

Complete Text

Catholic Family News

August 2012

“Sex Abuse in Catholic Schools – The Evolution of Sex Instruction in Catholic Schools from *Becoming a Person to Theology of the Body*”¹

By Randy Engel

Introduction to this Series

It may come as a surprise to *CFN*'s under-30 readership that the first major pro-life battle in the late 1960s with AmChurch's new post-Conciliar bureaucracy, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops/U.S. Catholic Conference in Washington, D.C., was not over birth control or abortion, but over so-called “sex education.”

Never mind that the Anti-Life Establishment has always viewed “sex education” as **the** primary weapon in their campaign against the proliferation of people. On March 20, 1969, Dr. Richard Day, a former National Medical Director for Planned Parenthood (PP), explained to physicians of the Pittsburgh Pediatrics Society that the purpose of sex education was “to get kids interested in making the connection between sex and the need for contraception early in their lives, even before they became active.”² Again, on May 3, 1973, just months after the Supreme Court *Roe Vs Wade* decision legalizing abortion in the United States, PP's President, Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, in an interview with the Washington, D.C. *Evening Star* and *Daily News* claimed that the only avenue PP had to win the abortion rights battle was “sex education.” “I think we're going to establish the individual's complete control over conception, and that will win the battle for abortion if we act wisely,” Guttmacher explained.³ But the American bishops weren't listening.

Today, we hear a great deal about the incredible and systematic lack of concern of bishops, cardinals and even popes with regard to clerical sexual abuse of children and youth.

So what's new?

As this series will document by chapter and verse, these very same shepherds turned wolves have been waging a relentless war against the innocence and purity of our children in the Catholic classroom under the misnomer of "sex education" or "sex initiation" for over 40 years, and yes - with the tacit, if not outright approval, of the Holy See.

How did we come to such a miserable state?

Why and how did we go from traditional Catholic doctrinal and moral catechetics to Kinseyan sexual catechetics?

How did the Second Vatican Council and the post-Conciliar Church manage to turn that which was formerly forbidden and condemned by the Church not merely into a "Yes," but into an obligatory and compulsory affirmation?

What actually happens to children and youth who are exposed to this form of psychological and spiritual assault on their very being?

What role did the homosexual network in the American hierarchy play in the advancement of "sex education" in the Catholic school and CCD programs?

Can we ever extricate ourselves from this moral abyss?

These are some of the questions that I will raise and hopefully answer in this series based on a lengthy talk presented given at the *CFN* Conference in April 2011.⁴

Part I explains the long-standing traditional prohibition of the Church against the practice of sexual initiation and how Modernist elements at the Second Vatican Council conspired to turn Church doctrine on its head using the newly formed Episcopal conferences to deliver this plague upon our children.

Part II presents a detailed timetable of the pivotal role of liberal AmChurch bishops and the NCCB/USCC in institutionalizing classroom sex instruction in Catholic schools and seminaries.

Part III describes in depth how classroom sex instruction as a form of “sexual conditioning” or “reconstructive psychotherapy” destroys the intellectual, emotional, psychological and spiritual life of young children and teens.

Part IV highlights the remarkable, but largely unknown English study, “Sex Education and Sex Practice” by psychiatrist Dr. Louise Eickhoff. The Eickhoff study documents the devastating effects of classroom sex instruction on young women following the introduction of mandatory sex instruction in English secondary schools in 1967. The reader will become an eye-witness so to speak of the transformation of the typical innocent English schoolgirl of World War II and post-war era to the new breed of sexually sophisticated young women who had become the “beneficiaries” of mandated classroom sex instruction in the mid-to late ‘50s.

Part V makes a concerted effort to demonstrate the ways that Catholic schools can restore sanity and sanctity to Catholic education in the 21st century; and some practical guidelines for parents who wish to fulfill their obligation in this area.

Part I – The Undermining of *Divini Illius Magistri*

Instruction with regard to the Sixth Commandment (sexual morality) requires “great caution and prudence” and should be carried out in a manner which stresses “brevity rather than copiousness of exposition,” lest, even unintentionally, such instruction may treat of “subjects which, instead of extinguishing, usually serve rather to inflame corrupt passion.”

*Catechism of the Council of Trent:
For Parish Priests*⁵

In accordance with Tradition and Sacred Scripture, the *Catechism of Trent* highlighted the principle means of practicing purity:

- Avoidance of idleness
- Avoidance of immodesty of the eyes
- Avoidance of immodest dress
- Avoidance of impure conversation, reading, and pictures
- Frequent reception of the Sacraments and
- Mortification of the body and sensual appetites.⁶

***Divini Illius Magistri* Brings Sex Instruction Scandal Out Into the Open**

The official teaching of the Catholic Church on the subject of classroom sex instruction or sex initiation classes can be summarized with a single word – “No.”

The first Magisterial pronouncement with regard to public, that is, open classroom sex instruction for children and youth is found in Pope Pius XI’s great encyclical on Christian education *Divini Illius Magistri* issued on Dec 31, 1929. The encyclical is addressed not only to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops and bishops, and other ordinaries in communion with the Apostolic See, but also to all the faithful Catholics of the world.⁷ In this encyclical we have the Catholic Church’s first official prohibition of formal sex instruction in an open classroom setting, an academic novelty which was introduced into certain liberal Catholic educational circles in the early part of the 20th century.

Divini Illius Magistri opens with the general acclamation that all Christian education is ultimately directed at man’s last end – the salvation of his eternal soul. Therefore, “there can be no ideally perfect education which is not Christian education.”⁸

With regard to the three necessary societies that man is born into, “namely the family and civil society” belonging to the natural order and the third, “the Church” belonging to supernatural order, the encyclical states that it in the task of the education of children, the Church gives first place to the family, “instituted directly by God for its peculiar purpose, the generation and formation of offspring; for this reason it has priority of nature and therefore of rights over civil society. ... Nevertheless the family is an imperfect society requiring for its perfection the assistance of civil society rightly ordered and the Church; a society of the supernatural necessary for the eternal salvation of mankind and the fulfillment of Christ’s command “Teach ye all nations.”⁹

Pius XI’s specific reference to formal sex instruction for young people apart from parents is found in §65 - §67:

Another very grave danger is that naturalism which nowadays invades the field of education in that most delicate matter of purity of morals. Far too common is the error of those who with dangerous assurance and under an ugly term propagate a so-called sex-education, falsely imagining they can

forearm youths against the dangers of sensuality by means purely natural, as a foolhardy initiation and precautionary instruction for all indiscriminately, even in public; and, worse still, by exposing them at an early age to the occasions, in order to accustom them, so it is argued, and as it were to harden them against such dangers.

Such persons grievously err in refusing to recognize the inborn weakness of human nature, and the law of which the Apostle speaks, fighting against the law of the mind¹⁰; and also in ignoring the experience of facts, from which it is clear that, particularly in young people, evil practices are the effect not so much of ignorance of intellect as of weakness of a will exposed to dangerous occasions, and unsupported by the means of grace.

In this extremely delicate matter, if, all things considered, some private instruction is found necessary and opportune, from those who hold from God the commission to teach and who have the grace of state, every precaution must be taken. Such precautions are well known in traditional Christian education, and are adequately described by Antoniano cited above, when he says:

Such is our misery and inclination to sin, that often in the very things considered to be remedies against sin, we find occasions for and inducements to sin itself. Hence it is of the highest importance that a good father, while discussing with his son a matter so delicate, should be well on his guard and not descend to details, nor refer to the various ways in which this infernal hydra destroys with its poison so large a portion of the world; otherwise it may happen that instead of extinguishing this fire, he unwittingly stirs or kindles it in the simple and tender heart of the child. Speaking generally, during the period of childhood it suffices to employ those remedies which produce the double effect of opening the door to the virtue of purity and closing the door upon vice.¹¹

Divini Illius Magistri, especially Pius XI's citation of the insights of 16th century Roman writer, Silvio Cardinal Antoniano on the Christian education of children upholds the principle that the responsibility of transmitting intimate information on sexual matters to youth belongs primarily to parents who have both the grace of state and intimate knowledge of their offspring.

Further, the encyclical stresses the fact that “particularly in young people, evil practices are the effect not so much of ignorance of intellect as of weakness of a will exposed to dangerous occasions, and unsupported by the means of grace.”¹² Pope Pius XI reminds us that sexual sins normally do not arise from a cognitive deficiency. It's not that we don't have enough information. Rather sexual sins are a matter of volition – a matter of will – and our task is to strengthen our will to mirror that of God's will for us.

The Holy Office Reinforces Ban

Not unexpectedly, the Modernists of the day were not pacified by Pius XI's explicit opposition to open sex instruction for Catholic schoolchildren. So two years later, on March 21, 1931, the Holy Office was forced to restate the prohibition:

Question: May the method called "sex education" or even "sex initiation" be approved.?

Answer; NO – The Holy Office refers back to *Divini Illius Magistri* adding, "No approbation whatever can be given to the advocacy of the new method, even as taken up recently by some Catholic authors and set before the public in printed publications."

Pope Pius XII Upholds Ban on Sex Initiation Programs

On Sept. 18, 1951, Pope Pius XII in an address to the French Fathers of Families, condemned as his predecessor had done, the scourge of sex initiation programs which greatly exaggerates the importance and range of the sexual element of life. Further he noted that in moral education, neither initiation nor instruction offers any advantage of itself. Rather they become an unwholesome and prejudicial liability when not closely linked to constant discipline, vigorous self control, and above all recourse to supernatural forces of prayer and the sacraments.

Later, Pius XII reiterated in an address to a Congress on Psychotherapy and Religion held on April 13, 1953, that the provisions regarding the ban on classroom sex instruction were still in force, and he reminded his academic audience that "These rules have not been rescinded, **either expressly or via facti (emphasis added).**"¹³

Second Vatican Council Undermines *Divini Illius Magistri*

Now let us fast forward to the Second Vatican Council (October 1962 to December 1965) and trace the circuitous route by which the Modernists successfully maneuvered to turn the Holy See's prohibition against classroom sex instruction into a mandate for the implementation of the explicit sexual instruction in parochial schools and CCD classes.

In reviewing the history of the Council's schema on Christian Education which opened the door to classroom sex instruction it is clear that the document underwent a total transformation from its original classification as a constitution; to its reduced status as a votum; to a series of propositions, to the final declaration *Gravissimum Educationis* which was promulgated by Pope Paul VI on October 28, 1965.

Heated debate on the original text by the Council Fathers and the many *periti* who had grafted themselves on to all the educational subcommissions began in July 1962 and continued for two years. Drafts after drafts were submitted and rejected. Finally, in the spring of 1965, a revised draft was completed but not distributed to all the bishops. Only members of the Commission itself received the revised text and new amendments.

So the **first time** that the Council Fathers actually got to view the final text was when the 4th session of the Council opened in September 1964. There were immediate problems, the most glaring of which was that most of the original text had been rewritten so that instead of a revised text it was essentially a new document. Up until this point there had been no mention and no debate on the matter of classroom sex instruction for Catholic schoolchildren.

Then at the very last moment, three amendments were added to the final document.

The first amendment referred to St. Thomas Aquinas and Scholasticism and it was the subject of a lengthy debate.

A second amendment took the form of a singular sentence of 16 words – **“Let them [children and youth] be given also, as they advance in years, a positive and prudent sexual education.”**¹⁴ There was no debate on the amendment. It passed without a peep. Nada. Zilch.

Who drafted the amendment? This has never been revealed. In a letter written to the author many years later from Rome, Rev., later Bishop Mark J. Hurley, who served as an expert commentator on the Commission told me he would not give me the name of the American who formulated the amendment, but simply noted that I would know the name if I saw it.

In an interview on this reference given at the Council, Hurley stated that this singular sentence did not contradict any of Pius XI's four detailed paragraphs found in *Divini Illius Magistri* prohibiting sexual education outside the home, but merely changed Pius XI 's conditional IF to SHOULD; i.e., private instruction should be provided by parents in this delicate area. But Hurley was in grave error, for the enemies of Tradition and the Magisterium had, in fact, achieved a brilliantly executed *coup d'état* by placing a ticking time bomb in *Gravissimum Educationis* that would shortly explode in the faces of Catholic parents in the U.S. and abroad.

The reader will note that the singular sentence in contention does not contain any reference to parents. Second, the sentence does not appear in §3 related to the obligations of parents. Rather it appears in §1 within the context of universal education. The sentence immediately preceding it refers to “the latest advances in psychology and the arts and sciences of teaching.” Most importantly, the implementation of the declaration was given over to a special post-Conciliar Commission on Christian Education and to Episcopal Conferences, that is, national church bureaucracies.

The Rise of the NCCB/USCC

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops/U.S. Catholic Conference, of course, did not exist when *Gravissimum Educationis* was written although the plans for replacing the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC) were already on the drawing board.

The old NCWC itself was a creature of liberalism, the heir of the Washington, D.C. based-National Catholic War Council which created in 1917 to help coordinate the World War I effort. There were some prophetic objections by traditional-minded bishops to the formation of any standing committee established to declare or shape Church policies, as this was seen, and correctly so as a challenge to the teaching and governing authority of a bishop, but during war time these objections were quickly set aside.

When the war ended, instead of abolishing the War Council, Americanist James Cardinal Gibbons mastermind the establishment of a permanent Catholic bureaucracy in

Washington, the National Catholic Welfare Council, later renamed, the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Again, objections were raised that this new entity of Church liberals with rapidly expanding powers ran counter to Canon law and interfered with the juridical responsibilities of individual bishops, but Gibbons prevailed. The creation of the NCWC introduced a new American Ecclesiology already popular in *avant-garde* Catholic circles. It tied the interests of the Church to the culture and institutions of a Protestant America. In other words, it tied Catholicism to the heresy of Americanism.

In 1931, a Family Life Bureau was created within the NCWC. The Bureau upheld and promoted traditional Catholic sexual morality and held the line against the growing Sangerite and Malthusian offensive until the mid-1950s.

On Nov 17, 1950, the NCWC issued a formal statement titled “The Child: Citizens of Two Worlds” in the name the American bishops in which the hierarchy reminded parents of their special competence and duty in regard to the provision of sex instruction to their children. The paragraph ended with the solemn warning “**We protest in the strongest possible terms against the introduction of sex instruction into the schools.**”¹⁵ Take note of that date. It’s the last time you will see the American bishops’ collective support of *Divini Illius Magistri*.

Nine years later, in 1959, the NCWC issued a statement entitled “Explosion or Backfire” in which all the American bishops joined together to oppose contraception, abortion and sterilizations and all government programs of population control, domestic and foreign.¹⁶ Remember that year also – **1959**. It would be the last hurrah the American bishops would ever utter on the subject.

Catholic Family News
September 2012

“Sex Abuse in Catholic Schools –The Evolution of
Sex Instruction in Catholic Schools from

Becoming a Person to Theology of the Body”

By Randy Engel

PART II – The NCCB/USCC Timetable for Implementing Sex Instruction in Catholic Schools

Introduction

On November 14-18, 1966, the old National Catholic Welfare Conference was dissolved and reorganized into a larger and more powerful entity – the bi-cameral National Conference of Catholic Bishops/United States Catholic Conference. These novel world-wide national Episcopal bureaucracies were essential to the advancement of the Vatican II Revolution, especially in the area of the New Theology and Catholic sexual morality. To control and/or dominate the NCCB/USCC was to control the future of the AmChurch in America. This point was not lost upon the revolutionaries within the American hierarchy, nor on the early leaders of the Homosexual Collective in the United States.

The two key positions within the newly established NCCB/USCC went to Archbishop John Dearden (later Cardinal) of Detroit, the leader of the powerful liberal wing of the nascent AmChurch, who was elected the NCCB’s first President, and to the newly ordained Bishop Joseph Bernardin who was selected by Dearden to be the first General Secretary of the USCC.

The newly created NCCB/USCC had a decidedly lower moral tone than its predecessor due, in part, to the presence of a large homosexual contingent of clergy and staff led by the young Joseph Bernardin, and his Assistant General Secretary Father, later Bishop, James Rausch.¹⁷

Not surprisingly, as one of its first acts of post-Conciliar governance, the newly reorganized USCC Family Life Office under the direction of Father James T. McHugh introduced a mandated program of sexual catechetics for Catholic schools throughout the

country. These new programs were designed to replace traditional doctrinal catechesis as found in the traditional catechism.

What do I mean by sexual catechetics? One example should suffice.

Whereas, heretofore, the term ejaculation was used by Catholic school children to describe short prayers to Our Lord and Our Lady, especially in time of temptation against purity, under the new sexual catechetical program, young Catholic school children were now expected to apply a sexual definition to the term complete with a phantasmagoric image of the physiological process

McHugh as the Architect of Catholic Sex Instruction

The title Family Life Office was a misnomer. Under McHugh it promoted neither family nor life. As I document in *The McHugh Chronicles*, McHugh was on record as being in favor of contraception, especially for fornicating teens; *in vitro* fertilization ; universal cradle to grave sex instruction; no-fault divorce; and he had the solitary distinction of destroying, with Cardinal Bernardin's co-operation, the only opportunity this country ever had of passing a no-exceptions Human Life Amendment.¹⁸

McHugh was known to travel in several anti-life circles. He served as an advisor to the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors (AASEC), an offspring of Planned Parenthood (P.P.), and was an ardent promoter of the Sex Education and Information Council of the U.S. (SEICUS), especially in the diocesan Catholic press. McHugh also served as an advisor to several large publishing houses which produced sex instruction manuals for Catholic school children.¹⁹

NCCB/USCC Sex Instruction Timetable 1968 - Present

In March 1968, shortly after he took over the Family Life Office, Msgr. McHugh persuaded the National Council of Catholic Women to publish a pro-sex instruction article written by E. James Lieberman titled "How Not to Teach Children About Sex." Lieberman was a Director of SIECUS and a member of the Population Crisis Committee and the National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws. Lieberman later opened a nation-wide chain of aboritoriums.²⁰

Two months later, McHugh persuaded the National Association of Catholic Men to invite SIECUS founder and P.P. Medical Director Mary Calderone to make a radio guest appearance on Catholic Radio to promote sex education. Calderone, a pro-abortion, pro-homosexual Quaker warned Catholic parents against opposing the Catholic Church's efforts to move children in the direction of "a mature, responsible, creative sexuality."²¹

In the early 1970s, McHugh continued to press for universal, cradle to grave sex instruction at various Congressional population control hearings including the landmark hearings of August 7, 1970, on the federal government's first multi-billion dollar domestic population control bill known as Title X of the Public Health Service Act, and the hearings held by the John D. Rockefeller III's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future in April 1971, at which time McHugh stated that instruction of all forms of birth control could be part of a comprehensive sex program for children. Never mind that general group instruction in sinful behavior is IMMORAL and PEDAGOGICALLY prohibited.

NCCB/USCC Mandates Classroom Sex Instruction

On November 15, 1968, the American bishops, acting through the NCCB/USCC formally advanced the cause of compulsory sex instruction for Catholic school children with the passage of the Pastoral Letter, "Human Life in Our Day," which made "systematic" classroom sex instruction a "grave obligation." In support of this massive spiritual assault on childhood innocence, the drafters of the document cited that singular mischievous sentence found in the Second Vatican Council's *Declaration on Christian Education*, which has already been analyzed in Part I of this series.

Education of Children in Sexuality

61. In accord with the Decree on Christian Education of Vatican Council II, we affirm the value and necessity of wisely planned education of children in human sexuality, adapted to the maturity and background of our young people. We are under a grave obligation, in part arising from the new circumstances of modern culture and communications, to assist the family in its efforts to provide such training. This obligation can be met either by systematic provision of such education in the diocesan school curriculum or by the inauguration of acceptable educational programs under other diocesan auspices, including the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.²²

Thus, what was formerly forbidden in Pope Pius XI's encyclical *Divini Illius Magistri*, that is, open and public sex instruction, had now become “systematic” and “a grave obligation.” Thousands of protest letters were sent to Pope Paul VI, but neither he, nor any subsequent post-Conciliar pope did anything to prevent Catholic children from drinking from the new catechetical poisoned wells. A war between faithful Catholic parents and the NCCB/USCC (USCCB) had begun and would continue to rage into the 21st century.

Human Sexuality Guidelines for Parochial Schools and CCD

Acting now with official hierarchical approval, in April 1969, the USCC Family Life Office in cooperation with the already Modernist-infected National Catholic Education Association mailed “Guidelines for the Formation of a Program of Education in Human Sexuality” and a set of instructions for teachers, educators and parents to all superintendents of Catholic schools. Clueless and compliant Catholic school teachers were rounded up and shipped off to AASEC and SIECUS classes to become certified sex trainers and professional child seducers.

Among the early recommended sex programs for young Catholic school children was the *Becoming a Person Program (BAPP)*. McHugh served as an advisor for this sexually explicit series which was co-authored by Reverend Walter J. Imbierski, a leader of the pro-contraception Chicago Cana Movement. Imbierski served on the Board of Directors of the pro-abortion, pro-homosexual SIECUS while serving on the Family Life Office Advisory Board. He eventually left the priesthood and the Church and entered into a civil marriage with Frances Marzec, his former secretary and the co-author of the series, but not before the *BAPP* plague spread throughout the country.

Rivaling the *BAPP* program for sexual explicitness and the wholesale spiritual and moral destruction of Catholic children and youth were Sadlier's *Respect Life Program* and the thrice revised Wm. Brown Co.'s *New Creation Series*.

Cardinal Ratzinger Upholds *New Creation Series*

In early June 1989, all of the American bishops received a 6-page memorandum from the General Secretary of the NCCB concerning the status of the *New Creation* series which had been a major source of continuing controversy for almost two decades in Catholic circles. The mailing had been initiated by Archbishop Daniel Kucera of Dubuque, who had given his *Imprimatur* to *New Creation*.

In his introductory cover letter in defense of *New Creation*, Kucera explained that the two separate Vatican dicasteries, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith headed by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger and the Congregation for Catholic Education headed by William Cardinal Baum, had found the 1-8 grade sex series did not appear to be “problematic from the doctrinal point of view,” (CDF) or lack “doctrinal integrity,” (CCE). These decrees flew in the face of statement by *New Creation* critics such as Edouard Cardinal Gagnon, President of the Pontifical Council for the Family, who had warned Catholic parents that the sex initiation series was a pedagogical and psychological disaster.²³

New Creation was unadulterated raw moral sewage. This would have been obvious to any right-minded adult looking at the larger-than-life overheads designed for use in the Catholic classroom. of a female and male’s exterior and interior sexual and reproductive organs Any right-minded-adult would have also viewed the intimate details of coitus; the instruction on male and female masturbation; and the promotion of “family planning” as an occasion of sin for young and impressionable youth. In Part III of this series we will examine in depth the harm that classroom sex instruction does to young children and adolescents, but for now, we must ask, “Why then was this not obvious to Ratzinger and Baum?” I cannot image a more profound disconnect between the thinking of these two churchmen, and the reality of the obliteration of the nascent spiritual life of the child or adolescent accompanied by the assault of persistent phantasmagoric sexual images imposed upon their immature psyches, the *sine quo non*, of the modern sexually sophisticated child.

Further, *New Creation* did, in fact, promote doctrinal errors with regard to matters of faith and morals. For example, in the *New Creation* text for 8th graders, “test-tube

baby” techniques are praised, and the question of the morality of *in vitro* fertilization is left open-ended. Yet on February 22, 1987, a year **before** the CDF was asked to rule on *New Creation*, Ratzinger had affixed his signature to *Donum Vitae-Instruction on Respect for Human Life in Its Origins and on the Dignity of Procreation Replies to Certain Questions of the Day*, which condemned the practice of *in vitro* fertilization. Why then was not this objection raised by the CDF?

A very practical question arises, of course, that is, did Ratzinger or Baum ever carefully examined the text of *New Creation* or any of the other sex instruction manual for Catholic youth, for THEMSELVES? I would have to say, they did not, even though the immortal souls of hundreds of thousands of Catholic school children were at stake.

“To Teach as Jesus Did”

Returning to our NCCB/USCC sex instruction timetable, in November 1972, the USCC Education Committee further entrenched formal sex instruction in Catholic schools with the passage of “To Teach As Jesus Did-A Pastoral Message on Christian education”²⁴ This document warned parents against interfering with the execution of sex programs in Catholic schools, as this opposition was said to be contrary to the teachings of Vatican II. A similar warning was issued against parents in the National Catechetical Directory “Sharing the Light of Faith,” which was approved by the NCCB in 1977, then approved by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and finally released in 1981.²⁵

Daniel Dolesh and the National Committee for Human Sexuality

In the late 1970s while McHugh was in Rome pursuing advanced degrees in moral theology and ethics, the continuing war against innocence shifted from the USCC Family Life Office to the USCC Department of Education which had created a new group called the National Committee for Human Sexuality under the direction of a small-time “Call to Action” bureaucrat by the name of Daniel Dolesh, S.T.D. Danny Boy had all the impeccable anti-life credentials necessary for a rising star at the NCCB/USCC. He was a member of AASEC and he belonged to several pro-abortion/pro homosexual groups

including the Washington, D.C., Metro Sex Ed Coalition, a Planned Parenthood front organization and the National Forum for Sex Education.

Not surprisingly, the National Committee for Human Sexuality was composed of well-known dissenters from *Humane Vitae*, pro-homosexual clergy, and authors with a commercial interest in sex instructional material. All serious opponents to classroom sex initiation programs had been deliberately excluded from the 25-member task force.

In 1981, the National Committee issued a revised set of USCC sex education guidelines called “Education in Human Sexuality for Christians” intended for use in all Catholic elementary and secondary schools. Included in the Committee’s recommendations was the mandate that all students receive formal instruction on sexual perversions including homosexuality, transvestism, pedophilia, incest, contraception, and masturbation, with emphasis on different sexual lifestyles. Dolesh eventually left the D.C. area when his own family fell apart. He resettled in Cleveland where he hosted a radio call-in show “Sexline” where, on at least one occasion, Dolesh defended bestiality. The news of the scandalous departure of the NCCB/USCC’s main architect of sex programs for Catholic school children left the American bishops unfazed as Dolesh’s National Committee “sex guidelines” were kept in place for another nine years.²⁶

Human Sexuality: A Catholic Perspective and Lifelong Learning

It was at the November 1990 meeting of the NCCB/USCC, that the 1981 “sex guidelines” were replaced by yet another set of USCC “sex guidelines” called *Human Sexuality: A Catholic Perspective and Lifelong Learning*. Although the USCC tried, (unsuccessfully) to keep the membership of the committee who drafted the document a secret, it was a forgone conclusion that McHugh had continued to play an influential role in the Church’s new sex programs, and indeed that proved to be the case as we shall see shortly.

At that fateful November D.C. meeting, the only bishop to openly oppose the new “sex guidelines” was New York Auxiliary Bishop Austin Vaughan, bless his soul. Vaughan along with old war horses like Father Paul Wickens, Msgr. Charles Moss, and

Dominican Rev. John O'Connor were among the handful of clergy who continued to support faithful Catholics opposing the sexual indoctrination of Catholic school children.

McHugh Operates from Behind the Scenes at the Vatican

For the record, it was later confirmed that, while in Rome, McHugh had participated in the drafting of John Paul II's "Charter on the Rights of the Family" and in the document *Educational Orientations on Human Love*, the title translated by the USCC as *Educational Guidance in Human Love (EGHL)* and released by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education on December 1, 1983.

When *EGHL* was initially released in the United States, Father Thomas Lynch, Father McHugh's replacement at the Family Life Office, praised the document, which he said "gave a creative green light to sex education." The NCCB/USCC Committee for Pro-Life Affairs likewise claimed *EGHL* provided "a theological foundation and moral principles, which guide the development of such programs in parochial schools."

Interesting as it is telling, however, it was the Planned Parenthood clone, Center for Population Options, and not the NCCB/USCC, that publicly recognized that *EGHL* marked a departure from the Vatican's Magisterial teaching prohibiting classroom sex instruction. According to the CPO, the document represented the first official support from the Vatican for "positive" classroom sex instruction. It also noted that it may serve to silence Catholic opponents of sex education in both parochial and public schools and concludes that *EGHL* has already opened up a "new dialogue" between sex education advocates (i.e., SIECUS, AASECT and Planned Parenthood) and the Catholic Church.

Undermining the Magisterium

The tactics used by the drafters of *EGHL* (Father McHugh was the Vatican's "expert" from the United States) follow the familiar Modernist tactic of undermining a Magisterial teaching without actually denying it.

First, they radically redefined the term “sex education” divorcing it completely from its historical roots, its well-known anti-life, anti-family nature and its primary function – to produce polymorphous perverts.

Then, having redefined the normative meaning of “sex education” beyond recognition, the framers of *EGHL* proclaimed that Pope Pius XI correctly "declared erroneous the sex education which was presented at THAT TIME, which was information of a naturalist character, precociously, and indiscriminately imparted."(emphasis added) (16) The new school sex programs were no longer “naturalistic” because they were now incorporated into religious catechetical programs, hence the term “sexual catechetics.” Therefore, they no longer fall within purview of the 1929 ban. *EGHL* concluded with a challenge to Christian educators to take up the “positive” work of sex education!

With the publication of *EGHL*, pro-sex education forces, within and without the Church, thought the controversy was laid to rest. But they were wrong. The battle raged on and there was more Vatican subterfuge. More and more Catholic parents were taking their children out of parochial schools and homeschooling them.

The Catholic Homeschooling Movement accelerated with the addition of so-called AIDS/HIV instruction into the Catholic classroom and CCD classes including the use of the National Catholic Education Association program *AIDS: A Catholic Educational Approach to HIV, Lessons to Teach About AIDS/HIV*. This and similar AIDS programs provided a new vehicle for waging a war against “homophobia” and for the promotion of sexual perversions.²⁷

Pontifical Council for Family Issues Parental Guidelines

It was not until 1995, that the Vatican once again tried its hand again at damage control with *The Truth and Meaning of Human Sexuality: Guidelines for Education Within the Family (TMHS)* issued by the Pontifical Council for the Family (PCF) headed by Alfonso Card. López Trujillo of Columbia.²⁸

Initially the PCF document was hailed by some Catholic anti-sex instruction groups as one that would finally “pull the plug” on parochial school sex curriculums. There were at least two groups, however, that publicly opposed *Truth and Meaning* – Parents Roundtable headed by Marie Zaccaria and the U.S. Coalition for Life, headed by this writer.

Why didn’t Parents Roundtable and the USCL back *Truth and Meaning*? Simply because in the 30,000 worded document with the usual assurances about parental rights, and “opting out” of objectionable courses, etc., the only word that could help return sanctity and sanity to Catholic religious education was conspicuous by its absence. That word was NO!

McHugh, now Bishop of Camden N.J., who served as a consultant to the PCF confirmed this opinion when he informed opponents of classroom sex programs that *Truth and Meaning* could NOT be used to make their case because the document does NOT ban sex education. On the contrary, he stated that *TMHS* was not intended to prohibit such programs because that would be contrary to church policy, which, he said had given birth to many good programs in the schools.²⁹

‘Catholic’ Sex Instruction Programs Move into the 21st Century

From the early 1990s to the present time, a number of the older sex programs for Catholic school children have been re-packaged for Catholic consumption including various “abstinence-based” programs like TeenSTAR (Sexuality Teaching in the context of Adult Responsibility) which promotes fertility charting for young girls and the monitoring of arousal/erection patterns for young boys.³⁰

On May 9, 2007, Cardinal Justin Rigali, Chairman of the USCCB Committee for Pro-life Activities testified before a Congressional Appropriations Committee that if federal abstinence programs were cut, “Catholic schools and other organizations truly dedicated to the message of personal responsibility and abstinence before marriage will be unable to participate in government programs.”³¹ No government sex programs? Now that would be a real loss for the Catholic Church wouldn’t it? Since when did the

Catholic Church look to a government that is stained with the blood of millions upon millions of unborn children for moral guidance of any kind?

The promotion of Pope John Paul II's *Theology of the Body* for young children and teens has, in recent years, become a cottage industry.³²

To add to this explosive mix, in 2002, Catholic bishops were forced to implement "child abuse prevention/ "safe environment" programs" in their dioceses despite the fact that victim-oriented programs are ineffective and inappropriate for the prevention of child and adolescent sexual abuse, and that such programs are harmful to children because they interfere with the proper emotional, spiritual and moral development.³³ Further, "None of the factors that place a child at risk for sexual abuse is within the child's ability to control or to change."³⁴

Why This Timetable Is Important?

My thanks to the *CFN* reader for trudging his way through this tedious timetable which tracks and records the role of the American bishops via their bureaucracy, the NCCB/USCC (USCCB), in the institutionalization of classroom sex instruction in parochial schools and CCD classes over the last 44 years. Yet, tedious and distressing as it may be, this timetable is of critical importance to analyzing this plague that has been deliberately delivered upon Catholic children and youth for more than four decades, and for deciphering any possible future plans for eradicating the plague from our Catholic educational system.

On December 1, 2011, *The Catholic World Report* carried an interview by Catholic writer Jim Graves with Bishop Alexander Sample of the Diocese of Marquette, Mich., titled "Lost Generations."³⁵ Bishop Sample was ordained a priest on June 1, 1990, at the age of 29, and was ordained a bishop on January 25, 2006, at the age of 45, the youngest Catholic bishop of the United States.

During the *CWR* interview which included questions related to the steep decline in numbers of Catholics in the United States, the bishop was asked to comment on his

statement that he was a member of “the first lost generation of poor catechesis,” which “raised up another generation that is equally uncatechized.”³⁶

Bishop Sample answered that he was part of the Vatican II generation raised in a time of great social upheaval as well as confusion in the Church especially in the field of catechesis. “We booted the *Baltimore Catechism* out the door, but there wasn’t anything to replace it,” he said.³⁷

Now, obviously, this statement is in error. Following the Second Vatican Council, traditional Catholic catechetics were indeed tossed out of Catholic schools, but they were immediately **replaced** with sexual catechetics deliberately designed to undermine Catholic morality, as well as Modernist religious textbooks designed to undermine the faith. That Bishop Sample should be unaware of this fact, is unfortunate but not surprising, since he comes from a generation of new prelates who never knew a time when classroom sex instruction was not mandated in the Catholic elementary and secondary school curriculum.

It is hoped that the timetable presented in this segment will help fill this information gap for all bishops and priests and religious of good will, including Bishop Sample, and for the Catholic laity as well, and that it will provide a solid foundation for a new and through reassessment of sex instruction programs in Catholic schools – programs that stand in direct opposition to the teaching Magisterium of the Church which prohibits classroom sex instruction for Catholic children, and which were **imposed** on Catholic families by the NCCB/USCC (USCCB) over the objections of a large segment of Catholic parents.

Catholic Family News
October 2012

“Sex Abuse in Catholic Schools –The Evolution of
Sex Instruction in Catholic Schools from
Becoming a Person to Theology of the Body”

By Randy Engel

PART III– How Exposure to Classroom Sex Instruction Harms Young Children and Teens

Introduction – Sex is Not Child’s Play

As every parent intuitively knows and appreciates, childhood is a special and dynamic time in a person’s life. The world of childhood is like no other. It is a time of explosive growth in every developmental sphere – physical, intellectual, emotional, psychological and spiritual.

Unless he is prematurely seduced or abused physically or psychologically or otherwise exposed to adult sexual activity, the child, by Nature’s decree – Nature being the Vicar General of God – is sexually innocent. Premature interest by a young child in sexual matters is unnatural, the precursor of a distorted personality.

We often forget that a school-age child is not a miniature adult. He doesn’t possess the cognitive skills necessary for abstract thinking and complex conceptualization essential for discerning the affective nature of coitus. On the contrary, since children are keen observers but poor interpreters, when they are given mating instructions and/or exposed to visuals of sexual intercourse between adults, such acts are interpreted by the child as an act of aggression, a physically sadistic and cruel attack on the woman.³⁸

The sexually-initiated child, his eyes having been opened and his innocence destroyed, now has sexual knowledge which he should not have at his young age, knowledge which will produce an unnatural sexual curiosity in a realm universally reserved by custom and statute for adults. From this precocious knowledge unaccompanied by understanding issues forth sexual images and phantasmagoric interventions, that will induce the child, now stripped of all his natural and supernatural defenses, to fixate on “infantile libidinal pleasures” with a marked tendency towards

habituated self-abuse, exhibitionism and voyeurism – acts which will often follow him through his teen years into adulthood.³⁹

Classroom Sex Instruction is Anti-Educational

In virtually all cultures, the child in his latency period, that is, between the years of five or six and the start of puberty is recognized as being educationally ideal. The age of seven has long been recognized as the age of reason and discretion whereby the child can be the recipient of the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion. Masters of religious catechesis have long recognized that it is a time when the child is most open to religious instruction and formation and the things that pertain to God and His divine domain of angels and saints.

The asexual nature of the child during latency releases the child's energies in the direction of fulfilling his natural curiosity and instinct for knowledge apart from the sexual sphere. He experiences and revels in the "affectionate love" demonstrated by his own parents, grandparents and siblings – a love which he will later transfer to God if he chooses the celibate religious life or single life, or share with his spouse should he embrace the vocation of marriage. For the unsullied child, his first associations with sexual matters are correctly tied to marriage, family, and babies.

Not so, the sexually educated or sexually sophisticated child who has been the benighted "beneficiary" of sex instruction, and who is rendered, for all practical and spiritual purposes, "uneducable" by such instruction. According to psychiatrist Melvin Ansell, M.D., A.S.P.P., an ardent foe of so-called "sex education," "With the artificially induced arousal of his erotogenic zones, the child experiences a decreased capability for academic and spiritual pursuits. He also exhibits an emotional retardation in connection with the development of compassionate feelings and empathy"⁴⁰

This developmentally dangerous situation, says Ansell, is further complicated by the fact that early classroom sex instruction invariably promotes all forms of sexual perversions including autoeroticism and homosexuality under the guise of "compassion."

For the normal person, be he child or adult, the first natural reaction to perversion is “one of shame and disgust,” explains Anchell. “To shun the abnormal is a subconscious mental defense against contamination. When disgust turns to sympathy, the normal individual become defenseless,” warns Anchell.⁴¹

Thus latency period, which should be an age of innocence and growing in God’s grace is corrupted and shattered by classroom sex initiation programs, described and condemned as such by Pope Pius XI in *Divini Illius Magistri*.⁴²

Parents Not Sexperts Are a Child’s Natural Guide

Imparting sexual knowledge, both indirect and direct, at the right time, at the right place, and in the proper manner to the questioning child and the older adolescent is the right and responsibility of parents. Parents are by nature free of concupiscence when dealing with their children in the sexual sphere. By the grace of their vocation they have the correct disposition and knowledge to protect their children from the dangers of “premature awakening of sexual interests.”⁴³ And by their example of chaste love and sense of modesty and decency, good and holy parents reinforce the innate sense of modesty and purity in their own children. Further, “formation in modesty and privacy are invaluable in developing the child’s power to discern what is normal versus abnormal behavioral interactions between him and older children and adults.”⁴⁴

It is one of the great tragedies of the Catholic Church in the post-Conciliar era of the Second Vatican Council, that all of the popes from Paul VI to Benedict XV and the majority of bishops especially in Western nations, whatever their spoken or written **pronouncements** supporting parental “rights” and “responsibilities,” have consistently **acted** to undermine parental authority and responsibility in the sexual sphere by encouraging and promoting the “expertise” of the “sexperts” and the SIECUS/Planned Parenthood-indoctrinated and trained shock troops over the primary teachers of children – their parents.

The Vulnerability of Adolescents

In September 1976, Myre Sim, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Ottawa, at a meeting of the National Federation of Catholic Physicians' Guilds in Chicago, delivered a powerful slam-dunk condemnation of the exploitation of vulnerable adolescents by those eager to initiate them into early sexual activity and practices.⁴⁵ Here are some pithy remarks which are as relevant today as they were almost a half-century ago:

When one ... considers adolescent sexuality, one must bear in mind that adolescents are vulnerable people and that they are living in a society where educational accents have shifted. They are likely to be exposed to sexual education designed to "turn them on," while their parents and grandparents were "turned off." Fantasies have given way to factual experience and where fantasies are fostered they are likely to be heavily contaminated with perverse practices.⁴⁶

That youngsters are generally sensitive and vulnerable on sexual matters is given scant consideration, for the Food and Drugs Act does not extend to this area and merchandisers can peddle their pills with impunity. I use the word "peddle" advisedly, for there is more profit to be derived by hooking 100 girls on the Pill than in achieving 100 contacts with heroin.⁴⁷

... There is a stable proportion of vulnerable young people who are being encouraged to behave sexually in a manner which exposes them to potential harm and many will be precipitated towards a psychotic state.⁴⁸

Interference with Adolescent Developmental Milestones

The developmental and sexual maturation of the human species is a complex process. At the start of puberty, the child's secondary sexual characteristics and physical changes are triggered by the hypothalamus which prompts the secretion of hormones produced by the pituitary gland – estrogen and other hormones for girls and testosterone for boys. Correspondingly, the production of melatonin, a hormone produced by the pineal gland which functions to inhibit sexual development in the young child is dramatically reduced at this time.

During adolescence, the human brain will undergo major reconstruction of its synapses or neuronal interconnections in the prefrontal cortex which directs the development of cognitive skills that contribute to sound decision-making and appropriate and moral behavior.⁴⁹ Up until the start of puberty, these interconnections formed in childhood have remained stable. Now they will undergo a dramatic remodeling which involves a severe pruning of existing neuronal interconnections called “dearborization,” a process which will continue through the teen years until the mid-twenties when cognitive and emotional operations stabilize.⁵⁰ Until this state of maturation is arrived at, teens are incapable of fully exercising the so-called “executive functions” of the brain which control the ability to understand the long-term consequences of actions on self, on friends, family and society.⁵¹

It has long been known that the use of drugs and alcohol during this critical period of brain dearborization and reorganization in the adolescent will interfere with this developmental process and lead to impaired thinking, decision-making, judgment and emotional reactions.⁵² But it is only in the last century with the development of brain scanning and mapping technologies that we are beginning to understand how normal psycho-sexual development and sexual maturation in the growing adolescent is radically altered by exposure to public sex instruction and other forms of premature sexual stimulation and seduction.

Early Physiological Damage

In the mid-1970s, the prominent Manhattan psychiatrist Dr. Walter Bruschi, a convert to the Catholic faith and an opponent of classroom sex instruction, warned of the detrimental physiological effects of public sex instruction, in all its forms, on children and adolescents:

With today’s biological knowledge and knowledge of the human nervous system which provides over biological impulse, we can state with certainty that the more you stimulate the sexual function, the more it is going to want to be expressed. We also have learned that this sexual stimulation is accumulated within the central nervous system and when a certain level is reached it has to be discharged. Therefore the less exposure there is to

information – any books, talking about sex, expose to sex, or any other acts which stimulate the sexual drive, the better. In short – the less sex instruction, the less sexual stimulation – the better.⁵³

It is essential that parents understand that these physiological realities engendered by explicit classroom instruction affect ALL children exposed to these programs in a deeply profound and negative way. Further this damage is incurred by the child without reference to the specific sexual content of program in use.

The loss of sexual innocence leaves an indelible mark on both body and soul even where the child is too young to understand the nature and ramifications of the crime carried out against his person in the classroom with at least (in the child's mind) the tacit approval of his parents who are suppose to protect him against such misadventures.

Neither the young child nor his adolescent counterpart are capable of understanding that they have been subjected to behavioral modification and “values-clarification” techniques in the classroom – techniques directed towards obtaining their consent to become “sexually active,” that is, to engage in sexual acts with self (masturbation) and with others, although the decision to act out sexually must appear to be spontaneous and self-directed.

Habituated Self-Abuse – A Turning Away from God

One of the hallmarks of early “Catholic” sexual catechesis in the 1970s was the encouragement of the solitary vice, with some texts going as far as to explain self-abuse techniques for boys and girls, and the role of pornography is aiding sexual release.

Masturbation, like other forms of sexual aberrations, is a learned not inherited behavior. It is intensely narcissistic, a turning inward on self and a turning away from God. The guilt and repugnance normally associated with the solitary vice is a natural reaction to a violation of the Natural Law especially when the act employs sexually deviant fantasies.

As noted earlier, habituated acts of self abuse are often carried over into adulthood and marriage with disastrous results for both spouses. Habituated masturbators do not make good marriage material. Most women cannot compete with an airbrushed porn centerfold, nor is it conducive to true conjugal love for the husband to view his wife

as a mere receptacle for the products of his orgasmic, and often sadistic and perverted behaviors learned in childhood or adolescence.

It is the task of fathers to instruct their young sons in the virtue of purity and self control, first by setting an example of sexual self-control and secondly, by promoting the love of God over the love of self and encouraging the aid of prayer and penance in the difficult battle of mastering one's sexual passions. Nowadays, mothers also need to be equally vigilant in this delicate matter since popular teen and glamour magazines promote masturbation as a norm for young girls and young women.

Nature Abhors Premature Sexual Seduction

Recent neuroscience advances have opened up new windows of research on the effects of sexual stimulation on the brain, especially the role played by neurochemicals such as dopamine, oxytocin, and vasopressin in influencing sexual behaviors, both constructive and destructive.⁵⁴

Nature seeks to insure the survival of the species, the primacy of monogamous relationships, and the bonding of spouses to each other and to their offspring by a generous production of these neurochemicals/hormones which flood the brain during periods of sexual excitement and coitus.

Nature, however, did not intend that children and adolescents enter into sexual activities and relationships reserved for adults within the bonds of Matrimony. This proscription is reinforced by the fact that the physical development of the adolescent in transition from childhood to adulthood is not matched by comparable psychological and emotional growth and stability that characterizes the mature female in her late teens and the mature male in his early to mid-twenties.

It follows then, that it is in the best interest of the adolescent that his youthful energies be directed away from the sexual sphere and redirected towards academic excellence and/or vocational training and artistic/sports pursuits as well as an active participation in familial enterprises and the development of the spiritual life.

In times past, Church and State made their contribution in support of this important developmental task of youth by supporting the indissolubility of (heterosexual)

marriage and the integrity and authority of the family; by enforcing laws which prohibit and/or discourage vice (including homosexuality) and promote virtue; by prohibiting the production and distribution of pornography and sexually explicit programming by the public media; by the vigorous enforcement of age of consent laws which mete out severe penalties for statutory rape of male and female minors; and by upholding the rights and responsibilities of parents to direct the education of their children, including instruction in sexual matters as their children advance in age and understanding. But, as Dr. Sim has so astutely observed, this is no longer the case.

The Production of Polymorphous Perverts

Today, there appears to be little interest (and no financial profit) in preserving and protecting virtue and purity in our young people. Indeed, it appears that our secularized society in tandem with the post-Conciliar Church has a different moral agenda for our youth, the end product of which is the production of polymorphous perverts. Is this an exaggeration? Based upon the evidence presented in this series, I think not.

In my book *Sex Education – The Final Plague*, I trace the history of the “Sex Initiation Movement,” from the Free Thinkers, anarchists, and Socialist/utopian innovators of the mid-1800s to the Neo-Malthusian, Social Hygiene, and World Sexual Reform Movements of the early 20th century.⁵⁵ Central to the platform of these “reformers” was the repeal of anti-birth control, anti-sodomy, anti-abortion, anti-pornography, anti-divorce and anti-prostitution laws and most importantly, the introduction of “systematic” and “scientific” sexual education for children and adults.

From the beginning, it was clearly understood that the classroom was the most efficient means of propagating the agenda of the sexual reformers. Where else could one gain immediate access to an unlimited number of vulnerable, immature, and non-discriminating children and adolescents isolated from their parents in a captive environment funded by public taxes and donations?

Following the close of World War II, classroom sex instruction was sold to public school administrators as a “public health” measure to reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancies and venereal disease, principally syphilis and gonorrhea. In Catholic parochial schools,

however, the prohibition against classroom sex instruction found in *Divini Illius Magistri* was upheld by the American bishops until the promulgation of *Gravissimum Educationis* by Paul VI on October 28, 1965.

Prior to the adoption of sex initiation programs, virginity was the norm for public, private and parochial high school students of both sexes. Modesty in dress and manners for youth prevailed. Not surprisingly, virginity was also the norm for candidates to the priesthood and religious life for both sexes. Incidents of sexual promiscuity among school-age adolescents including the sequela of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and induced abortion, fell outside the norm. Where they did occur, they could generally be traced to three factors – severe economic destitution and familial dissolution, delinquency, and mental deficiencies.

Fifty years, and two generations later, the United States adolescent scene has changed dramatically. Rampant sexual promiscuity and perverted sexual practices among adolescents of all ages has become the new norm. Sexually experienced high school girls threaten the livelihood of professional prostitutes not only in the numbers of partners they service, but in their crude dress, perverse sexual practices, and anti-maternal violent behavior not excluding the murder of their unborn children either by chemical or surgical abortion, or after birth by drowning their newborns in the school toilet or suffocating them in blankets which are later stuffed in school lockers. The number of serious sexually transmitted diseases has jumped to 25, some are incurable, and the infections are found in almost every orifice of the human body. “Shacking up” has become the norm for older adolescents, and when these couples do marry, to no one’s surprise, chances are that half the marriages will end in divorce. Drug-related deaths and suicide rates among young teenage males are climbing. The largest group of Internet pornography consumers consists of teens between the ages of 12 and 17.

These troubled teens are a reflection of a Godless society gone mad.

To make matters worse, these young people are, for the most part, spiritually rudderless, as their parents before them – the hapless products of post-Conciliar catechesis devoid of doctrine and morals.

Enough is enough! Isn't it time parents rein in the horde culture, and reintroduce their children to a civilized society that protects its youth and punishes the transgressors of innocence and morality, and to a Church that puts the salvation of souls, especially the souls of the young, above all else?

Catholic Family News
November 2012

“Sex Abuse in Catholic Schools –The Evolution of
Sex Instruction in Catholic Schools from
Becoming a Person to Theology of the Body”

By Randy Engel

**PART IV –The Eickhoff Study –
“Sex Education and Sex Practice”**

Introduction

This 18-year study on the effects of classroom sex instruction on young English schoolgirl delinquents in the second half of the 20th century is one of the most remarkable I have ever read on the subject. An article based on the findings of child psychiatrist Dr. Louise F. W. Eickhoff was published in 1974 in *Child and Family* magazine edited by Dr. Herbert Ratner.⁵⁶ Some 40 years later, the report is as timely and fresh as the day it was written.

The Eickhoff study was initially undertaken to investigate the origins of changes in juvenile delinquency patterns following the introduction of universal sex instruction into the English and Welsh school systems. Much of the data originated from the heavily populated metropolitan and industrialized city of Birmingham located in the West Midlands of England.

As in the United States, public sex instruction lectures were initially introduced into Birmingham society by the Voluntary Council of Social Health during the Second World War (1939-1945) for the ostensible purpose of safeguarding the population against the increase in venereal disease. Included in the target population were school graduates, factory workers, and members of youth clubs. In 1943, the Birmingham Public Health

Committee officially took over the task of prophylactic education. That same year, the national office of the Board of Education issued guidelines for the introduction of sex instruction into English schools, although it was not until the mid-1950s that these recommendations were implemented into Birmingham secondary education courses in biology, physiology, reproduction and hygiene.

Eickhoff reports that in 1967, the Ministry of Education “**mistaking parents instinctual reticence for negligence**, advocated sex education for all secondary schools, and suggested preparatory courses for primary grades (emphasis added).”⁵⁷ Thereafter, an increasing number of English and Welsh schoolchildren were exposed on a systematic basis to classroom instruction on human sexual behavior including deviant practices within the context of ever-increasing sexually explicit texts and visuals.

Preparations for Eickhoff Study

In the late 1960s, Eickhoff reviewed retrospectively 2,837 juvenile delinquency case records dating back to the 1950s which were taken from three remand homes (detention centers) for juvenile offenders located in Birmingham and in Lichfield, England. Beginning in 1969, the author carried out standard interviews concerning the content of all school subjects and all other sources of information and influence. This particular study was limited to the relationship of sex education sex practice as found in girls aged 12 to 17 in one remand home where conditions remained uniform between 1952 and 1970.

The study was an attempt to record and analyze the pathological sequelae of sex education found in girls in a particular community in which comparison with controls was possible with special attention to the nature of the alterations in these girls and the increase in juvenile promiscuity in England and Wales following the introduction of sex instruction into the school curriculum. In the United States, the correlation between sex education and aberrant behavior had already been observed by such authors as John A. Steinbacher (*The Child Seducers*, 1970), and Dr. Rhoda L. Lorand (“A Psychoanalytic View of the Sex Education Controversy” (1970).

Definition of Sex Education

Eickhoff uses the following definition of sex education – “any instruction that induces full sexual awareness, or imparts an understanding of the full significance of the genital parts, **in advance of the natural order**, *i.e.*, *before* the individual can manage his own living independent of parent figures, like other adults of his kind, instead of *after* as is the rule throughout the living world. ... (emphasis added). ”⁵⁸ I will return to this theme of premature sexual seduction and practice which runs throughout the study later in this article.

A Profile of the Early 1950s Schoolgirl Delinquent

Prior to the introduction of sex instruction courses into the English and Welsh school curriculum, the typical female juvenile who was remanded for psychiatric examination by the Juvenile Court in the early 1950s was never actively involved sexually. Her adverse situation was related to some defect in constitution and rearing, or abject poverty, and a precipitating disaster accentuated by real deprivation or adult forcefulness. Her offense was simple (*e.g.*, petty theft, truancy), unplanned, and committed without accomplice, except perhaps a sibling of like inheritance and circumstance. She was ignorant of the Law or the significance of her involvement. She was almost unanimously homebound.⁵⁹

The temperament of the sexually innocent schoolgirl was reflected in the normality of her behavioral responses when confronted with her delinquent actions. She was contrite, amenable and responsive. She wept, blushed, felt guilt and shame.⁶⁰ She was invariably sensitive, needing tactful investigation about sexual matters for which she knew euphemisms only. She was a virgin. Her sexual knowledge was hazy and was provided either by her mother at the start of her menstrual cycle or from her close friends or associates.⁶¹

The Emergence of the “New Type” of Schoolgirl Delinquent

Following the introduction in 1955 of sex initiation programs sold to the public under the comprehensive title “Human Biology,” a new type of young female juvenile offender and offense appeared on the scene. Notice the word “type.” This new creature is not simply different “in kind” but “in being.”

The New Type is no longer mentally deficient or from a destitute background. On the contrary, she is constitutionally, sometimes even superior intellectually. There is no apparent precipitating cause for her deviancy. She operates with extra-familial, peer accomplices, “mates” of either sex, and beyond control, even cognizance of guardians, *i.e.*, like the adult offender. She knows the Law and the significance of her acts, but she is uncontrite, accepting her lifestyle ... as normal and her right. In more than 50 % of the 1970 cases, the New Type had left home, signaling a conscious move toward immediate independence and a sexual goal, apart from parents’ and childhood’s ways.⁶²

The offenses of the New Type are grave, planned, and adult-type, *e.g.*, systemized shoplifting and burglary. She is invariably associated with sexual involvement or innuendo. She does not weep, nor blush, nor feel guilt or shame for her serious crimes.⁶³

Her adult-like sexual and criminal activity, however, is not mirrored in her emotional temperament which, according to Eickhoff remains immaturely self-centered. She is unable to love, or to wait for natural outcomes. She is apt to explode into violent tantrums when frustrated. She is motivated by personal convenience, spite, revenge, greed and sexual desire.

In other words, she is the exact opposite of the 1952 young female delinquent, most especially in her demeanor and in her readiness for sex.

According to Eickhoff, it is in the sexual field that differences are most striking. The “New Type” seeks sex, “the antithesis of natural femininity, the reverse of the pattern that enables faithful union and motherhood, the extreme on the scale of preparedness sex observed in *all* instructed girls; and the exact opposite of behavior in 1952.”⁶⁴ Although difficult to manage generally, she is easy over intimate matters, ready with clinical or crude expression.

In 1970, the proportion of girls fully instructed and sexually experienced who actively courted and hankered after sex was 78 percent, 77 percent of whom were still in school. Only 15 percent of all girls in 1970 were sexually innocent, against 94 percent in 1952-1954. The added degree of sexual promiscuity of the New Type is reflected in the increase in head and pubic lice, venereal infections including gonorrhea with the possible sequelae of infertility associated with sexually-transmitted diseases, and out-of-wedlock pregnancies that only the 1968 Abortion Act could check.⁶⁵

The fact that these New Type of sex-seeking young women (like the adult male) were still schoolgirls is of particular significance, since in the past, adolescent girls were at risk of being corrupted only *after* they had left home and the protection of parents, relatives and friends.⁶⁶

In comparing data between the early 1950s schoolgirls and the New Type who were fully instructed in sexual mechanics, contraception and venereal disease, Eickhoff reported the emergence of two unexpected triads – sex education, adult-type behavior patterns and sex-seeking on the one hand; and innocence, juvenile patterns and no active sex on the other. Examination of the retrospective data revealed the consistency of these triads and their use diagnostically and prognostically.⁶⁷

Another important finding of the study was that during wartime when circumstances were most provocative, young women who were sexually knowledgeable were affected by the heightened sexuality of the environment (resulting in higher venereal disease and illegitimacy rate), but the uninitiated and sexually innocent young women were unaffected.⁶⁸

Sex Education Interferes with the Natural Maturation of Children and Adolescents

Eickhoff’s findings correspond to the findings presented in Part III of this series – that “sex is not child’s play,” and that classroom sex instruction interferes with the Nature’s timetable for the maturation of the human species:

In all living creatures, maturity, the antithesis of the preceding immaturity, is attained, not by expansion, but through a period of irreversible changes converting all aspects of the immature constitution and relationships to those of adulthood. Sexual awareness, a cardinal sign of maturity, and the first step towards union, **in the natural plan follows the maturation of the reproductive complexity, and the individual’s attainment of capability to exist successfully in independence** (emphasis added). This insures a full span in dependence for collecting and perfecting essentials; and the optimum

chance for the emerging adult, away from used pastures, stalemates, and competition with the established and experienced.

The whole of immaturity is preparation for maturity. The adult rudiments, including the sexual, and in humans, the psychosexual, present from the onset, **are innately programmed:** parents augment instinctively. ... (emphasis added).⁶⁹

In the natural course, the force of the female's progressive glandular switches, culminating at the first parturition (birth) in the replacement of the self-preservation instinct by the maternal (*cf. Exodus, 13:2*), reverses this essential life principle in certain contexts lest it prevent the faithful submission to the male and the continual cherishing of the issue.⁷⁰

In the case of the New Type female delinquent who has been subjected to explicit and systematic classroom sex instruction, the species' God-given maturation plan is thwarted. Far from deepening femininity and maternal feelings, exposure to such programs produces an immature self-assertive, sex-seeking creature. She has been given sex knowledge out of time and forced into adult activities for which her immature constitution is not completely ready.

Alterations in Normal Physiology Observed in the New Type Delinquent

Unlike her 1952 counterpart, the New Type experiences disturbed menstruation patterns, either missed periods altogether or dysmenorrhea (painful menstrual cramps), indicators of a disturbed physiology.⁷¹

Although Eickhoff did not have access to the more sophisticated brain-imaging technology we have today, nevertheless she recognized the correlation between a disturbance in the complex sexual maturation process and the premature activation of the pineal gland. "Artificial activation, externally applied through eye and ear," says Eickhoff, "cannot be as effective as the natural force from within, that is, the culmination of the programmed build-up to that goal in all the system, both physical and personal." "This could explain the failure of sex-education to turn on fully to the next stage of feminine maturation, and to emit any of the diagnostic signals of the progressive stages (from girl to mother) except readiness for sex," the author states.

Conclusions Drawn from the Eickhoff Study

The conclusions drawn from the Eickhoff study will come as no surprise to the many parents and professions who have waged a relentless war against classroom sex instruction in public, private and parochial schools over the last 45 years:

The national statistics reveal a coincidence between the onset of the continuing increase in female promiscuity and the introduction of schoolroom instruction in sexual matters; and between the continuous rise in illegitimate conceptions and new cases of gonorrhea in girls under sixteen, and the increasing availability for the immature.

It was concluded that apparently sex education interferes with the natural maturation process, bringing about irreversible changes and including maladjustment in the complex intermingling of physical, personal and sexual mechanisms and environmental connections.⁷²

A Return to the Scene of the Crime

Since the findings of the Eickhoff study were published in *Child and Family* in 1974, the element of criminality that characterizes classroom sex initiation programs for children has escalated from bad to catastrophic. Little wonder that a 2011 survey of parents in the United Kingdom revealed that 58% did not want so-called sex education in school.⁷³

Newly redefined cutting-edge “Sexual Relationship and Education” courses which feature sexually explicit videos and computer generated sexual acts including all forms of deviant sex, most especially, sodomy, masturbation and oral sex, are being visited upon another generation of hapless elementary and secondary school-age victims.

Meanwhile, the age of consent for sodomy (buggery), which not so very long ago was a crime, has dropped to 16, with the Homosexual Collective campaigning for a reduction in the age of consent to 14.

According to recently released statistics from Britain’s Department of Health abortions for young teens are soaring. Since 2002, more than 35,262 abortions were carried out on girls **under** the age of 16 including abortions on girls as young as 12 and 13.⁷⁴ The legal age for consent for abortion in the UK is 16.

Britain’s teenage pregnancy rate is the highest in Europe. In 2002 there were 39,286 teen pregnancies recorded. The government has spent more than £60 million to tackle the problem but so far failed to halt the rise.⁷⁵

Perhaps it’s time for a re-examination of the Eickhoff Report – for Brits and for us.

Catholic Family News
December 2012

**“Sex Abuse in Catholic Schools – The Evolution of
Sex Instruction in Catholic Schools from
Becoming a Person to Theology of the Body”**

By Randy Engel

PART V – Restoring Sanctity and Sanity to Catholic Education

Introduction

It is a difficult reality to face up to, but today, in the United States and in many parts of the Catholic world, at least two generations of post-Vatican II Catholic school children and adolescents, and Catholic adults including bishops and religious under 45, have been or are currently being subject to the toxic effects of classroom sex instruction during their formative years.

Of course, many of the victims of contemporary sexual catechetical indoctrination in parochial, public and private schools have never made the connection between their exposure to sexual values clarification and other brainwashing techniques and their current state of unhappiness and immersion in unlamented sins of the flesh which separate them from God.

They look about, and see that Catholics are aborting, sterilizing and contracepting themselves into oblivion at the same rate as their Protestant and Jewish neighbors. They see the disintegration of the Catholic family taking place before their very eyes in the increase of divorce, pornography, drugs, fornication, adultery, masturbation, homosexuality, venereal disease, out of wedlock pregnancies, and familial violence, but they fail to appreciate the source of many of these evils - Kinseyan “sexual catechetics administered under the guise of “family life education” programs.

In his classic work, “A Psychiatrist Looks at Sex Education, “Dr. Melvin Anshell notes that such individuals are in a state of “psychiatric emergency,” yet they are largely ignorant of the underlying cause of their psychiatric and accompanying spiritual and moral distress.⁷⁶ Moreover, even if they were actually to understand and acknowledge the nature of their plight, to whom could they turn for help and rehabilitation except the Divine Physician?

True there are exceptions, primarily Catholic families who have homeschooled their children and managed to hold on to their Catholic faith and children in an alien anti-Christian culture. I see these families among some of my close relatives and friends, and at the Traditional Mass I regularly attend. But they are just that, exceptions, rather than the rule.

No Wild Goose Chase This Time Round

To be honest with the reader, I have been struggling with this last chapter in this series on the restoration of sanctity and sanity in Catholic education for months.

I recall a happier time back in 1989 when I was writing *Sex Education - The Final Plague*, and I held out the slim hope that the Vatican would restore the ban on classroom sex instruction as mandated by Pope Pius XI in *Divini Illius Magistri*.

But that time has long past, and it would be an act of folly for me to even hint at the possibility that Pope Benedict XVI will take corrective action in this matter considering his support for the *New Creation* series when he was the Prefect for the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Further, I would be guilty of an even greater act of betrayal to suggest that Catholic parents seek support for an end to sex initiation programs from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) which has exhibited as much zeal in protecting the spiritual welfare and innocence of Catholic youth, as it has in helping to put clerical pederasts, including some fellow bishops, behind bars for their criminal deeds.

So, I'm not going to send *CFN* readers on any wild and feckless Vatican or USCCB goose chase. Instead, I'm going to lay out, as best I can, the problems faced by Catholics fighting for the restoration of true Catholic education in parochial schools, and offer some short and long-term solutions that will, hopefully, in better times ahead, lay the groundwork for a true restoration in Catholic education.

The Immediate Challenge

Removing Children from Source of Contagion

Readers may recall that following the passage of the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) by Congress in 1986, public and non-profit private schools including parochial schools were required to inspect their facilities for asbestos contained in building materials. Some Catholic schools were immediately closed down until the sources of damaged asbestos contagion could be identified and removed. Parent meetings were held to explain the state of emergency and to lay out options and mandatory management and periodic surveillance plans to deal with the environmental hazards. Under the AHERA, parents and other interested parties were given free access the school's asbestos management plan. Students did not return to the school building until school authorities had received a clean bill of health from the State.

This has not been the case with the plague of sex initiation programs which has been visited upon elementary and secondary parochial school children and Catholic children in public schools in the United States over the last forty years.

In the case of parochial schools, it would be well to remember that these programs were initially shoved down the throats of Catholic parents in the late 1960s by the bishops' bureaucracy, the NCCB/USCC, with the hardy endorsement of the liberal hierarchy, and little if any resistance from "conservative" bishops.

During the early years of the sex instruction battle, parish meetings were held to **tell** parents that these programs were going to be implemented by the diocese. Acquiescent teachers were sent off to Planned Parenthood-affiliated training sessions held by groups like SIECUS (Sex Information and Information Council of the United States) for anti-life indoctrination.

It has been observed that the devil has many allies, but sex instructors of the young and the sex education industry are among his closest friends. These professional revolutionaries were welcomed into the Catholic classroom in droves by bishops, priests and religious thus exposing an untold number of captive parochial school children to years of clinical sexual psychotherapy and a massive frontal attack on their virtue and morals.

Recalcitrant parents were accused of “neglecting” their children because of their “embarrassment” or “ignorance.” Fatal terms like “old fashioned” or “having sexual hang-ups” were heaped like coal on the heads of parents who refused to give their children over for destruction. Parents who could not be intimidated into submission were unceremoniously shown the parish door. Direct access by parents to the student text and teacher’s handbook and visual aides for the sex courses was routinely denied by school administrators.

The Kinseyites, some sporting Roman collars or religious habits, charged parents with “driving the child into an excess of sexual repression and from there into mental illness,” when in fact, they themselves were victims of their own personal neurotic sufferings.⁷⁷ By devaluing parental influence, they also devalued the student’s conscience.⁷⁸ By pushing an openness to every kind of vice and perversion, they released and nurtured a new breed of young barbarians who murder their young without guilt and plunder civilized society. The fact that these attacks on the sanctity of the family and parental rights were carried out under the authority of the “Catholic Church,” actually the post-Conciliar Vatican II Church, made these actions all the more horrific.

Complaints to the diocesan bishop were promptly dropped in the circular file. Complaints to the Papal Nuncio were forwarded to the Congregation for Education and to the offending American bishop, and then dropped into the circular file. Letters of complaints accompanied by explicit sexual texts and pictures found in student books or handouts which found their way to the pope were deemed too graphic and upsetting for him to view, and quickly disappeared into the Curia’s circular file.

Perhaps, had Pope John Paul II been forced to face up to his responsibilities in this area and take action against the sexual revolutionaries and their minions who were destroying the innocence of Catholic school children, he might have been better prepared and motivated to defend Catholic youth against the second wave of sexual revolutionaries, clerical pederasts, who were hiding in the shadows waiting for their next victim.

When individual parental pleadings to Rome failed, Catholic parents who opposed sex instruction in Catholic and public schools joined together with like-minded parents and organized ourselves under the banner of Pope Pius XI's *Divini Illius Magistri*. A few U.S. bishops and Vatican officials came to their aid, notably Auxiliary Bishop Austin B. Vaughan of the Archdiocese of New York, and Canadian Cardinal Edouard Gagnon, P.S.S., President of the Pontifical Council for the Family, both deceased. Together they formed an effective war machine in defense of the innocence of our children and parental rights and responsibilities, and they did achieve some major victories.

But ultimately the battle was lost when Rome came down in favor of the American bishops who were pushing the moral rot on Catholic school children.⁷⁹

With the realization that in order to save their children's souls they would have to remove their children from the source of moral and spiritual contagion, Catholic parents looked to their own resources and their Catholic heritage and faith, and the Catholic Home Schooling Movement was born.

These early pioneers, these gallant mothers and fathers, had learned an invaluable lesson which, unfortunately, many Catholic parents have still to comprehend. The great "Sex Education Experiment" in Catholic schools will be over when (a) the pope reinstates and enforces the ban on sex initiation programs instituted in 1939 by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical *Divini Illius Magistri* or 2) when there is no one left in the Catholic classroom to indoctrinate.

Parental Rights and Responsibilities

In order for our Catholic civilization to survive, for the moral and civil order to be restored, for familial and religious influences to be protected by the State and the Church, for young psyche to be healed, and youthful consciences restored to sanity and enlightened by authentic love and compassion, Catholic parents need to reassert their authority over their children and DEMAND that the Catholic Church and its leadership back them up.⁸⁰

This arduous task begins with the home and the hearth, There is no entity known to mankind which is capable of serving as a better training ground for the upbringing of citizens destined for the Kingdom of God than the family and the home.

In matters of love and life, the home is the natural and supernatural place for children to learn what they need to know on the subject. Children do not learn about true love and affection from a text book. They learn it from the cradle onwards by witnessing the daily acts of love shown by their parents toward God, each other and their offspring. Children make the essential connection between sex, love and marriage by witnessing the small acts of tenderness, devotion and fidelity of their mother and father, and by the anticipation of the birth of a new brother or sister – the more the merrier.

When I was writing the above statement, I recalled a small book titled *The Home-Courtship, Marriage, and Children* written in the mid-1940s by John R. Rice, D.D., Litt. D., a Protestant minister. I've never forgotten a comment he made about his own large family of eight children. He recalls that as a child, he always had plenty of company and "the only home we liked better than ours, to visit, was a family that had more children!"⁸¹ Rice remembers what many Catholics today seem to have forgotten, that, "The choicest gift one can bequeath to a child is not material possessions but another brother and sister," and "the large family is the best prevention against loneliness which is so all-pervasive in modern society."⁸²

Obviously, the Kinseyite wouldn't be found dead spouting such "blasphemies."

The Law of Necessity - Parental Instruction of Children in Sexual matters

Prior to the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church believed in and supported the right of parents to impart sexual information to their children on an individual basis – ideally, mothers to daughters and fathers to sons - at the appropriate time, the appropriate place (the home) and in the proper manner, that is, with discretion and reticence.

As the Reverend Thomas J. Gerrard states in his 1911 masterpiece *Marriage and Parenthood*, "There can only be one reason for enlightening children with sexual knowledge. ... And that reason is necessity."⁸³ Interestingly, Gerrard makes reference to the fact that in 1905, Germany had permitted sexual instruction for boys in secondary schools, but the experiment was not "satisfactory to the Catholic conscience." "In a matter so personal and private," Gerrard states, "class instruction is not the desirable thing."

Mothers, who by their example, take pride and pleasure in their femininity, are the natural communicators to their daughters regarding sexual matters. Young girls need to be instructed by their mothers in matters related to personal hygiene before the onset of puberty; instructed on the virtues of modesty and virginity; and enlightened as to the purpose of single dating (in the late teens) as the first step toward courtship and marriage. Explicit details regarding the sex act, is, in most cases, unnecessary as nature and common observation are well able to fill in the knowledge gap.

Young boys, by both example and instruction from their fathers, need to come to an understanding of what it means to be a man. They need to understand the changes that occur at puberty and the necessity of respecting their body as the temple of the Holy Spirit. A reverence and respect for women is best transmitted by the example of the father's love for his wife and his children. On the matter of masturbation, Gerrard notes, "the sin of self abuse is so prevalent among boys, that the father need hardly be afraid of giving the warning too soon." That warning came in 1911!

Today, youth of **both** sexes need to be warned against self abuse as well as the dangers of pornography and the consumption of alcohol. Their radio and television habits need to be restricted and monitored especially with regard to the deluge of contemporary rap and rock music with sexually explicit lyrics. On the positive side, parents need to encourage their teens to select their friends and companions carefully.

Catholic School Children and the Spiritual Life

As I have already noted in this series, the deadliest effect the plague of classroom sex instruction is the destruction of the spiritual life of young children and adolescents. This is a matter which the post-Conciliar popes, as well as the majority of post-Conciliar bishops, have completely ignored.

By the spiritual life, I mean a life filled with the love of Christ. It is a life of prayer and penance. A life of purity and conformity to God's laws. By helping their children and teens understand the importance of the Sacraments, especially the importance of Confession and Holy Communion, parents are providing the supernatural remedy and antidote to the life of the sensual – the life promoted by sex initiation programs. For children and adults who have been already damaged by classroom sex programs, the discovery or rediscovery of the spiritual life is the only answer to a return to sanity and sanctity in this world and as preparation for the next.

A Priest Apologizes to Catholic Parents

On September 1, 1988, *The Wanderer* column, "From the Mail" written by Paul Likoudis, carried an extraordinarily and astounding apology to Catholic parents from the pastor of Assumption Grotto Church in the Archdiocese of Detroit who had originally defended the *New Creation* sex series promoted by the Diocesan Religious Education Department in his Pastor's Column on May 15, 1988. Now he wished to retract his support.

In his opening remarks, the pastor stated that the implementation of the *New Creation* program is "a violation of the parental right to be the primary teacher of their children in matters of religion and sexuality." He continued:

Parents had no say in this educational endeavor in sexuality. They could not ask explicit questions, nor could they question explicit factors of this education. Parents were allowed to keep their children outside the class, which, of course, for the children means a form of ostracism. In the case of several children of at least two families, they were forbidden to continue as students at Divine Child because of their protesting over this form of sexual education. ...

I would say that this form of sexual education is more of a harassment of the values of Catholic parents and children than it is an educational program. When children are exposed to explicit sexual misbehavior, when they are informed as to the use of Church-condemned artificial forms of birth control and their use explicitly demonstrated, the values directly these young people are shattered, because the authority of the parental teaching is contradicted. ...

I am sorry that I allowed myself to be misled because I had not the explicit evidence to the contrary. I presumed that there were not high schools in this Archdiocese teaching contrary to Church doctrine in matters of sex education. I was wrong and I should have known that I was wrong. Now I shall join with those people in seeking to do what we can to assure parents and children of a decent and sound Catholic instruction in Catholic schools and a soundly based value system regarding sexual morality.⁸⁴

An apology of this kind to Catholic parents from the Holy See is long overdue.

Concluding Remarks

On April 27, 2012, EWTN News carried a feature titled “Holy See’s U.N. mission warns of state intrusion on families.”⁸⁵

Addressing the 45th Session on the Conference on Population and Development, Archbishop Francis A. Chulikatt, head of the Holy See’s mission at the United Nations stated “For some time now, my delegation has noticed a disconcerting trend, namely, the desire on the part of some to downplay the role of parents in the upbringing of their children, as if to suggest somehow that it is not the role of parents, but that of the state.” He went on to say that “In this regard it is important that the natural and thus essential relationship between parents and their children be affirmed and supported, not undermined.”

Archbishop Chulikatt, the new Apostolic Nuncio to the UN, described the family as “the original nucleus of society” whose integrity must be preserved. He also affirmed “the singular and irreplaceable value of the family founded upon matrimony (the indissoluble union between a man and a woman) and the inviolability of human life from conception until natural death.”

It is unfortunate that the Archbishop’s warning about the trampling down of parental rights was not also directed at the Holy See itself in light of the post-Conciliar Church’s four decades of support for classroom sex initiation programs.

- The end-

¹ See also Randy Engel, *Sex Education – The Final Plague* (Charlotte, NC, Tan Books, 1993). Available at <http://www.newengelpublishing.com/categories/Paperback/>.

² For additional information on the historic Day speech of March 20, 1969 see http://uscl.info/edoc/doc.php?doc_id=89&action=inline.

³ Full article available at http://uscl.info/edoc/doc.php?doc_id=91&action=inline.

⁴ Audios, CDs and DVDs of this talk are available from *CFN*. Request Tape 8 from April 2011 *CFN* Conference. Call (905) 871-6292.

⁵ Pope Pius V, *Catechism of the Council of Trent: for Parish Priests*, translated by John A. McHugh, O.P., and Charles J. Callan, O.P. (Philippines: Sinag-tala Publishers, 1974), p. 431.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ See http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_31121929_divini-illius-magistri_en.html.

⁸ *Ibid.*, § 7.

⁹ *Ibid.*, §11 – §13.

¹⁰ *Rom.*, VII, 23.

¹¹ Silvio Antoniano, *Dell' educazione cristiana dei figliuoli* (Turni, 1926), Bk. II, c. 88. For biographical data on the holy and learned Silvio Cardinal Antoniano (1540-1603) who possessed wondrous insights into the virtuous formation of the soul and mind of a child see

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01584d.htm>.

¹² *Divini Illius Magistri*, § 66.

¹³ Pius XII: *Allocution to the French Fathers of Families*, Sept. 18, 1951. Ed. 571-572.

¹⁴ http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_gravissimum-educationis_en.html. See § 1.

¹⁵ *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, Hugh J. Nolan, Editor, Vol. II, 1941-1961 (Washington, D.C., USCC, 1984), pp. 97-105.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, “Explosion or Backfire?” pp. 221-225.

¹⁷ Randy Engel, *The McHugh Chronicles – How the American Bishops Betrayed the Pro-life Movement*,” (Export, PA, NEP, 1989). Available at <http://www.newengelpublishing.com/categories/Paperback/>.

¹⁸ Randy Engel, “The Bishops’ Bureaucracy and the Homosexual Revolution,” *The Rite of Sodomy*, (Export, PA, NEP, 2006, pp. 566-567. Available at

<http://www.newengelpublishing.com/categories/Paperback/>. Also see “A Catholic Abortion,” at http://uscl.info/edoc/doc.php?doc_id=95&action=inline.

¹⁹ What was not known at the time by the opponents of McHugh and his pro-sex instruction campaign and compromised pro-life strategies was that the Teflon-coated priest was connected to AmChurch’s homosexual network by his personal relationship with Archbishop (later cardinal) Theodore McCarrick, a notorious homosexual predator, who was later instrumental in obtaining a bishopric (Diocese of Camden) for his young protégée. See Engel, *Rite of Sodomy*, pp. 894-895. For confirmation of McCarrick’s nefarious homosexual relationships with seminarians and priests see Richard Sipe, “The Cardinal McCarrick Syndrome,” May 12, 2010, at http://www.richardsipe.com/Comments/2008-04-21-McCarrick_Syndrome.html.

²⁰ Engel, *Final Plague*, p.43.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p.44.

²² Complete text of “Human Life in Our Day” is available at <http://www.priestsforlife.org/magisterium/bishops/68-11-15humanlifeinourdaynccb.htm>.

²³ Engel, *Final Plague*, p. 163-164.

²⁴ A Copy of “To Teach as Jesus Did,” is available at <http://www.usccbpublishing.org/productdetails.cfm?sku=063-X>.

²⁵ Engel, *Final Plague*, p.74.

²⁶ For additional information on the National Committee “Sex Education Guidelines,” see Engel, *Final Plague*, pp. 83-99.

²⁷ Copies available from http://www.bookfinder.com/dir/i/AIDS-A_Catholic_Educational_Approach_to_HIV/1558331115/?ref=bf_ih_8_18.

-
- ²⁸ The text of *The Truth and Meaning of*
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/family/documents/rc_pc_family_doc_08121995_human-sexuality_en.html.
- ²⁹ See Engel, *The McHugh Chronicles*, p.20-21.
- ³⁰ A critique of TeenSTAR by Mothers' Watch is available on request from author at rvte61@comcast.net.
- ³¹ See <http://old.usccb.org/comm/archives/2007/07-081.shtml>.
- ³² See Randy Engel, "John Paul II and the 'Theology of the Body' – A Study in Modernism," in e-book format at <http://www.newengelpublishing.com/products/Theology-of-the-Body.html>.
- ³³ See Mothers' Watch critique at <http://www.motherswatch.net/content/view/6/17/>.
- ³⁴ Catholic Medical Association, "To Protect and To Prevent – The Sexual Abuse of Children and Its Prevention," (2006), Second printing, p. 51.
- ³⁵ Jim Graves, "Lost Generations," *The Catholic World Report*, November 1, 2011, at http://www.catholicworldreport.com/Item/968/lost_generations.aspx.
- ³⁶ Ibid.
- ³⁷ Ibid.
- ³⁸ . M. Anchell and M. Morris, *A Psychiatrist Looks at Sex Education* (Clovis, California: Up With Families Publishers, 1981), pp. 21-23. See also, Randy Engel, *Sex Education – The Final Plague* (Charlotte, NC, Tan Books, 1993), pp. 100-109. Available at <http://www.newengelpublishing.com/categories/Paperback/>.
- ³⁹ . Ibid., pp1-4.
- ⁴⁰ . Ibid., p. 15.
- ⁴¹ . Ibid., p.22-23.
- ⁴² . See Part I of this series which provides the full background on the encyclical *Divini Illius Magistri*.
- ⁴³ . Catholic Medical Association, *To Protect and Prevent – The Sexual Abuse of Children and Its Prevention*, December 2006, p. 40. Available at <https://app.etapestry.com/cart/CatholicMedicalAssociation/default/item.php?ref=4832.0.1492019>.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 34.
- ⁴⁵ See Myre Sim, M.D., "Psychological Problems of Adolescent Sexuality," *Linacre Quarterly*, August 1977, pp. 266-272.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid., 266-267.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 267.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 271.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 24.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 46.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ Private communication to author (undated).
- ⁵⁴ See J.S.
- ⁵⁵ Engel, *Final Plague*, pp. 7-12.
- ⁵⁶ Louise F.W. Eickhoff, "Sex Education and Sex Practice." *Child and Family*, Vol. 13, No.1, 1974, pp. 41-51.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 47.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 42
- ⁵⁹ Ibid.,
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 43.
- ⁶¹ Ibid.
- ⁶² Ibid.
- ⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., p.44.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 45-46.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 46, 47
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 48.

-
- ⁷⁰ Ibid., Exodus, 13:2. “And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: Sanctify unto me every firstborn that openeth the womb among the children of Israel, as well as men as of beasts: for they are all mine.”
- ⁷¹ Ibid., p. 43.
- ⁷² Ibid., p. 50.
- ⁷³ “Parents reject sex ed,” *Alive!*, July/August, 2011, p.2.
- ⁷⁴ “In United Kingdom...Abortions for Young Teens Soaring,” *The Wanderer*, July 28, 2011, p. 7.
- ⁷⁵ See <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2004/may/09/society.schools>.
- ⁷⁶ M. Anchell and M. Norris, “A Psychiatrist Looks at Sex Education,” (Clovis, CA: Up With Families Publishers, 1981, pp. 1-4.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 29.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 26.
- ⁷⁹ Engel, *Sex Education – The Final Plague*, pp. 158-210.
- ⁸⁰ A summary statement based on M. Anchell, pp. 31-32.
- ⁸¹ Randy Engel, *The McHugh Chronicles – Who Betrayed the Pro-Life Movement?* (Export, PA, 1997, p. 82.
- ⁸² Ibid., 81.
- ⁸³ Reverend Thomas J. Gerrard, *Marriage and Parenthood* is available online at http://books.google.com/books/about/MARRIAGE_AND_PARENTHOOD.html?id=XumBd2yDxFIC .
- ⁸⁴ “From the Mail, *The Wanderer*, September 1, 1988, p. 9.
- ⁸⁵ Text available at <http://www.ewtn.com/vnews/getstory.asp?number=119114> .