

Liberty University

From the Selected Works of Judith A. Reisman

December 18, 2003

"Safe Child" School Programs Pose Dangers

Judith A. Reisman, PhD



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/judith_reisman/11/

"Safe Child" School Programs Pose Dangers

A RICO Suit In The Making...

By DR. JUDITH A. REISMAN
December 18, 2003, Page 1, 10



Patrick Buchanan remarked recently upon the recent judicial mandate for homosexual marriage, saying: "Let the counterrevolution begin where that first revolution began, with a new Boston Tea Party."

Boston may also toss some "Talking About Touching" tea leaves in for the "child safety" program mandated and implemented - but widely resisted by both priests and parents - by the Archdiocese of Boston for the Catholic children in parochial schools and religious education programs. Catholic critics say the archdiocese's ruling contravenes Catholic law just as Chief Justice Margaret Marshall's "gay marriage" ruling contravenes the commonwealth of Massachusetts' constitution.

After decades of government and media-endorsement, eugenic "sexologists," hiding inside the Trojan Horse of "sex education" have stealthily entered our public, private, and parochial schoolrooms. So "schooled," a sex cult now pervades our churches, courts, legislatures, and public and private school systems.

Catholic parents in Boston are implicitly told to trust the disciples of Alfred Kinsey with their innocent children. Sexual subversives, charged with creating sweeping rates of child sexual abuse, will further train Catholic children on how to be "safe" from sexual abuse. That is not likely.

The "Talking About Touching" program, Catholic parents should know, is endorsed by such inveterate opponents as Planned Parenthood and SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States), and was originally designed by COYOTE (a sex workers' rights organization of strippers, phone operators, prostitutes, and porn actresses).

As a sympathetic non-Catholic, I find the endorsement of a sex program pioneered by prostitutes bizarre. Most *Wanderer* readers now know that the alleged "safety" program cynically shifts the burden of ending child molestation from adults to children.

Domenico Bettinelli Jr. reported that in the "TAT" introductory video a child of about five years old is scripted to ask, "Mommy, what is sex?" The "mother's" lines read, "Sex is when two people get undressed and rub their private parts together."

Following the "TAT" presentation, one father observed, "There was no mention of chastity or love, that the two people should be married, or even that they should be of the opposite sex - whether the child (in the video) was an actor or not, I knew that the child had just been sexually abused."

Other examples abound that reveal TAT's creation of damaging distrust of all authorities, its violation of parents' rights and its premature sexualization of small children ("he starts to rub your bottom"; "He stroke[s] you on the back and bottom"; "he tries to touch your private parts"; etc).

Bettinelli was, as they say, on to something. Why would "sex workers" want to eroticize children and eliminate marriage from their hearts and minds?

Well, obviously COYOTE (Call Off Your Old Tired Ethics, progenitor of the Committee for Children which produced TAT) profits from eroticizing as many children as possible. Some percentage of "young flesh" will eventually be recruited into their sex "business." As disciples of Alfred Kinsey, Planned Parenthood, SIECUS, and almost all accredited sex ed teachers may also be classified as sex workers. For, both PP and SIECUS were early recipients of *Playboy* monies, the pornographic genre that had normalized prostitution, homosexuality, incest, child sexual abuse and all of the sexual perversions recommended by the sexual liberationists now celebrating *Playboy's* 50th anniversary.

Here are a few current "Expert" boasts on Planned Parenthood's Scarleteen.com web site, "The Information and education you need to help find the you in sexuality":

"Many of the textbooks that are used in public school sex education classes in 1999 would've been considered 'pornographic' or 'obscene' 20 or 30 years ago. Most people use 'kinky' to refer to sexual behavior considered 'abnormal' in our society' (a value judgment, not a definition). That does not mean they are abnormal. However, not too long ago oral sex was considered abnormal or deviant, as was masturbation, mutual masturbation, anal sex, and more. Many people use the term 'kinky' to describe themselves proudly."

Planned Parenthood's "teen site" proudly proclaims scientific objectivity while hiding PP's profits from pornographers and abortions. "Planned Parenthood educators serve as a resource for individuals seeking information for themselves or others."

TAT claims to be a "sexual abuse prevention" curriculum for preschool and elementary school-age children. Although PP leaders would be fully aware that the pandemic rise in child sexual abuse by and to children largely reflects sex education and pornography use, the PP teen web site falsely claims "no indication" of harm from pornography. PP

deliberately dodges the illegality of obscenity (and pornography) for minors. A "teen" allegedly writes to PP:

"Dear Experts, I look at porno sites but I got all A for my subjects [sic]. People say looking at those sites affect your school work, [sic] but since i think i'm not affected, should i stop it? If i should, how?"

"The Answer: Pornography (also known as porn or porno) is sexually arousing imagery. Some people prefer to call it erotica because the word pornography is sometimes used to describe material that may be considered offensive and obscene. In any case, many people enjoy using pornography or erotica as a part of their sex play - alone or with a partner....[extensive PP details omitted here]. There is no indication that using pornography causes problems as long as it does not interfere with other aspects of a person's life. Hope this information helps!"

Why does a "pattern" of lying to schoolchildren dominate PP's training on obscenity and pornography, marriage, and virginity, from 1974 to today?

You've Changed the Combination!!!, a PP booklet, is graced by pornographic drawings of nude, *Playboy*-like, large-breasted women towering over wimpy nude males (sans genitalia). The booklet warns these naive youths that boys are "forced" into heterosexuality by parents who fear homosexuality and that girls are mentally impaired. PP says if it's a "one-night stand," ask if she is "old enough." These sexual pedagogues warn the cornered children to only have sex with their "friends" and that should some girls refuse to have sex before marriage, well, virginity is the same as prostitution. That, of course, is the same position taken by most prostitution groups. Note PP's pedagogy:

"Do you want a warm body? Buy one. That's right. There are women who have freely chosen that business, buy one. Do you want a virgin to marry? Buy one. There are girls in that business too. Marriage is the price you'll pay, and you'll get the virgin. Very temporarily."

Teaching the teachers who teach our children about sex, *Time* magazine concluded that SIECUS was part of an academic "pro-incest lobby...conducting a campaign to undermine" the "taboo against incest" and all other child sex abuse - the Kinsey Model. *Time* cited the SIECUS paper, "Attacking the Last Taboo" (April 14, 1980), which claimed, "We are roughly in the same position today regarding incest as we were 100 years ago with respect to our fears of masturbation."

SIECUS propaganda is regularly funded by the state, taking over \$500,000 from the CDC as part of a five-year cooperative agreement for school health projects. As noted, *Playboy* long has promoted homosexuality, incest, prostitution, and, of course, its main product - pornography.

Does this sex alliance share an economic interest? The January 1979 *Playboy* bragged that, "Playboy Foundation provide[d] the first of several major grants to the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States to support its nationwide educational programs." Christie Hefner gushed that *Playboy* gave the original seed money for SIECUS.

So, is this child sex ed funding a covert form of racketeering, a taxpayer-subsidy for secret servants of the pornography industry? Hefner gave PP and SIECUS funds and lo, both market his corporate product - sexually explicit materials - to schoolchildren nationwide. For, like PP, SIECUS's "Comprehensive Health Education" program would recruit Tom Sawyer and Becky to pornography. In 1992 SIECUS strongly hinted children should use pornography in "Talk about Sex":

"When talking to a friend or a possible sex partner, speak clearly. Movies, music, and TV...often have a message about sexuality and can help possible sexual partners express their affection and sexual interest. Use entertainment to help talk about sexuality, TV, music videos - magazines are a good way to begin to talk about sexuality."

By 1996 the SIECUS February/March 1996 "Position Statement" for schoolchildren on "Sexually Explicit Materials" was more blunt:

"When sensitively used in a manner appropriate to the viewer's age and developmental level, sexually explicit visual, printed, or online materials can be valuable educational or personal aids helping to reduce ignorance and confusion and contributing to a wholesome concept of sexuality."

PP and SIECUS know it is illegal for children under the age of 18 years to buy "sexually explicit materials" (pornography). Posing as an independent scholastic group, training schoolteachers, PP and SIECUS covertly desensitize and recruit millions of naive child consumers into lifelong pornography addicts. And COYOTE naturally profits thereby.

Does this sex educator-pornography alliance funded with taxpayer dollars have insider-trading and stock options? SIECUS Director Mary Calderone and other SIECUS and PP associates were further financially advantaged by pornographers - appearing as interviewees in *Playboy* and as paid "advisers" on the "boards" of other pornographic magazines.

By exposing children to illegal sexual materials, recommending "outercourse" (oral, anal sodomy) with multiple partners and demeaning marriage, chastity, heterosexuality, fidelity, and sexual purity, SIECUS and PP "experts" do "contribute to the delinquency of minors." Have PP and SIECUS disclosed their corporate pornography connections to their state and federal grantors, as required by law?

Have PP or SIECUS violated the 1992 Federal False Claims Act, which provides damages and civil penalties for individuals or persons who knowingly submit a false or fraudulent claim to the United States government for payment or "approval" - like a grant?

If any diocese forces the Planned Parenthood/SIECUS/COYOTE endorsed sex program, "Talking About Touching," onto schoolchildren, someone needs to ask if the "TAT" program is in violation of the RICO (Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organizations law, 1970) law. Those who operate or manage an enterprise through a "pattern" of racketeering activity may violate RICO. "Any group may be a RICO enterprise regardless of whether its members wear pinstripes, poster boards, fatigues, or hoods." (See <http://www.ricoact.com>.)

"Racketeering activity" includes "bribery, extortion, dealing in obscene matter" (relating to sexual exploitation of children); "enterprise" includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity." Yet, any union or group of individuals associated in fact although not a legal entity, can be subject to RICO.

RICO allows the courts to attack "enterprises" that engage in a "pattern of racketeering." "TAT" endorsers, COYOTE, PP, and SIECUS have long promoted a "pattern" of sexual promiscuity and pornography (pictorial prostitution) to children - seeded by the pornography industry and funded by the state.

Now, it seems to me that, instead of instituting "TAT" for Catholic children, the Boston Archdiocese should consider joining the effort to eliminate pornographic toxins from the nation's environment. If secular sources are desired, older schoolchildren might read and perform the inspirational letters between Abigail and John Adams, or the roles of Orlando and Rosalind in *As You Like It*. Orlando speaks:

"Run, run Orlando; carve on every tree! The fair, the chaste, and unexpressive she. (And Rosalind says she is sure:)

"[Orlando's] kissing is as full of sanctity as the touch of holy bread."

Even "Popeye" and "Olive Oyl" champion chastity, courage, love, and fidelity. Such a "secular sex ed" curriculum would still teach children more about Catholic love and marriage than is dreamt of in the "TAT" philosophy.

+ + +

(Dr. Judith Reisman is an internationally recognized expert on America's premier sexologist Dr. Alfred Kinsey and the harmful effects of pornography and sex education on both children and adults. This is the first of a number of articles she will be writing for *The Wanderer*.)

