norms, especially those based in religious beliefs are repressive and unhealthy and should be changed.
- Children have the right to experiment with diverse sexual identities and orientations and the behaviors associated with them in order to develop a healthy sexuality.
- Youth are to be enlisted to combat "homophobia," "transphobia" and "heterosexism" and to advocate for their sexual rights.
- Youth should be involved in the design and implementation of CSE programs.
- Children, under internationally recognized rights to health and education, have a right to all sexual information, uncensored and without parental consent.

V. False Claims Often Made About CSE

Sexual rights advocates make astounding claims to support their promotion of comprehensive sexuality education programs to children throughout the world.

As discussed previously, one claim upon which many of the other false claims are based is that international law already mandates that children have the right to comprehensive sexuality education. In fact, the UN Special Rapporteur on "The Right to Education" made this false claim to the UN General Assembly also stating that CSE should teach children about eroticism among other things. (A policy brief on the rapporteur's report can be found at FamilyWatch.org in the UN section of the Policy Center.)

Other alleged claims about CSE include that it will:

- Prevent teenage pregnancy
- Prevent sexually transmitted infections
- Prevent HIV/AIDS
- Prevent coerced or unwanted sex
- Prevent violence against women
- Lift people out of poverty
- Promote sustainable development by encouraging contraceptive use
- Help with global warming

- Delay the onset of sexual debut
- Increase young people’s ability to make responsible decisions
- Enable youth to participate in society and exercise their human rights
- Increase critical thinking skills and overall educational achievement
- Increase a sense of self-efficacy and agency
- Increase a sense of sexual well-being and enjoyment
- Increase gender equality between the sexes

What government or parent wouldn’t want their children to receive CSE if it could do all this? However, these wild claims are exactly that, wild claims with no credible research to back them up.

VI. How CSE Harms Children

The Protect Child Health Coalition has identified the following 15 Harmful CSE Elements found in many CSE programs that have negative effects on children. Consider analyzing any sex education curricula proposed for your schools against these 15 elements. Even if just one of these harmful elements is identified that should be enough to disqualify a program from being taught:

- 1. SEXUALIZES CHILDREN**—Normalizes child sex or desensitizes children to sexual things. May give examples of children having sex or imply many of their peers are sexually active. May glamorize sex, use graphic materials, teach explicit sexual vocabulary, or encourage discussion of sexual experiences, attractions, fantasies or desires.
- 2. TEACHES CHILDREN TO CONSENT TO SEX**--May teach children how to negotiate sexual encounters or how to ask for or get “consent” from other children to engage in sexual acts with them. **Note:** “Consent” is often taught under the banner of sexual abuse prevention. While this may be appropriate for adults, children of minor age should never be encouraged to “consent” to sex.
- 3. NORMALIZES ANAL AND ORAL SEX**—Introduces these high-risk sexual behaviors to children and may normalize them. May omit vital medical facts, such as the extremely high STI infection rates (i.e., HIV and HPV) and oral and anal cancer rates associated with these risky sex acts.
- 4. PROMOTES HOMOSEXUAL/ BISEXUAL BEHAVIOR**—Promotes acceptance of and/or exploration of diverse sexual orientations, sometimes in violation of state education laws. May omit vital health information and/or may provide medically inaccurate information about homosexuality or homosexual sex.
- 5. TEACHES CHILDREN ABOUT SEXUAL PLEASURE**—Teaches children about sexual pleasure. May tell them they are entitled to or have a “right” to sexual pleasure or encourages children to seek out sexual pleasure.
- 6. PROMOTES SOLO AND/OR MUTUAL MASTURBATION**—While masturbation can be part of normal child development, encourages masturbation at young ages, making children more vulnerable to pornography use, sexual addictions or sexual exploitation. May describe masturbation or provide instruction on how to masturbate. May encourage children to engage in mutual masturbation.

7. EROTICIZES CONDOM USE—May use sexually explicit methods (i.e., penis and vagina models, seductive role play, etc.) to promote condom use to children. May provide medically inaccurate information on condom effectiveness and omit or deemphasize failure rates. May imply that condoms will provide complete protection against pregnancy or STIs.

8. PROMOTES PREMATURE SEXUAL AUTONOMY—Teaches children they can choose to have sex when they feel they are ready or when they find a trusted partner. Fails to provide data about the well-documented negative consequences of early sexual debut.

9. FAILS TO ESTABLISH ABSTINENCE AS THE EXPECTED STANDARD—Fails to establish abstinence (or a return to abstinence) as the expected standard for all school-age children. May mention abstinence only in passing. May teach children that all sexual activity—other than “unprotected” vaginal and oral sex is acceptable, and even healthy. May present abstinence and “protected” sex as equally good options for children.

10. PROMOTES UNSCIENTIFIC TRANSGENDER IDEOLOGY—Promotes affirmation of and/or exploration of diverse gender identities. May teach children they can change their gender or identify as multiple genders, or may present other unscientific and medically inaccurate gender theories. Fails to teach that most gender-confused children resolve their confusion by adulthood and that extreme gender confusion is a mental health disorder (gender dysphoria) that may be helped with mental health intervention.

11. PROMOTES CONTRACEPTION/ABORTION TO CHILDREN—Presents abortion as a safe or positive option while omitting data on the many potential negative physical and mental health consequences. May teach children they have a right to abortion and refer them to abortion providers. May encourage the use of contraceptives, while failing to present failure rates or side effects.

12. PROMOTES PEER-TO-PEER SEX ED/SEXUAL RIGHTS ADVOCACY—May train children to teach other children about sex or sexual pleasure, through peer-to-peer initiatives. May recruit children as spokespeople to advocate for controversial sexual rights (including a right to CSE itself) or to promote abortion.

13. UNDERMINES TRADITIONAL VALUES AND BELIEFS—May encourage children to question their parents’ beliefs or their cultural or religious values regarding early sex, sexual orientation or gender identity.

14. UNDERMINES OR VIOLATES PARENTAL RIGHTS—May instruct children not to tell their parents what they are being taught about sex in school.

15. REFERS CHILDREN TO HARMFUL RESOURCES, LIKE PLANNED PARENTHOOD—Refers children to harmful websites, materials or outside entities. May also specifically refer children to Planned Parenthood or their affiliates or partners for their lucrative services or commodities (i.e., sexual counseling, condoms, contraceptives, gender hormones, STI testing and treatment, abortions, etc.) **Please Note:** A conflict of interest exists whenever an entity that profits from sexualizing children is involved in creating or implementing sex education programs.

VII. How CSE Undermines and Violates Parental Rights

Comprehensive sexuality education is intended not only to sexualize children but also to liberate them from their parents' conservative or religious values regarding sexuality.

In order to liberate children, however, adults must first get access to them. Since most parents are fundamentally opposed to their children engaging in sexual activity at a young age, sexual rights activists attempt to enact laws and policies granting children autonomous "sexual rights." These rights encompass a "right" to freely access all kinds of sexual information, regardless of their age, a "right" to sexuality education programs and sexual and reproductive health services, and a "right" for children to express their sexuality. CSE advocates simultaneously usually also try to ensure that children have "privacy" and "confidentiality" rights related to their sexual rights.

While these so-called rights may sound good when applied to adults, they have different and serious implications when applied to children. And with regard to confidentiality and privacy, we should be asking confidentiality from whom? And privacy from whom? The true intent of those promoting CSE is to expose children to controversial sexual information through CSE programs without the knowledge or consent of their parents.

If the vast majority of parents understood what CSE programs contained, they would never allow their children to be exposed to them.

In order to protect children, we must protect the rights of parents to guide their children's education, including sexuality education.

VIII. Why CSE is Not Evidence Based: What the research shows

While CSE advocates claim that among other things, CSE programs will reduce teen pregnancy and STD infections, this is not what the research shows. The Institute for Research and Evaluation (IRE) conducted an analysis of the most rigorous research on school-based CSE in the United States, the same research relied upon by the U.S. government and the UN to claim CSE is effective, and found no evidence of effectiveness for school-based CSE.⁵ See at SexEdReport.org.

⁵ *The Institute for Research and Evaluation (IRE) is a nonprofit research organization that has gained national recognition for its work evaluating sex education programs over the past 20 years. IRE has conducted program evaluations for federal Title V, CBAE, and Title XX projects in 30 states, and has evaluated sex education in three foreign countries, collecting data from more than 900,000 teens, and conducting over 100 evaluation studies. IRE staff members have published articles in professional journals and presented at professional conferences and workshops. Dr. Stan E. Weed, Founder and Director of IRE, has served as a national consultant for federal Title XX and CBAE projects, and was a charter member of the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy. He has been invited to provide expert testimony about sex education to state legislative bodies, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives (April, 2008), and the White House (June, 2009)*

Summary Findings: “Re-examining the Evidence: School-Based Comprehensive Sex Education in the United States”

The study found that CSE programs show ‘far more evidence of failure than success.’ In an in-depth review of 60 of the best peer-reviewed studies of 40 different comprehensive sex education (CSE) programs used in U.S. school classrooms, researchers looked for program effects:

- On most-protective indicators (increased abstinence and/or condom use, decreased pregnancy or STDs),
- Lasting 12 months after the program
- For the main (intended) teen population
- Based on the preponderance of research evidence.

Applying these criteria to studies by both independent evaluators and program developers, the researchers found “there is no scientific justification for the designation of comprehensive sex education in U.S. schools as ‘evidence-based,’ nor for its broad dissemination in school settings.”

Key findings on CSE’s lack of effectiveness in U.S. schools:

TEEN PREGNANCY: Only one of the 40 school-based CSE programs evaluated by the 60 studies reported a reduction in teen pregnancy, but that effect was short term, and a subsequent study in a different location found the same program actually increased pregnancy rates.

STD PREVENTION: None of the school-based CSE studies demonstrated a reduction in teen STDs, in fact, only two measured it.

TEEN ABSTINENCE: Although four of the 60 school-based CSE studies reported 12- month increases in teen abstinence, 12 other studies of the same programs found no such positive effects and one negative effect.

CONSISTENT CONDOM USE: None of the school-based CSE programs showed effectiveness at increasing consistent condom use by teens. (Consistent use is necessary to provide meaningful protection from STDs.) Although there was one program that reported a long-term effect, a subsequent replication study conducted by independent evaluators—not the program’s developer—actually found that the program increased teen sexual risk behavior.

CSE’S INTENDED DUAL BENEFIT: None of the school-based CSE programs showed success at achieving the purported dual benefit of the “comprehensive” strategy— increasing both teen abstinence and condom use within the same teen population. No program produced sustained effects on both outcomes.

NEGATIVE EFFECTS: Five of the 40 school-based CSE programs evaluated by these 60 studies produced significant negative effects (i.e., increases in sexual initiation, recent sex, oral sex, or pregnancy) for the target population or a substantial subgroup of teens. The detailed report with citations can be found at: SexEdReport.org

IX. Who Promotes or Profits from CSE?

While several of these entities have been previously mentioned, in sum, comprehensive sexuality education is being promoted by powerful international organizations, such as the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) and their affiliates in over 170 countries. It is also being pushed by UN agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNICEF, and UNFPA, Save the Children, Marie Stopes and more. Even the World Association

of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (WAGGGS) promote CSE.
(See www.100QuestionsfortheGirlScouts.org.)

In the U.S specifically, some of the main entities promoting CSE include: Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Advocates for Youth, the Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, Rutgers University, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), Human Rights Campaign, the Southern Poverty Law Center, GLSEN, and more.

In addition, CSE is heavily promoted at the UN and at national and state legislatures by paid lobbyists of multi-million dollar organizations and businesses (the most prominent being **Planned Parenthood**) that profit from services they provide to young people and adults who are sexually active. In fact, it is not unusual for these lobbyists to become members of official UN delegations without the governments understanding the deceptive sexual CSE agenda the lobbyists are intending to promote.

Lucrative “sexual and reproductive health care services” can include sexual counseling, family planning, contraception, condoms, abortion, testing and treatment for STIs, and HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment, as well as related commodities, pharmaceuticals, and vaccines. The early sexualization of children through CSE can create lifelong paying customers for these services, so this is big business, especially for organizations like Planned Parenthood.

X: Protect Children from Harmful CSE

StopCSE.org contains valuable information and tools for fighting the CSE agenda.

Please consider taking one or more of the following steps to protect children:

1. Watch “The War on Children” documentary at WaronChildren.org and send the link to as many people as you can to raise awareness of the harms of CSE.
2. Sign both the international and the U.S. petitions (if you live in the U.S.) found at StopCSE.org
3. Join the Protect Child Health Coalition at ProtectChildHealth.org