

SEX EDUCATION PROBLEMS

by

Gary Allen

About The Author



Gary Allen, one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, graduated from Stanford University with a degree in history, and did post-graduate work in education and social science at Cal State at Long Beach. Mr. Allen, the father of four children, is a former instructor of both history and English at the high school level in southern California. He is now devoting all of his time to anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION magazine, and is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* — a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Gary Allen has written the scripts of seven widely distributed educational films, and his frequent lecture tours have brought him before hundreds of educational groups in all parts of the United States.

Additional copies of *Sex Education Problems*, by Gary Allen, are available at the following prices, postpaid: 1 to 99 copies, four for one dollar; 100 to 999 copies, eighteen cents each; 1000 copies or more, sixteen cents each.

This article first appeared in the March, 1969, issue of AMERICAN OPINION, an internationally circulated Conservative journal. The subscription rate to the magazine is ten dollars per year, to any address in the United States; twelve dollars to other countries. For either reprints or subscriptions address.

AMERICAN OPINION
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

Copyright © 1969 by American Opinion

SEX EDUCATION PROBLEMS

by

Gary Allen

Sex education in the schools is not new. Most high schools have for years conducted courses which teach the biological facts of life. What is new is that these are now sneered at by sex educationists as "plumbing courses," inadequate for "modern social needs." What is needed, we are told, is a jet-age "sex education" which really gets down to the nitty gritty.

And that is just what we are getting.

As the *Saturday Evening Post* related before its recent demise, the "sex-education" programs which are now "mushrooming all over the country are newer than the new math America seems to have suddenly discovered an urgent need for universal sex education — from kindergarten through high school, some enthusiasts insist — and is galloping off in all directions at once to meet it." The *Post* trumpeted that fifty percent of public and parochial schools are now providing the glories of academic sexuality, and that at the present rate the figure will pass seventy percent within a year.

Nothing happens in a vacuum, and the educationists' sex explosion would not be taking place unless a great deal of influence, organization, and money were being poured into its promotion from somewhere. It is. The organization behind the new "sex education" now sweeping the nation is S.I.E.C.U.S., Sex Information and Education Council of the United States. (Pronounced, *seek us*.) As the *Post* noted, "Among the organizations shaping the structure of American sex education, by far the most influential is S.I.E.C.U.S." *McCall's* puts it this way: "Today's atmosphere in sex education cannot be described without mention of a high-voltage, nonprofit organization called S.I.E.C.U.S., which is

without doubt the single most important force in sparking sex education in our schools" The *Wall Street Journal* records that "S.I.E.C.U.S. reports fifty to seventy inquiries a week from schools, churches, and other organizations seeking guidance on sex education."

A leaflet distributed by the National Education Association describes S.I.E.C.U.S. as a voluntary health agency founded in New York City, in 1964, to provide "assistance to communities and schools wishing to embark on sex education programs. S.I.E.C.U.S. will act as a clearing-house for research and education in sex, as a source of information about sex education in the schools, and as a public forum where consideration of various aspects of man's sexuality can be carried out in dignified and objective fashion."

The tax-free S.I.E.C.U.S. organization operates largely from foundation grants — which means that American taxpayers are ultimately footing the bill. Those who write to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare concerning "sex education" are now advised to contact S.I.E.C.U.S. The Department of H.E.W. is also putting your money where its commitment is, and in 1967 granted \$1.5 million to support the new "sex education" programs in thirteen school districts. In addition, officers of the U.S. Office of Education have served, or are serving, on the Board of Directors of S.I.E.C.U.S.

Chief torchbearer for S.I.E.C.U.S. is Dr. Mary Calderone, the organization's Executive Director — referred to by *McCall's* as the Commander-in-Chief of "sex education" forces. Since the Commander-in-Chief's attitudes must of necessity be reflected in the choice of materials for the S.I.E.C.U.S. program we are all required to subsidize, her views have undergone close scrutiny by concerned parents. Dr. Calderone has, for example, often made clear her commitment to the "New Morality" — as old as Sodom and Gomorrah. In speaking to 320 boys at Blair Academy in New Jersey, S.I.E.C.U.S. Director Calderone commented: "What is sex for? It's for fun . . . for wonderful sensation . . . Sex is not something you turn off like a faucet. If you do, it's unhealthy." And, she continued: "We need new values to establish when and how we should have sexual experiences."

What sort of "new values"?

According to *Look* magazine, when a student asked: "What is your opinion of premarital sex relations among teenagers?" Mrs. Calderone snapped back: "What's yours? Nobody from on high [God] determines this. You determine it I don't believe . . . the old 'Thou Shalt Nots' apply anymore."

She certainly doesn't.

In *Seventeen* magazine, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Executive Director claimed "sex is not the prerogative of Christianity," and the *Saturday Evening Post* quotes her as declaring that sexual "do's and don'ts" cannot be imposed on the young. After telling her youthful audiences that "there doesn't seem to be any correlation between premarital sex and success in marriage," she regularly leaves the decision of premarital intercourse up to the glands of her young listeners. The *Boston Globe* of December 5, 1968, quotes her as telling a blushing audience of five hundred high school boys and girls:

The question goes far beyond "Will I go to bed?" and it's one you must answer for yourselves. You boys may know a girl is physically ready, but you have to ask yourselves: "Am I ready to take the responsibility to say, yes, she is ready emotionally and psychologically?"

Though described by *Post* as a Joan of Arc for "sex education," Dr. Calderone is more often referred to as "a sweet-faced, silvery-haired grandmother" who shocks audiences by using four-letter words to make her point. Her motto is "tell them everything and tell them early." According to the *Saturday Evening Post*:

Contrary to the views of most child psychoanalysts, Dr. Calderone holds that sex education should start in the nursery. Around the age of three the child should assimilate such knowledge, along with the correct terminology such as "The penis of the father is made to carry the sperm into the mother through the vagina." Kindergarten teachers should then impart additional clinical details.

That's right, kindergarten teachers!

As you might expect, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Executive Director also has very progressive ideas concerning homosexuality. As she is fond of telling youngsters: "Almost everybody has some attraction to people of the same sex I cannot condemn it." Every boy in an urban environment, she says, "is going to have a homosexual advance made to him, and therefore he should understand what it is and what his attitude about it and about himself should be."

And what *should* that attitude be? Concerning homosexuals, the S.I.E.C.U.S. Commander-in-Chief smirks to boys in her lectures: "... you owe that person your responsibility and understanding, even if you don't share his conviction." Dr. Calderone adds, sadly, that "it will be some time before homosexuality receives general acceptance." Unless, of course, her "educational" efforts on behalf of S.I.E.C.U.S. are successful.

If Dr. Mary Calderone is the Joan of Arc of the school-sex revolution, Dr. Lester Kirkendall, Professor of Family Life at Oregon State University, and a member of the S.I.E.C.U.S. Board of Directors, is its Pied Piper. Dr. Kirkendall, a prolific author of sex books and magazine articles about every conceivable sexual foible, will never be accused of being an old fuddy-duddy by even the hippiest of the pornopoliticians. Still, Kirkendall is referred to by *Reader's Digest* as "without question, one of the most respected authorities in the whole field of sex education and family life." He has, according to the *Digest*, "helped to create today's new generation of sex educators."

Lester Kirkendall says he believes that, "if present trends continue, premarital intercourse will almost certainly increase." But, the Professor adds, he doesn't feel this is necessarily bad. He writes in *Sex And Our Society* that if couples "do experiment with sex only to have their relationship flounder, their honest efforts to understand and be responsible to one another may well have been more gain than loss."

Like Mrs. Calderone, S.I.E.C.U.S. director Kirkendall is not "hung-up" with the religious and moral foundations of sex. He is, in fact, a past director of the anti-religious American Humanist Association, and has written in its magazine that morality cannot be found in the context of "supernaturalism or a supernatural deity." Instead, he



Typical issue of smut magazine edited and pushed at children by S.I.E.C.U.S. educationists.

defines his religion as a "respect for and a belief in people, and a concern for true brotherhood among men." Just as Kirkendall rejects God for "people," he also rejects patriotism, actually going so far as to brand defense of one's country as immoral. In "Searching for the Roots of Moral Decisions," he writes:

A tremendous feeling of national unity, a sense of closeness, good will, and harmony may result from fearing another nation or from the effort of trying to destroy another nation. Such unity . . . is immoral.

Another founder of S.I.E.C.U.S. — and its longtime Treasurer — is Isadore Rubin. He too shares Dr. Kirkendall's rejection of patriotism. Rubin was on May 3, 1955 identified in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Communist Party by Mrs. Mildred Blauvelt, an undercover operative within the Communist Party for the New York Police Department. Rubin was subsequently Editor of the *New York Teacher News*, published by the New York Teachers Union — which was expelled from

the A.F.L.-C.I.O. when it was found to be controlled by the Communists. So total was his commitment to the Reds that he even had to be dismissed from his job as a teacher in New York City because of his refusal to deny his membership in the Communist Party.

In addition to his subversive work for S.I.E.C.U.S., Comrade Rubin now edits the notorious *Sexology* magazine. Although S.I.E.C.U.S. proclaims that one of its purposes is to counter exploitation of sex, its own officers are involved in the wildest sort of sex exploitation. Rubin's pulpy *Sexology* magazine dwells on sex sensationalism, with lurid pictures of men and women in the most intimate positions, presenting crass articles dealing with the worst sort of perversion. Examples of features in recent issues include: "Can Humans Breed With Animals?," and "Witchcraft And Sex - 1968," and "The First Sadists," and "Wife Swapping In Naples," and "My Double Sex Life (the story of a bi-sexual)," and "Gangs That Hunt Down Queers," and "Why I Like Homosexual Men," and "Unusual Sex Demands," *ad nauseam*. In addition, *Sexology* also features film reviews of the latest "adult movies," carries advertisements for rank sex books, and has published its own titillating work on *Transvestism*.

Mr. Rubin's *Sexology* periodical has for years been available to certain seedy stores around the country (often from behind the counter, with the pages stapled together), but bigger and better things are in store for the magazine. Speaking in December of 1968 to a group of educators at an institute on "sex education" sponsored by the International Business Machines Corporation, S.I.E.C.U.S.'s Lester Kirkendall revealed that *Sexology* is currently being revised with a different cover and titles so it can be used in the schools.*

Now, get this: Dr. Lester Kirkendall serves with Communist Isadore Rubin as an Editor of *Sexology* magazine. Also on the staff of this pornographic sheet are S.I.E.C.U.S. directors William Genné, John Money, and Wardell Pomery.

*Kirkendall, according to the *Anaheim Bulletin* of December 19, 1968, ridiculed those at the I.B.M.-sponsored sex institute who noted that Isadore Rubin was identified as a Communist before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. "Rubin," said Kirkendall, "only wrote a paper for the *Daily Worker*." The sworn testimony of the New York detective who was in the same Red cell as Comrade Rubin contradicts Dr. Kirkendall's claim.

Another of those laboring with Communist Isadore Rubin and his fellow pornographers on the Board of Directors of S.I.E.C.U.S. is Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, the newly elected President of the million-member National Education Association.* The radically Leftist Mrs. Koontz urges teachers to "... organize, agitate, and strike." In paraphrasing the Communist Black Panthers to call for "Teacher Power," she explains: "We cannot teach democracy and ignore what is wrong" It is thus not surprising that N.E.A. has been in the forefront of promoting S.I.E.C.U.S. throughout the nation, and that Mary Calderone has been a contributor to the *N.E.A. Journal*.

Earlier we mentioned *Sexology* staffer William Genné – a director, founder, and officer of S.I.E.C.U.S. who calls himself "Reverend" and is Director of the Commission† on Marriage and Family Life of the National Council of Churches. The "Reverend" Genné, who offers the view that those who think "Wherever healing takes place, Christ is present, no matter what the Church says about fornication," has quite a background himself. In addition to his consultation in pornography at *Sexology*, the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities record that Genné has affiliated himself with such Communist Fronts as the Stockholm Peace Petition, the World Peace Appeal, the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act, the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, etc.

Then there is S.I.E.C.U.S. director William Masters, who published with Virginia E. Johnson the best-selling *Human Sexual Response*. That incredible volume records Dr. Masters' studies in intercourse and automanipulation of 694 persons. Masters had no qualms about employing *unmarried* subjects to perform before the cameras for this subsequently popularized study of intercourse, and used an artificial plastic phallus which recorded female responses. The S.I.E.C.U.S. director was quoted in *Playboy* describing the tortuous device as follows:

The equipment can be adjusted for physical variations in size, weight and vaginal development. The rate and depth of penile

*Mrs. Koontz has just been named by President Nixon to head the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

†S.I.E.C.U.S. director Calderone is also a member of that N.C.C. Commission.

thrust is initiated and controlled completely by the responding individual. (From *Playboy*, May 1968.)*

The immediate past-President of S.I.E.C.U.S. is sociologist David Mace, who stated his case for the "New Morality" in the April, 1968, issue of *Sexology* as follows:

The simple fact is that through most of our history in Western Christendom we have based our standards of sexual behavior on premises that are now totally insupportable – on the folklore of the ancient Hebrews and on the musings of medieval monks, concepts that are simply obsolete.

The current President of S.I.E.C.U.S. is Lester Doniger, said to be the former Publisher of *Pulpit Digest*, Director of Pulpit Book Club, and President of the Pulpit Press. Curiously, Doniger's autobiographical note in *Who's Who In World Jewry* does not mention his Protestant publishing business, and he has variously listed his birthplace as Raczk, Poland, and Vienna, Austria. We do know that the *Great Neck* [New York] *News* of February 14, 1947, carried an article entitled "US-USSR Committee Announces Meeting," which reported that a forum would be held under the auspices of the Great Neck Committee of the Communist National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. Among those scheduled to appear was Jessica Smith, wife of Communist Party attorney John Abt and widow of Communist Hal Ware of the notorious Soviet spy ring called the Ware Cell. Mrs. Abt was editor of *Russia Today*. The article stated that tickets for the Council affair were obtainable from Mrs. Rita Doniger, wife of S.I.E.C.U.S. President Lester Doniger.

Training For Illicit Sex

The philosophy, attitudes, and beliefs of the above officials of

*Listed as sponsors of S.I.E.C.U.S.'s second annual dinner were the notorious Hugh Hefner of *Playboy*, John Cowles of *Look*, Secretary of Defense and Mrs. Robert Strange McNamara, Leftist Stewart Mott (heir to a G.M. fortune), best-selling author Vance Packard, Steven Rockefeller, and James Warburg of the international banking family.

†This organization is described by the federal government's *Guide To Subversive Organizations* as being "created by the Communist Party in 1943." It is cited on the U.S. Attorney General's list of subversive organizations as "subversive and Communist."

S.I.E.C.U.S. have been projected into the curriculum it recommends for our schools. The S.I.E.C.U.S. program is more than just education. After all, it isn't any good to know *what*, if you don't know *how*. And *how* requires training in the required "sex skills." As S.I.E.C.U.S. *Study Guide Number 1* states:

... the time-tested principles accepted in other areas of education must be supplied; to equip youngsters with the skills, knowledge and attitudes that will enable them to make intelligent choices and decisions. (Emphasis added.)

To burden a "sex education" program with folderol about morality would, in the opinion of S.I.E.C.U.S., simply muddy the water in teaching children to express their "sexuality." According to the S.I.E.C.U.S. *Study Guide*: "Sex education must be thought of as being education — not moral indoctrination. Attempting to indoctrinate young people with a set of rigid rules and ready-made formulas is doomed to failure in a period of transition and conflict." More specifically, when Esther Schultz of S.I.E.C.U.S. listed in *Redbook* the qualifications for "sex education" teachers, she specifically noted: "he must *not* be a moralist."

Not tolerating moralists. S.I.E.C.U.S. naturally makes no judgments on perversion. And from the point of view of the Leftist S.I.E.C.U.S. propagandists, why should it? As one of the S.I.E.C.U.S. informational brochures states: "It is not the job of any voluntary health organization, which S.I.E.C.U.S. is, to make moral judgments; S.I.E.C.U.S. can be neither for nor against illegitimacy, homosexuality, premarital sex — nor any other manifestation of human sexual phenomena." When little George asks about homosexuality, or little Betty inquires about having children out of wedlock, you just know that you want their teacher to follow S.I.E.C.U.S. procedures and remain neutral. We wouldn't want any "moral" judgments, after all. Such judgments might warp the little psyches of our children!

A guiding theme throughout S.I.E.C.U.S. material seems to be to release students from any inhibitions, or feelings of guilt or conscience, about illicit sexual activity. The S.I.E.C.U.S. *Study Guide Number 5* begins: "The best way to gain insight into premarital sexual standards

today is to start with the realization that among young people abstinence is not the only nor in some cases the dominant standard." This pamphlet draws attention to the fact that there are four premarital standards in use today: total abstinence; the double standard; affection-centered relations; and, permissiveness without affection. Naturally, S.I.E.C.U.S. doesn't take sides. Instead, the *Guide* tells your children: "The choice of a premarital sexual standard is a personal moral choice, and no amount of facts or trends can 'prove' scientifically that one ought to choose a particular standard. Thus, the individual is in a sense 'free,' " —to make up his own morality on the spot.

In discussing such consequences of permissiveness as venereal disease, promiscuity, and illegitimacy, *Study Guide Number 5* drags out the old shell game and assigns the blame to parents:

The difficulties of doing anything about the consequences of greater permissiveness become apparent when one realizes that our type of courtship inevitably involves a certain amount of such consequences. The same parents who decry the consequences favor a free courtship system — a system that encourages permissiveness. Even more paradoxical is the stress parents place on love as the basis for marriage and happiness. The research findings on female permissiveness indicate that love is a key factor promoting sexual intercourse. Thus, the more parents stress love the more their daughters will engage in coitus.

Got that, parents? Stress permissiveness and your children will find themselves in trouble, or stress an abiding love and things will be even worse. Either way, you are to simply surrender your children to the indoctrination and "skills" provided in the schools by Comrade Rubin and the Leftist pornographers of S.I.E.C.U.S.

Many parents have concluded that the S.I.E.C.U.S. stand on masturbation verges on advocacy of it as a salutary pastime. Dr. Warren Johnson, of *Sexology* fame, informs seventh-graders in the S.I.E.C.U.S. *Study Guide Number 3*:

Most students have some experience with this activity [masturbation], sometimes before puberty, although many of them are

unfamiliar with the word: masturbation. They hear it called ----- . It is an almost universal practice among healthy boys and is also a common, but not so frequent habit in girls From the medical point of view it is necessary to emphasize the fact that the commonly quoted medical consequences of masturbation are almost entirely fictitious Any harm resulting from masturbation, according to the best medical authorities, is likely to be caused by worry or a sense of guilt due to misinformation.

Dr. Johnson even tells us who the bad guys are in our society causing all of these feelings of guilt. Ready? It is the churches. Who says so? Why, the authorities at S.I.E.C.U.S. say so. The *Study Guide* relates:

Moreover, it should be recognized that in our society most religious groups are strongly opposed to this practice [masturbation], and it is quite difficult for boys and girls to practice it and not feel some sense of guilt or fear

Got that? "Guilt and fear" are a product of the churches, and masturbation is "universal" and "healthy."

In the past, young people were encouraged to work off their nervous energy through athletics, study, dancing, and other wholesome activities. Now we have the Leftists of S.I.E.C.U.S. working in the schools to tell our teachers that masturbation is a healthier outlet. Page eighteen of *Study Guide Number 3* maintains:

As a general rule, parents and adults concerned with youth are best advised to disregard evidence of private masturbation in juveniles, not to look for it nor to try to prevent it directly or even indirectly by attempting to divert the youngster's attention to other activities. In adulthood, as well as in childhood, masturbation by individuals in private is coming more and more to be regarded as an acceptable means of releasing sexual tension.

According to S.I.E.C.U.S., not only is this practice not harmful, it actually performs a positive function of building manly self-confidence. The *Study Guide* remarks, "During adolescence, masturbation and its

attendant fantasies may not only be a means of releasing sex tensions, but often serve as part of the adolescent struggle to achieve a sense of identity and a sexual self-image."

In addition to preparing study guides, S.I.E.C.U.S. publishes a quarterly newsletter expounding its philosophy and recommending films, books, and articles in the field of sexology; it reprints articles that it judges particularly valuable; and, it issues new reading lists of sex books. Included in the reprints are articles from Communist Isadore Rubin's grisly *Sexology* magazine. And, among the books recommended are such erotica as *Prostitution In Europe And The Americas*, *Unmarried Love*, *Women's Prisons*, and *Sex And The Social Structure*.

One of the most controversial educational tools being used in "sex education" courses is a slide-film called *How Babies Are Made*, prepared with the aid of S.I.E.C.U.S. This film, which is recommended for grades kindergarten through six, uses *papier-mâché* models to teach sexual reproduction. While the children watch the film the teacher reads the narrative which describes what is happening in adult, medically accurate terms.

One slide, which shows two dogs copulating, carries this dialogue: "When a father dog wants to send his sperm into a mother dog, he climbs on her back" The film then shows human male and female anatomy, indicates how a baby is produced, and ends with an optional slide showing a man and woman in bed with the narrative: "You have already learned how a father's sperm meets and fertilizes a mother's egg to create a new baby. To do this, they lie down facing each other"

One such film set, used in a Westchester County elementary school shows dogs copulating — followed by a human couple under bed sheets as a recorded voice explains: "Mummy and Daddy are doing the same thing the dogs do."

As part of its educational program, S.I.E.C.U.S. cooperates with a number of other Leftist efforts in the sexology field. For example, S.I.E.C.U.S. lists Barney Rosset of the notorious Grove Press as a source of information. Rosset has been in court many times over his

publication of pornography and was the subject of an article in the January 25, 1969 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post*, entitled "How to Publish 'Dirty' Books for Fun and Profit." The *Post* revealed that Mr. Rosset relinquished his "fiery pacifism" when Hitler broke his pact with Stalin and attacked Russia. With Mother Russia in trouble, Barney joined the Army. (Yes, ours.)

Besides pornography, Rosset also specializes in books glorifying Communism — such as *Reminiscences* by Ernesto "Che" Guevara, Edgar Snow's *Red Star Over China*, and Communist Kim Philby's *My Silent War*. Not surprisingly, S.I.E.C.U.S. has even run advertisements in Rosset's lewd *Evergreen Review*.

The S.I.E.C.U.S. organization has also run its ads in the disgusting *Nude Living* magazine, published by the Elysium Institute. Although S.I.E.C.U.S. proclaims itself against "sexual exploitation," and claims it wishes to "dignify human sexuality," it has picked another strange bedfellow in the Elysium Institute — whose specialty is perversion and pornography dressed up as "health" fadism and "scientific inquiry." Elysium's magazines are comprised mostly of photographs of nude men and women in sickening sexual positions, photographed from angles clearly designed to attract the pervert. They promote everything from necrophilia to nude Satanism and are frankly beyond description by a normal human being.

Of course, those magazines published by Elysium contain a page which lists the Institute's connection with S.I.E.C.U.S. and others of the "growing number of organizations in this country which are concerned, as is the Institute, with seeking means to man's physical, emotional and intellectual development in an environment of openness, understanding and tolerance."*

Among the books recommended by S.I.E.C.U.S. as source material is *Situation Ethics — The New Morality* by Dr. Joseph Fletcher. Fletcher has been a member of thirty organizations cited by the federal

*Some of those wildly Leftist efforts with which Elysium exchanges information (in addition to S.I.E.C.U.S.) are the University of Humanism, Institute of Rational Living, Institute for Sex Research, Pacifica Foundation, Joan Baez' Institute for the Study of Non-Violence, Sexual Freedom League, and the Underground Press Syndicate.

government as Communist Fronts. Herbert Philbrick, former undercover operative for the F.B.I., testified that "Joe Fletcher worked with us on Communist Party projects and on an enormous number of tasks." Needless to say, Dr. Fletcher thinks the "New Morality" is glorious.

The recordings and books of Dr. Albert Ellis are also recommended by S.I.E.C.U.S. Ellis, a much-married former used-car salesman who obtained his Ph.D. late in life, is another "New Moralist." He is quoted in *Life* magazine as observing: "I certainly agree that if we are ever to become at all rational about our system of dating and marriage, the double standard will have to go. However, it seems to me that *one of the main ways of getting rid of the standard is to encourage premarital sex relations today.*" During the 1930s Ellis translated *Das Kapital* for the lay reader. In his book, *The Case Against Religion*, he writes: "The religious person sells his soul, surrenders his own basic urges and pleasure so that he may feel comfortable with this heavenly helper that he himself has invented. Religion, then, is needless inhibition."

In a S.I.E.C.U.S.-recommended book, *The American Sexual Tragedy*, Ellis castigates "men who cannot be satisfied with any form of sex activity but coitus" as "probably fetishistically attached to this idea." The effect of the efforts of Dr. Ellis on our children can only be called calculated and sick.

Anthropologist Ashley Montagu, a member of the S.I.E.C.U.S. Board of Consultants, is another whose materials are recommended to schools by S.I.E.C.U.S. Writing in the *Phi Delta Kappan*, Montagu visualizes a future in which:

Young unmarried individuals who are sufficiently responsible will be able, in the new dispensation, to enter into responsible sexual relationships in a perfectly healthy and morally acceptable and reciprocally beneficial manner, which will help the participants to become more fully developed human beings than they would otherwise have stood a chance of becoming.

As a S.I.E.C.U.S. authority, Montagu even views the demasculinization of American men with forthright approval: "The short-sighted 'viewers with alarm' will be relegated to their proper

places when what they so wrongheadedly deplore, namely, the alleged feminization of men and the alleged masculinization of women, are discovered to be advances in the right rather than in the wrong direction."

Here It Comes

The S.I.E.C.U.S. program which has been described by the national Press as the model effort in community "sex education" is being committed in the schools of Anaheim, California. The *Saturday Evening Post* called it "a S.I.E.C.U.S. show window." In Anaheim, 32,000 students from seventh through twelfth grades get six weeks of coeducational "sex education" yearly.*

Sally Williams, who supervises the Family Life and Sex Education program at Anaheim is on the S.I.E.C.U.S. Board of Directors, and Dr. Esther Schultz of S.I.E.C.U.S. helped to develop the Anaheim program, which relies heavily on S.I.E.C.U.S. materials. Yet, strangely both S.I.E.C.U.S. and the School District, headed by Superintendent Paul W. Cook, steadfastly maintain that Anaheim has nothing to do with S.I.E.C.U.S. Apparently it is felt that the Leftists and pornographers of S.I.E.C.U.S. are vulnerable to criticism and that it is best to provide the program while doing everything possible to avoid the label. Certainly the *Saturday Evening Post* wasn't fooled about who is running the show — nor is anyone else.

The Anaheim scheme has stimulated opposition in the form of a Citizens' Committee formed by Mrs. Janet Townsend. Mrs. Eleanor Howe, now a committed activist, is typical of the Committee members. She became upset at what was going on in her son's eleventh grade "sex education" class when she learned that the teacher asked young Howe what he would do if he discovered his son masturbating. That was a little too much for this courageous youngster, and he walked out of the class. Mrs. Howe told me:

"You wouldn't believe some of the reports we get from parents about these classes. One young man became so upset at the thought

*Because the elementary school is a separate system and has not yet adopted the program, children in the kindergarten through sixth grade have thus far been deprived of S.I.E.C.U.S. sex in Anaheim.

that he might be a homosexual, after the way the subject was treated in his eighth grade class, that his parents had to send him to a psychiatrist to calm his fears. He was simply a normal adolescent, but the sex program proved too much for him."

In addition to the Citizens' Committee, the Anaheim program has also provoked opposition from the local newspaper, the *Anaheim Bulletin*, which has an old-fashioned Editor by the name of Sam Campbell who, along with reporter John Steinbacher, has not been afraid to challenge the educational power structure. The *Bulletin* has published literally scores of letters from distraught parents. Such parental objection is mushrooming, and far from confined to Anaheim. Here, for example, is a letter of November 27, 1968, from a Mrs. Erwin Handel to the *Phoenix American*:

We just received our Nov. 6 . . . issue of "The American." I noted the article on the front page about sex education — which might better and more accurately be termed "obscenity education" in the Phoenix schools.

We just moved from Phoenix — and for that reason. We have a 12-year-old son who was taught this smut last spring, and about 9 weeks thereafter we had a near disaster in our home.

I walked in and caught him sexually molesting our 4-year-old daughter. He had been taught all about intercourse at school and wanted to "try it out" on his sister. (I caught him before he actually committed the act.)

Now, teaching young kids this in school is nonsense . . . It's like giving someone a recipe to discourage cooking. It won't discourage, but rather encourage experimentation.

We hope that you might publish this — so some other parents might realize just what this "education" is doing to our children before they actually suffer a disaster — just as we nearly did.

You think it can't be that bad? Tell it to Mrs. Handel. Or, take a look at some of the supplementary books used in the \$375,000 per year program to push sex at the children of Anaheim. A typical example is Kenneth Barnes' *He And She*. The theme that "America is a repressed Puritanical society," constantly proclaimed by the Leftists and "New Moralists," is emphasized by Barnes on page eighty:



When a father dog
wants to send
his sperm into a
mother dog, he
climbs on her back
like the rooster.
This is called mating.
His penis fits into
an opening in her
body called the
VAGINA (va-gi'-na).
The father's sperm
swim up toward the
eggs in her ovary.

This slide is taken from a film-strip promoted by S.I.E.C.U.S. for use — in kindergartens.

The sad result of the way the world upsets the attitudes of young people is that it encourages a divided feeling about sex and about people. It ought to be possible for a young man to see a girl naked and to enjoy her nakedness without any sense of guilt, accepting it not just as the nakedness of a female body, but as something that is part of her personality and that arouses respect for her as a whole person. There are countries in which the taboo on nakedness is not so strong as here.

Barnes also informs the students of Anaheim that God-centered religion is *passé*. In advocating a new-style religion, he writes:

This religion must have a person at its centre; nothing less will do, no dogmas or rules or pseudo-scientific notions will suffice, for these are all thoughts produced by persons and therefore less than persons. Nothing less than a living person can give us the complete truth about humanity.

Since the Anaheim program has been part of the curriculum for over

three years, many residents have been trying to get the School Board to assess the results. Unfortunately, the School District absolutely refuses to release any statistics concerning the subsequent increase in venereal disease and illegitimate births. However, the Orange County Health Department says that venereal disease in the area is "out of control." And Richard Taylor, Vice President of the Orange County branch of the Florence Crittenton Society, which operates homes for unwed mothers, reports of this matter in the area: "The 'new morality' is leaving a broad trail of heartbreak in Orange County."

There can be no doubt about it. When newspaper reporter John Steinbacher asked a young Marine why so many servicemen congregated in Anaheim every weekend, the reply was: "Man, everybody knows that the high school girls here are 'available.'" The comment, Steinbacher found, was typical.

Although the retardation of venereal disease and illegitimacy are promoted as reasons why local school districts must adopt sexuality training, even S.I.E.C.U.S. officials confess that the program will not ease these problems. Lester Kirkendall of S.I.E.C.U.S. and *Sexology* magazine admitted in the *Reader's Digest* for June 1968:

Most people have the vague hope that it [sex education] will somehow cure half of the world's ills — reduce casual sex experience, cut down on illegitimate births, and eliminate venereal disease. To be perfectly blunt about it, we have no way of knowing that sex education will solve any such problems.

Identified Communist and Treasurer of S.I.E.C.U.S., Isadore Rubin, stated at a symposium on *Sex And The Teenager*: "For the community to ask the sex educator to take on the responsibility of cutting down on illegitimacy or on venereal disease is to ask him to undertake a task that is foredoomed to failure." With S.I.E.C.U.S. in charge, there can be no doubt of that! What else could be expected with morality abandoned?

The fact that many parents are aware of the efforts of the sex educationists to divorce the teaching of sex from morality has created growing resistance to the S.I.E.C.U.S.-style programs. It seems that every "expert" and sexologist associated with the S.I.E.C.U.S. program

rejects traditional Judeo-Christian concepts of sexual morality. Again and again we hear from its proponents that S.I.E.C.U.S. maintains sex education "must not be moral indoctrination," and that "it is not the job of S.I.E.C.U.S. to make moral judgments: S.I.E.C.U.S. can be neither for nor against premarital sex." Many of us find it ironic that our youngsters can be given instruction in our schools on various positions for sexual intercourse — or, as *McCall's* noted, shown how to apply "a contraceptive to a life-sized plastic phallus" — but a student saying a prayer in that same school would be violating the law.

Even so, Anaheim School Superintendent Cook advocates presenting a sexual smorgasbord and letting the teenager take his choice. Cook told an audience at Chapman College recently:

We give the kids the whole picture — we lay all the facts out on the table for them and we tell them they are going to hear different ideas and attitudes than in their churches. We tell them that after all they do have to make up their own minds, and they're the only ones that can choose their own level of morality.

No prayers, you understand. No firm moral code. None of those "different" ideas from home and church! Listen to Comrade Rubin. Listen to the pornographers of *Sexology*.

The advocates of S.I.E.C.U.S. go farther. They attempt to picture all opposition as that of ignorant reactionaries and religious fanatics. Not only do the concerned taxpayer-parents resent this characterization as grossly unfair, but they point to the fact that their objection to sex instruction for the "New Morality" is supported by many medical authorities. Dr. Max Levin, in strenuously objecting to the amorality of the S.I.E.C.U.S. position on "sex education," writes:

I speak not as a clergyman but as a psychiatrist. There cannot be emotional health in the absence of high moral standards and a sense of human and social responsibility. I know that today morality is a "dirty word," but we must help our youth to see that moral codes have meaning beyond theology: they have psychological and sociological meaning. Even the atheist, who rejects religion, should be able to understand this.

You don't have to be a psychiatrist like Dr. Levin to realize that today's teenagers already have more sophistication about the mechanics of sex than they have the maturity to handle. Telling teenagers to choose their own level of morality, while emphasizing that premarital intercourse might be desirable, can only lead to tragic consequences. Teach biology and physiology, yes. But let's get the anti-moral, Leftist, sex-pushers out of our schools! They are an embarrassment to the professions which they trumpet and an out-and-out danger to our children.

Look at the truth. The preponderance of both scientific and practical support for traditional morality is simply ignored by the permissive S.I.E.C.U.S. programs and the frantic school sexologists. As psychiatrist Graham Blaine writes: "The steps necessary to take in following unplanned pregnancy — adoption of the child, abortion, or premature marriage — are clearly unfortunate ones, and their increasing frequency would seem to be a cogent argument for *holding the line* against permissiveness"

Dr. Paul Gebhard has recently conducted surveys of twelve hundred college students which also support traditional views of sexual morality. He found that the first step was likely to be decisive in the case of a girl. If she once crossed the "Rubicon," it was not easy for her to subsequently avoid such sexual activity thereafter. In such a case, he noted, she was jeopardizing her own prospects of a good marriage in the future, as well as running other risks. As sociologist Robert Blood Jr. points out:

Premarital intercourse is associated more closely with broken relationships than with strengthened ones; twice as many engagements are broken among couples who have intercourse as among those who did not; the more frequent the intercourse, the greater the number of rings returned; both divorce and adultery are more common among those couples who indulge in premarital intercourse, and that even among those who do not separate, the incidence of marital unhappiness is greater.

New York psychiatrist Max Levin comments on S.I.E.C.U.S. activist Warren Johnson's contention that "an increasingly safe and potentially

wholesome sex life is said to be becoming available to the married and the unmarried who desire it; and there seems to be a growing feeling that this is a decision to be made by individual women and is not the business of society at all." Dr. Levin writes: "The young unmarried woman who has a sexual affair is harming herself emotionally. She cheapens herself when she yields to a seducer. There can be no mental health without a measure of self-respect."

With teenagers being steeped in boggling sexual stimuli from the mass media, our schools should be bolstering those who are moral and promoting self-control rather than providing rationalization for promiscuity. According to Dr. Melvin Anshell, the only justification for the S.I.E.C.U.S.-style program is "the misconceived notion that if you can't beat them, join 'em." *Many sex education courses turn out to be only an exercise in destroying the conscience.* Is it surprising that after hearing sexual intercourse discussed in class, and shown in classroom movies, the reserves of young people are broken down and they are stimulated to experiment? As Dr. Anshell observes:

The sexuality instinct is one of the strongest that we human beings have, and if we have a conscience associated with that sexuality then we cannot express it like amoebas. But the desensitization program is taking away the conscience and making the sex act a raw instinct.

The way homosexuality is treated in S.I.E.C.U.S. sex education is also destructive. According to psychiatrist Anshell:

I'll be frank with you. I haven't had a pervert yet that I have cured, but I don't know anyone else who has either. The answer is in the prevention. And [this sort of] sex education, paradoxically, doesn't prevent it, but is causing it.

Today's teenagers have been sold by the Left on the idea that they discovered sex and that sex is "in." When has it ever been out? It's been "in" since Adam and Eve. But, teenagers are not the only target of the Leftist S.I.E.C.U.S. operators. As I have noted, they want to start by selling their amoral sexuality to kindergartners. The fact is that most reputable psychiatrists believe that presenting such information to

young children can cause drastic psychological problems. Psychiatrist William McGrath explains it this way:

"There is a phase of personality development, called the latency period, during which the healthy child is not interested in sex. In this interval, from about age five until adolescence, a boy learns how to get along with other boys. And he can dream of becoming a man among men, a hero.

"This latency period is not just a cultural or moral intervention. It serves a very important biological purpose. It affords the child an opportunity to develop his own resources, his beginning physical and mental strength. Later, when he is ready, he can take on other responsibilities

"Sophomoric and supercilious persons, who are without learning in philosophy or in science, fail to realize the significance of the latency period. When we plead that it should remain inviolate, they scoff and accuse us of narrow-minded prudishness

"Premature interest in sex is unnatural and will arrest or distort the development of the personality. Sex education should not be foisted on children; should not begin in the grade schools.

"Anyone who would deliberately arouse the child's curiosity or stimulate his unready mind to troubled sexual preoccupations ought to have a millstone tied around his neck and be cast into the sea.

"A letter asks: Isn't sex the source of most psychological problems? No; not in a man who has been allowed to develop character before his introduction to sex. Sexual problems are almost always secondary, or symptomatic of a deeper immaturity.

"To be first and above all a man among men is what one begins to learn in the latency period. This is sacred territory. A plague on those who trespass."

Psychiatrist Rhoda Lorand, after viewing the type of sex material now being used in the elementary schools, puts it this way: "It is

overwhelming, disturbing and embarrassing, upsetting and exciting and very likely to lead to sex difficulties later in life." Author of *Love, Sex And The Teenager*, she is a long way from being a blue-nose on this subject. Psychiatrist Anchell agrees, noting:

The one thing [this sort of] sex education is supposed to do for us — that is, help our children become mature adults — it actually destroys. It does it by interfering with the normal instinctual growth of the child. It catapults the child into advance sexual information; it perverts the child If you turn into an obstetrician at eight years of age, you have developed a fixation I think it is creating more perverts than were ever created before, and more-diversified perverts.

Indicative of the fact that elementary school children do not have the maturity to handle the material being thrown at them is that many children, after having seen the S.I.E.C.U.S.-prepared *How Babies Are Made*, have come home and asked to watch mommy and daddy plant the seed. This has already prompted a lawsuit against the school system by a local committee in San Luis Obispo, California. No doubt further legal action is on the way.

Frankly, the program is proving downright dangerous. Even S.I.E.C.U.S.'s Dr. Kirkendall admits: "There's no way that you can proceed without some risk [to the students]. You have to admit that there are people teaching in schools who have sexual problems of their own they haven't worked through." The subject would obviously have an overwhelming attraction for instructors with voyeur tendencies. Psychiatrist Melvin Anchell, himself the author of a fine book on sexual adjustment, warns:

Many of the so-called sex experts are no more qualified to be involved with this problem than a used-car salesman would be. Many are misguided disciples of Freud who call themselves psychiatrists. Many are social workers. Many are teachers who don't know anything about the subject. These people have set themselves up as experts. What they have been attempting to do is promulgate the sexuality instinct into that of an instinct related to a bodily function such as eating, breathing or going to the

bathroom. But it really isn't . . . you could do all these other things alone, but sexuality takes two.

Danger or no danger, however, Anaheim Superintendent Cook has admitted that what he is involved in is "changing attitudes." That, alas, is precisely the problem.

The Scandinavian Model

The S.I.E.C.U.S. style of "education" is too new in this country to draw any statistically-based conclusions as to what its cumulative effects will be. We do, however, have a model at which we can look for a glimpse of the future. The Scandinavians have had compulsory "sex education" of the type S.I.E.C.U.S. is promoting for two decades. In fact, Professor Ira Reiss of S.I.E.C.U.S. maintains, "Where Sweden is today is where we're going to be in ten years. Sweden has a culture that accepts 'permissiveness with affection' standards."*

The S.I.E.C.U.S. *Study Guide Number 5* says: "The Scandinavian countries have developed even further than we a type of affection-centered premarital sexual permissiveness. We seem to be heading toward a Scandinavian type of sexuality." Promoting this "trend," S.I.E.C.U.S. recommends the book *Sex And Society In Sweden* as part of its curriculum, explaining: "Because it is a book that is open, honest, and reliable regarding the real situation in Sweden, it should prove of unusual value and interest to parents and educators everywhere." Dr. Kirkendall, in praising Denmark's "sex education" program, states:

The consequences for young Danes seem to be far less damaging than here Hence guilt and conflict over premarital sex are minimal They may even let the child be born before they marry, since there is little stigma on illegitimacy.

Perhaps local citizens will want to look at the "real situation" and the "minimal" negative consequences of "sex education" in Scandinavia before embarking on a S.I.E.C.U.S.-type program. A third of the brides in Denmark kneel at the altar pregnant. In twenty years the

*What is happening in America, according to Professor Reiss, is "not a sexual revolution but the evolvement of a system which has replaced the prostitute with the girl next door."

number of brides aged fifteen to seventeen has swelled by four hundred percent. One legal, and four to five illegal, abortions are now performed for every twenty births. In Sweden the increase in venereal disease is described by officials as "catastrophic." According to *U.S. News & World Report* of February 7, 1966:

Physicians say that gonorrhea and syphilis are more widespread in Sweden today than in any other civilized country in the world. A recent inquiry revealed the startling fact that about half of all boys who had become infected with venereal disease admitted having sexual relations with at least forty different girls – and ten percent said that they had had relations with as many as two hundred.

The Swedish education system has been accused by a highly-respected group of 140 eminent Swedish doctors and teachers, including the King's physician, Dr. Ull Nordwall, of producing sex *obsession* among adolescents because, as they put it:

It has bombarded school children with sexual instruction for which their immaturity ill fits them and the result has been an un-natural over-sexualization of the rising generation [in which] . . . the young have confused instruction in method with encouragement to practice.

As for the S.I.E.C.U.S. contention that while sex education will not lower venereal disease or illegitimacy, it will produce healthy, happy, well-adjusted young men and women, the results in Sweden prove the contrary. An article in the issue of *Reader's Digest* for August 1966 relates:

There is a significant report from Sweden, which for so long prided itself on the removal of moral restraints and what amounts to the encouragement of sexual freedom, even in the schools. Yet the human toll has been so great that we now read of a growing movement, headed by the country's leading doctors to put an end*

*The trend is indicated by the recent recommendation of a Stockholm teacher that: "What every good high school needs is a sex room where teenage lovers can seek respite from the rigors of reading, writing, and arithmetic"

to sexual laxity. But note: The doctors . . . observe that, for all their sexual freedom "young people in Sweden are not happy today," and urge the schools to spend more time on moral and religious leadership and instruction which will help the children know "what is right and wrong" in terms of their own ultimate well-being.

What has been the effect of the efforts of the sex educationists on the family in Sweden? Psychiatrist Graham Blaine writes:

In Scandinavian countries extramarital affairs have increased. It would seem logical to assume that family environment which includes a philandering father or a promiscuous mother, or both, would be less healthy for children than one in which fidelity prevailed.

The inevitable results of adopting the Scandinavian attitudes pushed by S.I.E.C.U.S.? As Professor Russell Kirk notes: "In another generation or so, American church communicants may be as scarce as they are in Denmark or Sweden today — that is, one to five percent of the population, or even fewer."

Leftist Harassment

Still, parents who rebel at having the public school lead their children into the pit which proved so disastrous for the Scandinavians are astonished to find that they have run into a veritable Leftist buzz-saw. The S.I.E.C.U.S. proponents even hold seminars on how to deal with their conservative opponents. At one of these seminars, Dr. Lester Kirkendall characterized all such opponents as "a fringe group of dissidents who don't think rationally." He maintains that those who oppose the program to "change America's sexual attitudes have hangups about sex." To skirt these "sick" people, Kirkendall urges:

Just sneak it [the sex program] in as an experimental course Go to your P.T.A. and get support. That's where the power lies Don't say that you are going to start a sex education course. Always move forward. Say that you are going to enrich, expand, and make it better. The opposition can't stop something that you have already started.

This strategy puts the opponents in a position of being "aginnners" who are "out to destroy our modern, progressive Family Life course."

Another strategy used by the Leftist sex educationists is to form a committee of civic leaders including doctors, clergymen, and businessmen to endorse the introduction of the program into the local school. Many, if not most, of these men are not aware of just what they are endorsing, but feel that sex education is generally a good idea. Once having committed themselves, pride and ego require them to defend their stand even as the educationists turn a presumed course in physiology into out-and-out indoctrination for premarital sex and amorality.

The educationists, as usual, want complete autonomy — free from the "interference" of those who pay the bills. Citizens' groups have found that once the program is begun their letters are not answered and that it is almost impossible to get school boards to give specific answers to questions about these sex programs. Complaints are met with educationese and mumbo-jumbo.

Is the alternative to a S.I.E.C.U.S.-type program to keep teenagers in total ignorance about sex, as has been charged by some? The question is not whether "sex education" should be provided, but what kind, where, and by *whom*. There is a significant minority, if not a majority, of parents who believe that sex cannot be divorced from morality — and who are convinced that sex education is the province of the home and not of the State. Are their civil rights to be trampled by arrogant behavioral scientists, social anthropologists, and educationists? It is argued that some homes will abrogate their responsibility in this field. And, this is true. But, critics ask: Does this justify putting the sexual morality of all children at the mercy of the atheists and pornographers and Communists who are supporting and directing S.I.E.C.U.S.?

What's Really Happening

As terrible as are the personal tragedies produced by the S.I.E.C.U.S. programs, let us pause here in conclusion to note the broader effect on our national life which may well be the real object of these programs aimed at our sons and daughters — and, through them, at the health of our nation.

We have already noted the ties of S.I.E.C.U.S. directors to the Communists. We note now in passing that the motivation of the S.I.E.C.U.S.-style efforts directly parallels the various "mental health" programs promoted by the World Health Organization. Instrumental in the founding of W.H.O. was Soviet spy Alger Hiss, who declared that "health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity." Selected to lead the creation of this "social well-being" was the notorious pro-Communist Canadian, Brock Chisholm, who spelled out the foundations for the "New Morality" when he wrote in the February, 1946, issue of *Psychiatry* (with an introduction by Abe Fortas):

The re-interpretation and eventual eradication of the concept of right and wrong which has been the basis of child training, the substitution of intelligent and rational thinking for faith in the certainties of the old people, these are the belated objectives of practically all effective psychotherapy. Would they not be legitimate objectives of original education . . . Freedom from morality means freedom to observe, to think and behave sensibly . . . free from outmoded types of loyalties . . . This is a new kind of world and there is no ethical or moral system that is intended for anyone in this world.

Chisholm's chief administrator at W.H.O. was Dr. Frank Calderone, husband of the S.I.E.C.U.S. Commander-in-Chief, Mary Calderone.

Everywhere one turns with these people the reins lead back to the Far Left. Why? Clearly because it is in the interest of the Communists to promote programs like S.I.E.C.U.S. for destroying American sexual morality, and enervating the moral fiber of our nation's youth.

Nationally syndicated columnist Henry J. Taylor, playing Devil's Advocate, delineated a sixteen-point program for the destruction of the United States. One of these points reads: "Preach 'permissiveness.' If 'anything goes' then, of course, everything goes. Every internal and external enemy knows the advantages of destroying a nation's standards. The rewards are as old as the Trojan horse."

As far back as May of 1919, Allied forces in Dusseldorf, Germany,

first captured a Communist document entitled *Rules For Revolution*. Number One on that list of objectives was: "Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness." Again, in the early 1950s, Florida State Attorney George A. Brautigam confirmed that "The above 'Rules for Revolution' were secured by the State Attorney's Office from a known member of the Communist Party, who acknowledged it to be still a part of the Communist program for overthrowing our Government." The *Sacramento Union* has recently editorialized:

Diabolical as it may seem, it has been a common tool of Communism for many years to undermine values and substitute their opposites. The Communist Conspiracy has always used the weak to infect the strong. In fact history shows that often the strong have been betrayed into surrendering to the weak. It would not be too difficult . . . to gain control of the minds of the young and the weak. It can be done by systematically denigrating all that a person has been taught to be worthy of respect. It would be done very cleverly with an appeal to the reasonableness of each argument, the use of half-truth It would be necessary to attack belief in Americanism, morality, and personal integrity. These will be replaced by un-Americanism, immorality and personal anonymity. Perhaps this begins to sound shockingly familiar. If what we presently see and hear on the American scene is any indication, the process is well under way

It would test our credulity to propose that our schools and other influential institutions are deliberately aiding this hideous process. It is possible, however, to believe that such institutions are being used by conspirators to accomplish the aims of the world-wide Communist movement.

It might also be pointed out that fanatical Marxist Stuart Chase noted in his book, *The Proper Study Of Mankind*: "Theoretically, a society could be completely made over in something like fifteen years, the time it takes to inculcate a new culture into a rising group of youngsters." Don't doubt that it can happen.

Historically, the destruction of morality has often been used as a technique to ready a country for Communist revolution. Nowhere was

this more evident than in Spain where five percent of the nation's inhabitants were slaughtered in a bloody civil war. Before the revolution, kiosks sprung up on nearly every corner of the major cities peddling the most lurid pornography, and the cry "long live free love" was a regular part of student demonstrations. As the *Red Domination In Spain*, an official report of the Spanish government, notes:

The moral corruption and disintegration of family and social ties reigning throughout the Marxist zone of Spain during the civil war were a direct consequence of communism . . . Degradation amongst children during pre-revolutionary days [led to] . . . degradation of spiritual life and morals.

The same was true in Russia with the Nihilists, in Greece when the Communists sought to take power, in post-Kun Hungary, and in a dozen other places where the Communists have moved. Surely the vast majority of those promoting S.I.E.C.U.S.-style "sex education" are perfectly loyal, if misguided, Americans. However, it is impossible to deny that there is Communist influence within any parent organization which contains an identified Communist as its Treasurer and has such a number of its directors who have been active in officially cited Communist Fronts. It would seem only logical that their motives and/or judgment should be subjected to the closest scrutiny. Their target, after all, is our own children — and America's future.

One remembers a recent comment by my colleague George S. Schuyler, in the January *AMERICAN OPINION*. Mr. Schuyler noted:

When General William F. Dean was released from a Korean Communist prison camp, the young Chinese psychologists who had been trying to break him said: "General, don't feel bad about leaving us. You know, we will soon be with you. We are going to capture your country." Asked how, they replied: "We are going to destroy the moral character of a generation of your young Americans, and when we have finished you will have nothing with which to really defend yourselves against us."

Those are powerful words to remember. And they provide, beyond doubt, the single best explanation of What's Really Happening. ■ ■