



THE SOUTH AFRICAN MUSLIM NETWORK

P.O. Box 50865, Musgrave, 4062

Tel: +27 (31) 207 4223 **Fax:** +27 (86) 549 9786

E-mail: info@samnet.co.za

www.samnet.co.za

NPO: 143-584



Samnet SA



@SAMNET786



samnet_sa



SAMNET SA

Comprehensive Sexuality Education

After receiving many queries from the Muslim public on the new and controversial Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) program that the Department of Education plans to incorporate into the South African curriculum, the South African Muslim Network (SAMNET) has put together some research on this very important issue.

The CSE curriculum has ignited public outrage due its graphic and age inappropriate content. By delving into the private realm of parenting, government is seen as crossing the line. Furthermore, the Department of Education has stated they have consulted widely on the curriculum however there is no evidence to support this statement.

We encourage the Muslim community to object to the introduction of Comprehensive Sexuality Education to South African schools. Write to the Ministers of Education.

Department of Basic Education - mabua.s@dbe.gov.za

Department of Higher Education, Science and Technology - Siphokazi.Shoba@dst.gov.za

Contents

What is CSE? - 23 Mar 2019 (Stop CSE).....	1
CSE in South African Schools – Sexuality Education, Or Sex Education? – 23 Feb 2018 (ForSA)	2
Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) – an Update – 28 June 2019 (For SA)	5
CSE is sexual social engineering experiment using children as guinea pigs – 21 July 2018 (ACDP)	6
International CSE Material Examples – 2018 (Stop CSE)	7
Comprehensive Sexuality Education: Where things stand and what to do – 05 June 2019 (Gateway News).....	7
“It’s soft porn” – SA’s controversial sex education plans allegedly exposed – 24 Oct 2019 (The South African)	10
Religious group rally against CSE curriculum	10
What is allegedly on the sex education curriculum next year?.....	11
Sex education by grades – who is learning what?	11
Controversial sex education curriculum faces Parliamentary review – 31 Oct 2019 (The South African)	11
‘Inappropriate’ sexual content in SA school curriculum ignites public and religious outcry – 28 Oct 2019 (702)	12
Lack of consultation and undermining religious teachings	14
School sex-education curriculum slammed – 31 Oct 2019 (Herald Live).....	15
Are the new Comprehensive Sexuality Education lesson plans really too much? – 31 Oct 2019 (Parent 24).....	17
Netherland NGO Representative Reveals How He Manipulated Ugandan UN Delegation ...	19
Fraudulent Kinsey Sex Research (Family Watch).....	22
Uproar over Comprehensive Sexuality Education – 29 Oct 2019 (IOL).....	24
CSE Update – 5 Nov 2019 (For SA)	25

What is CSE? - 23 Mar 2019 (Stop CSE)

Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) is one of the greatest assaults on the health and innocence of children. This is because unlike traditional sex education, comprehensive sexuality education is highly explicit and promotes promiscuity and high-risk sexual behaviors to children as healthy and normal. CSE programs have an almost obsessive focus on teaching children how to obtain sexual pleasure in various ways. Yet, ironically, comprehensive sexuality education programs are anything but comprehensive as they fail to teach children about all of the emotional, psychological and physical health risks of promiscuous sexual activity. The ultimate goal of CSE is to change the sexual and gender norms of society, which is why CSE could be more accurately called “abortion, promiscuity, and LGBT rights education.” CSE is a “rights-based” approach to sex education and promotes sexual rights to children at the expense of their sexual health.

The Deceptive CSE Agenda

Comprehensive sexuality education is usually disguised with innocuous sounding names like human rights education, gender equality education, or sexual and reproductive health education or information. CSE is typically taught to children at the youngest of ages, often without the knowledge or consent of their parents.

Since opposition to CSE programs is increasing as more and more parents are learning about its explicit nature, CSE advocates have become better at disguising it. For example some CSE programs are called “abstinence plus” programs when they have little or no focus on abstinence and largely focus on sexual pleasure. Just because a program is not specifically labeled “comprehensive sexuality education” does not mean it is not CSE. So programs called “sexual education,” “sexuality education,” “sex education,” or a number of other things, can still be CSE if they have many of the harmful elements of CSE regardless of how it is labeled.

Increasingly, government officials are pressured at the United Nations and elsewhere to accept “comprehensive sexuality education” without ever seeing the actual curricula or understanding its graphic nature. In fact, in several instances, UN ambassadors have been manipulated into giving speeches on the UN floor promoting CSE as the solution to many world problems, without realizing what they are promoting.

Later, however, when they see the actual content of CSE programs, they are aghast as they learn how CSE promotes radical sexual ideologies and behaviors that conflict with the religious and cultural values of most people.

Who Promotes or Profits from CSE?

[Click here for an extended list of CSE supporters >](https://www.comprehensivesexualityeducation.org/cse-facts/what-is-cse/organizations-in-support-of-cse/)
<https://www.comprehensivesexualityeducation.org/cse-facts/what-is-cse/organizations-in-support-of-cse/>

Comprehensive sexuality education is promoted by powerful and respected organizations such as the U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC), International Planned Parenthood

Federation (IPPF), the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), and UN agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNICEF, and UNFPA. Even the World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts (WAGGGS) promotes CSE. (See www.100QuestionsfortheGirlScouts.org.)

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

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

Click [here](#) to see the extensive steps International Planned Parenthood and UN agencies have taken to manipulate African governments to accept comprehensive sexuality education. http://familywatch.org/fwi/documents/CSE_10_steps_001.pdf

Click [here](#) to learn more about those who profit from and promote or fund comprehensive sexuality education. https://familywatch.org/fwi/CSE_philosophy.cfm

Get the Facts and Decide for Yourself

Advocates of comprehensive sexuality education programs claim that among other things, CSE programs will reduce teen pregnancy and STD infections and that they do not sexualize children. However, as you explore the documentation on this site, including research on CSE programs, you can judge for yourself if these claims are true or whether the exact opposite may be true. And remember, the health and innocence of our children are at stake.

CSE in South African Schools – Sexuality Education, Or Sex Education? – 23 Feb 2018 (ForSA)

Earlier this year, Freedom of Religion South Africa (FOR SA) met with the Department of Basic Education to discuss the intended roll-out of Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) programmes in public schools.

Generally speaking, CSE takes on different forms and is sometimes referred to as “education, information or counselling on human sexuality”, “sexual and reproductive health training, education or information”, “HIV/Aids prevention education”, “life skills programs”, “rights-based sexuality education”, etc.

As such, CSE may seem fairly innocuous and even a good idea. In countries where CSE has already been implemented (including the USA, the UK, Australia, Sweden, etc) however, it has become clear that CSE has a different and more sinister agenda, namely the radical sexualisation of our children. In this regard, the following statement by the American College of Pediatricians is insightful: *“Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) goes far beyond sex ed, and is a dangerous assault on the health and innocence of children”*.

This is because unlike traditional sex education, CSE is often very graphic and promotes high-risk sexual behaviours as healthy and normal. For example, it is not uncommon for CSE programmes to teach children (as young as five years old!) to masturbate; to encourage acceptance and exploration of diverse sexual orientations and gender identities; to promote anal and oral sex, and teach that it is normal and safe; to promote sexual pleasure (including sexual responses towards inanimate objects, animals, minors, non-consenting persons, etc) and promiscuity as a right for children; to promote abortion as safe and without consequence; to promote condoms to children (as young as nine years old!) without informing them of their failure rates; to promote sexual counselling, information or services to minors without parental consent; to teach children and youth that they are sexual from birth; to train children to advocate for their “sexual rights” in laws and policies, etc. (For more information on the harmful components of CSE, see for e.g. www.comprehensivesexualityeducation.org)

Increasingly, governments (particularly in developing countries) are being pressured by the United Nations (who promotes and advances CSE through agencies such as the World Health Organisation, UNAIDS, UNESCO, UNICEF, etc) to implement CSE – under the guise that it will reduce teenage pregnancy, HIV/Aids and STD infection, will prevent violence against women, will help to reach gender equality etc. Although described as “proven effective”, there is inadequate evidence of program effectiveness for most CSE programs. In fact, research has shown that most CSE programs appear to be more “policy-based” (or “ideology-based”) than “evidence-based”.

It should therefore not be surprising that parents, particularly those who hold a conservative worldview, have major concerns regarding the implementation of CSE in South African schools. What exactly will their children be taught, or exposed to – and at what age? What if they don’t agree with the CSE content – will they have the right to “opt [their children] out” of certain lectures or material? Will their children be tested for HIV/Aids, or referred to an abortion clinic, without their knowledge and consent? These are just some of the (very valid) concerns that parents have raised.

The Department of Basic Education’s response

The Department explained firstly that, at the behest of UNESCO and other UN agencies, South Africa (along with 20 other Eastern and Southern African countries) has made an international commitment to implement CSE (known as the “ESA Commitment”).

The Department assured us however that, far from taking a blanket approach to CSE, they will take a contextual approach to the implementation of CSE in South African schools. This implies finding “African solutions for African problems”. Amongst these, he mentioned the high infection rate of HIV/Aids in South Africa (2,000 children per week), the challenge of keeping (pregnant) girls in school, gender-based violence, lack of knowledge around menstruation, lack of proper sanitation, etc.

Given these basic challenges, the focus of CSE will be “sexuality education” (i.e. teaching children basic anatomy; recognising and dealing with abuse; physical and emotional changes during puberty; HIV/Aids and STIs; teenage pregnancy; etc) rather than “sex education” (teaching children how to have sex). (The proposed health education for children at foundation phase, intermediate phase, senior phase and further education and training, appear in the Integrated School Health Policy 2012).

According to the Deputy Director we met with, the core message will be that the best method (to prevent / curb HIV/Aids infection, teenage pregnancy etc) is abstinence. Children will also be taught that you have the right to say no to sex. (This is particularly important in view of statistics that have shown that children’s sexual debut has now shifted from 16 to 11 years of age). In the last instance, (high school) children will be taught that if you cannot abstain, at least condomise. The focus is therefore on prevention. However, where prevention has failed and a girl has fallen pregnant, it is important for children to know (and therefore be taught) that the boy and the girl have responsibility to take care of the child, and to instruct them with regard to the various options including keeping the child and carry on schooling, adoption and only in the last instance, abortion.

This “sexuality education”, which will be age-appropriate, scientific and culturally/religiously relevant, will form part of the (broader) life orientation programme in public schools. Consultants are currently in the process of preparing policy packs for the implementation of CSE in schools, which have to be presented to the Department around June 2018. (This includes developing scripted lesson plans and activities, and training for teachers. Teachers who do not adhere to the prescripts, could be the subject of a complaint by a parent or child and face disciplinary action.) Thereafter, the Department intends to meet with life skills coordinators in schools to inform them of the programme and expectations. Thereafter, parents and School Governing Bodies (SGBs) – who are regarded by the Department as a critical stakeholder in their children’s education – will need to be informed and brought on board. According to the Department, roll out will probably only take place from 2019 and will be staggered, depending on resource, etc.

During the meeting, FOR SA was able to explain to the Department why parents (including particularly those who hold to a more religious or conservative worldview) are concerned about CSE, and to propose possible solutions to their concerns. While it does not appear as if it will be a possibility for parents to “opt out” of CSE (as a component of the broader Life Orientation programme in schools), we appealed to the Department to – at the very least – convene an information session for parents of each particular phase (i.e. at foundation, intermediate, etc) at the beginning of every year to inform, and make available to them, the specific content which their children will be exposed to and taught in each semester – and to give parents an opportunity to ask questions, give input and together with the school, find ways of addressing any concerns. The Department was very impressed with and grateful for this constructive proposal, and undertook to recommend the specific inclusion of this proposal in the policy packs that are currently being prepared.

Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) – an Update – 28 June 2019 (For SA)

The curriculum content

During our meeting, the DBE again explained that the review process started due to the existing curriculum having minimum impact on lowering HIV infections and teenage pregnancies, and teachers needing guidance as the DBE had received complaints about teachers exposing children to age-inappropriate content.

As a result, the DBE looked at how to strengthen the topics already covered by the CAPS curriculum – with a focus on human rights, and the prevention of HIV and learner pregnancies. To put it into context, the DBE explained that Life Skills / Orientation is allocated only two hours of lesson time per week, covering a range of issues including sexuality education, sport, art, nutrition, religion, etc.

A parallel process of textbooks (for learners) and scripted lesson plans (for teachers), written by curriculum specialists, was undertaken. At present, the scripted lesson plans for grades 4 to 12 are finalised, but the textbooks are still being written and are not even in their first draft yet. The DBE emphatically stated that Dr Eve (quoted in the *Sunday Times* article) is not a curriculum specialist and was not part of the writing team.

While the grade 4 scripted lesson plans do not mention masturbation, the grade 7 scripted lesson plans (which FOR SA had sight of during our meeting with the DBE) does define masturbation as the act of touching oneself for sexual pleasure, and further comments that “*masturbation is normal and will not hurt you*”. In this regard, FOR SA pointed out to the DBE that there is a difference between factual statements (e.g. explaining what masturbation is), and value-laden statements (e.g. saying that masturbation is “normal”). Unlike subjects like maths or science that is value-neutral, sexuality education is infused with value judgments and should for that reason ideally remain the right and prerogative of parents, who have the primary responsibility for the upbringing and education of their children including their sexual education.

FOR SA specifically asked the DBE regarding the rights of parents who do not believe it in the best interest of their children to be exposed to the proposed content, e.g. would it be possible for them to “opt out” of a particular lesson, or to privately teach their child an alternative curriculum? The DBE undertook to consult with their legal department in this regard.

The way forward

On all occasions when FOR SA has met with the DBE with regard to CSE, we have found them to be very open to and appreciative of our input. In particular, the Department has undertaken to include FOR SA in the stakeholder meeting that is planned for July 2019.

Many parents have asked us how they can become involved to raise their concerns, and make sure that their voice is heard. In this regard, FOR SA recommends that concerned parents mandate their SGB to:

1. Ask the DBE to be included in stakeholders' meetings where they can give input on the textbook content etc.;
2. Ask that the content of the scripted lesson plans be disclosed to them; and
3. Ask that parents who, on grounds of their religious or moral convictions and beliefs, do not believe it in the best interest of their children to be exposed to particular content, be given the option to opt their child out of a specific lesson, or to teach them an alternative sex-education curriculum that the child can be examined on.

CSE is sexual social engineering experiment using children as guinea pigs – 21 July 2018 (ACDP)

ACDP Deputy President, Councillor Wayne Thring, said in Johannesburg today that "the African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP) has taken a decision to oppose the introduction of Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) into the curriculum of our South African Schools."

This decision was taken at its Federal Council of Provinces (FCOP) meeting held over this weekend (20-21 July 2018) in Johannesburg.

The Department of Education has used the high rate of teenage pregnancies as its rationale for wanting to introduce CSE into the South African schools curriculum in an attempt to reduce teenage pregnancies.

"The ACDP has consistently opposed the current government campaign on teenage sexuality, which includes the lowering of the age of sexual consent, the lowering of the age at which girls may have abortions without parental permission, and the roll out of condoms and other contraceptives to our school children, again, without parental consent. The ACDP has also repeatedly stated that the responsibility for educating children, which includes educating them on matters of sexuality, lies primarily with parents and not the state.

It is the belief of the ACDP that the blame for the high rate of teenage pregnancies, and in particular of those still at school, lies at the feet of the ruling party. Why? Our children have been exposed by government to pornography at early ages and this includes the proliferation of child pornography, which is on the increase. In addition, the handing out of condoms and other contraceptives to our school children has over the years only served to entice children to engage in early, and sometimes risky, sexual experimentation.

The view of the ACDP is that CSE is nothing short of lessons to our school children on immoral sexual behaviour."

Some of the core philosophies of CSE with which the ACDP vehemently disagrees include that *"children and adults should have regular sexual experiences either alone or with persons of either gender. A right to sexual pleasure, even at the youngest of ages is a primary right that trumps other rights. Children have privacy and confidentiality rights that trump the rights of parents to guide their education in the area of human sexuality. Most societal sexual*

and gender norms, especially those based on religious beliefs are unhealthy, repressive and should be changed."

Thring concluded: "this is nothing more than a sexual, social engineering experiment with our children as the guinea pigs."

The ACDP calls on all parents, civic and religious bodies to reject the introduction of this reprehensible CSE agenda into our school curriculum."

International CSE Material Examples – 2018 (Stop CSE)

Excerpts from UNESCO

https://www.comprehensivesexualityeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/UNESCO_2018_CSE_Excerpts-1.pdf

Comprehensive Sexuality Education: Where things stand and what to do – 05 June 2019 (Gateway News)

In the wake of growing public concern about the introduction of Comprehensive Sexuality Education in SA schools, Cause for Justice (CFJ) last week met with the Department of Basic Education (DBE) to get the facts about what is going on. This article is based on a report on the meeting by Ryan Smit, CFJ Executive Director and Legal Counsel. [View the full report here.](#)

While the Department of Basic Education (DBE) faces the difficult task of catering for children from vastly different social, economic and cultural backgrounds — including communities struggling with HIV infection and teenage pregnancies — there are grounds for serious concern about its decision to implement Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) at schools and about the process it is following.

So, concludes Ryan Smit CFJ executive director and legal counsel after a fact-finding meeting with the Department of Basic Education (DBE) Directorate of Health Promotion on Monday last week. Last week's meeting was a sequel to his meetings with the DBE in August 2018 and April this year, in the context of the DBE's proposed Draft Learner Pregnancy Policy, which promotes the delivery of CSE as a means to prevent and manage learner pregnancies.

What is known?

The CSE programme adopted by the government is apparently provided by UNESCO and UNFPA, and funded by USAID, says Smit. After reviewing progress on developing — and piloting at selected schools — scripted lesson plans (SLPs) for integrating CSE into life skills and life orientation curricula, these are some of CFJ's findings:

- The new SLPs are expected to be mandatory
- parents were not involved or consulted in the development of the new CSE content
- the DBE has completed SLPs for Grades 4 to 12 and is currently developing SLPs for Grades R to 3
- the content has been piloted at some schools in five provinces.

Limited information is available on the results and reception of the school pilot projects. Concerning results from one such study include:

- Parents were not familiar with the SLP (new curriculum) content
- Life orientation educators said that they were not comfortable teaching the sexuality education part of the LO curriculum.
- Although SGBs and SMTs were in favour of the teaching of LO, in general, they did not support the LO curriculum, with responses ranging from no support to some support.

At his meeting with the DBE last Monday, he also learned about a related CSE textbook-writing project which is in the early development phase. He was told that Marlene Wasserman — aka Dr Eve — was not involved in SLP development but had been “unofficially” involved in giving inputs into the textbook project. He told the department CFJ’s concerns regarding Wasserman include her commercial interest because of her sex products store and her prior campaigning in support of pornography on subscription television.

Smit says international research on school-based CSE shows there is almost no evidence:

- that it is effective at reducing teen pregnancy or contracting STDs
- that it increases consistent condom use
- that it is significantly increasing teen abstinence.

Other research findings include that 26% of school-based CSE programmes correlated with negative effects on participants’ sexual health, e.g. increase in sexual initiation, STDs, number of partners, recent sex, paid sex, forced intercourse (rape), or a decrease in condom use.

CSE, as promoted by UNESCO, has also been criticised heavily for a wide variety of reasons, such as early sexualisation of children, promoting abortion, undermining family and ethical values, peddling deviant gender theories, alienating children from parents on the topic of the child’s sexuality, sexual choices and consequences, promoting a fictitious right to CSE and being influenced to a large extent by International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Smit says since there are no binding domestic or international legal obligations on SA to implement or provide CSE in schools or to out-of-school youth, and no evidence to support it from a public policy perspective, it is unclear what could be the rationale for its implementation. He speculates that UNESCO, UNFPA, USAID and / or their formal and informal affiliates and / or the funders behind these international bodies could be the driving force behind the provision of CSE to SA schools.

He lists the following as some of the unknowns about the implementation of CSE at schools:

- We don't know what is in the new content (SLPs: educator guides and learner workbooks per grade), i.e. what the state wants to teach parents' children about sex and sexuality.
- We don't know whether parents and other stakeholders will be able to meaningfully contribute to or influence the content.
- We don't know whether parents or children will be penalised if they choose to sit out one or more of the SLPs and / or choose to provide sex education at home or in other non-school settings.
- We don't know whether provinces, individual schools and / or individual parents will be allowed to teach an alternative curriculum to the state's sexuality education; or refrain from teaching, alter or replace certain parts of the national curriculum to the extent that they disagree with its contents.

What can be done?

He submits that the best interest of children demands that every effort be made to achieve the following objectives:

Information:

- Obtain clarity about the policy / evidential basis (rationale) for promoting CSE in line with UNESCO's ITGSE in South African schools and to out-of-school youth, if any exist.
- DBE must make all completed new content materials / SLPs (educator guides and learner workbooks) publicly available without delay, to allow parents and other stakeholders the opportunity to familiarise themselves with the new content that is proposed to be taught in the LS and LO curricula from 2020 and make informed decisions in the best interest of their children's health and wellbeing.
- DBE to make full disclosure of names of contributors to the development of the SLPs (educator guides and learner workbooks) for each grade; the timetable for the roll-out of SLPs for all grades, including pilots and full curricular implementation; the outcomes and reception of all SLP pilots at schools; names of all contributors to the development and writing of the CSE support textbook and regular updates on the progress of the textbook writing project.

Public participation:

- DBE should conduct a substantial public participation process with all stakeholders and interested parties to determine whether the public want a national sexuality education curriculum to be provided through schools (and to out-of-school youth).
- DBE must allow and enable parents and other stakeholders to contribute to or influence the content of the SLPs (new curriculum content) by creating adequate public participation opportunities; giving proper consideration to their inputs and meaningfully engage with them and their inputs, including amending the SLPs where necessary, to ensure that children are not violated by the content or influenced by it in a manner that goes against their own, their family or their community values, beliefs and convictions.

Recognition, Protection and Diversion:

- Obtain confirmation from the DBE that they will respect parental rights in respect of the training and education of their children in the area of sexuality, including the right to decide to provide sex education in the home, whether by way of the national curriculum or any other alternative curriculum; that they will allow provinces, individual schools and/or individual parents to teach an alternative curriculum to the state's sexuality education; or allow them to refrain from teaching, to alter or replace certain parts of the national curriculum to the extent that they disagree with its contents on rational grounds.
- Non-state service providers be allowed to actively train parents on how to educate their children regarding sexuality, sexual choices and consequences; and to developing sexuality education curricula as an alternative to state-sponsored CSE and roll these out to all South African communities; or parents be allowed to train children on character and values-based healthy sexuality, sexual choices, behaviour and consequences.

Where to from here?

Smit says all the different stakeholders and interest groups should individually and collectively take action to achieve the objectives outlined above in the interest of school children.

We encourage each individual stakeholder/interested party or group and representative body to work through existing channels to engage with DBE in respect of the objectives that you agree with or are aligned with.

“It’s soft porn” – SA’s controversial sex education plans allegedly exposed – 24 Oct 2019 (The South African)

There have been some suggestions that sex education lessons on the 2020 curriculum for “younger grades” [could whip-up controversy in South African schools](#). Now, one of the main religious rights bodies in the country have vented their fury, after allegedly coming across the finalised plans for next year.

Religious group rally against CSE curriculum

Michael Swain is the Executive Director of Freedom of Religion South Africa (FOR SA). The group official claims to have seen the content, which will feature on the Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) roster. According to Swain, some of the content is “nothing less than soft porn”:

“Having now seen the actual content, parents and teachers have every reason to be very concerned – particularly as some of the content to which children will be exposed, and teachers will be expected to teach, is nothing less than ‘soft porn’.”

“Of all subjects taught in schools, CSE is the most likely to make a lasting impact on children since they are at a highly impressionable age and often unable to process the information that they are given. For this reason, the rights of parents to raise their children according to their own values and beliefs must be therefore respected.”

What is allegedly on the sex education curriculum next year?

They have said that each grade will be taught on the following issues...

- **Grade 4:** Allegedly, Learners will be asked to engage in group discussions to identify their (and others’) “private parts”.
- **Grade 5:** Will apparently learn about “lesbian relationships”, same-sex molestation and sexual assault.
- **Grade 6:** It’s believed the primary school pupils will be asked their views on “sexting topless photos”.
- **Grade 8:** FOR SA state that their teachers will educate them on all forms of intercourse – including anal sex.

Sex education by grades – who is learning what?

Although Grade 7 is missing from that list, we had it confirmed earlier in the year that the 2020 curriculum would only teach “masturbation” as a topic from Grade 7 onwards, as that is when children hit their adolescent development phase (between the ages of 12-13). Life Orientation for Grade 4 will also focus on things like the environment, road safety and the dangers of smoking.

The Basic Education Department are yet to respond to the matter, amid claims that the contentious subject matter has already gained ministerial approval. Previously, a spokesperson for the department told us that the textbook content for sex education “is shaped by UNESCO’S technical guidance”. They also stated that these lessons have been created “with input from highly respected South African institutions.”

FOR SA concluded their brief to the media by labelling the “graphic and ideologically-laden content” as “completely inappropriate” for a young audience. They’re insisting that parents must be given the right to withdraw their children from the revised sex education classes – a suggestion which will only stir the pot more vigorously.

Controversial sex education curriculum faces Parliamentary review – 31 Oct 2019 (The South African)

The Comprehensive Sex Education (CSE) curriculum is set to be rolled out across South African schools in 2020. However, the UNESCO sponsored programme has attracted fierce criticism from a number of detractors, after details of the lesson plans sparked a wave of anger amongst parents and religious groups.

Despite the Department of Basic Education (DBE) claiming they have engaged with all stakeholders, some teaching unions are opposed to the new curriculum. Representatives feel

that the content is too graphic for schoolchildren, and that there are a few topics that aren't age-appropriate for their target grades.

The birds, the bees, and even a few controversies

The biggest concerns surround what Grade 4 children may be asked to learn. Discussions about "private parts" feature in their lesson plans for next year. Meanwhile, Grade 7 children will allegedly address the topic of masturbation, and secondary school learners may be asked to refer to illustrations of "female condom use".

It may be a case of he-said, she-said at the moment, but one thing is certain: A great lack of communication and transparency is prohibiting concerned citizens from understanding what exactly features on this curriculum. That's where Nomsa Marchesi has decided to step in.

DA want answers on controversial sex education curriculum

The DA Shadow Minister of Basic Education has revealed that her party wants a full briefing of what the lessons entail, to be delivered in a session of Parliament. According to Marchesi, the concerns and sensitivities of the complainants need to be recognised:

"The DA wrote to the Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Basic Education on Tuesday to request an urgent meeting with all relevant stakeholders in order to give the Department of Basic Education (DBE) an opportunity to give a full briefing on what the CSE curriculum will entail."

"Sex education must strike a careful balance between equipping young people with the information they need to make the right choices, and unintentionally over-sexualizing learners. The DA is cognizant that there appears to be concerns related to the level of detail in some of the proposed CSE material."

The DA also plan to get answers on the following questions:

- Will the CSE will be implemented in schools by 2020?
- Has it been piloted in schools, and what are the outcomes?
- Has the DBE has consulted teacher unions and parent bodies as to the content?

'Inappropriate' sexual content in SA school curriculum ignites public and religious outcry – 28 Oct 2019 (702)

The controversial Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) curriculum has ignited public outrage with many arguing that government is once again crossing the line and delving into the private realm of parenting. Faith-based organisations and political parties such as Freedom of Religion South Africa (FOR SA) and the African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP) have come out in condemnation of the new sexual content proposed for young school students, likening it to "soft-porn" and warning that it has been proven ineffective in addressing the concerns of the South African government. The curriculum, which exposes young school students to arguably inappropriate and explicit sexual content, has already been

piloted in five provinces – including the Western Cape – and is likely to be formally introduced in all public schools in 2020.

Legal Counsel of FOR SA, Nadene Badenhorst highlighted that government is once again entrenching itself in what should be respected as the parent’s domain and has removed the rights of parents to have primary responsibility for the upbringing and education of their children, which includes sexual education combined with religious and moral teaching.

“According to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, parents – not the state or teachers, parents – have the primary responsibility for the upbringing and education of their children, including sexual education.

While some parents may be too happy for the state to take over that role of teaching their children about the birds and the bees...the point remains that for many parents they want to retain the right over the messenger on these sensitive topics, over the message that is being given to their children and their own world view on these issues. Their religious and moral rights are also protected by the constitution.”

“We don’t have a problem with the department teaching children the facts regarding some of these things but the moment the school starts getting engaged in making value-judgements – whether some things are good or bad – that’s where we get into trouble and that’s where the school takes it too far and steps into the shoes of the parents, and that should not be allowed,” she said.

Not long ago, there was a Constitutional Court ruling outlawing corporal punishment in the private and public domain, effectively making the physical disciplining of your child – as some faith-based organisations would argue is their religious right – unconstitutional and therefore illegal.

Badenhorst warned that what she regards as an “ineffective” attempt at addressing legitimate concerns through the CSE would result in “*early sexual debut, paid sex, sore sex*” and an increased likelihood of sexual assault.

“Sexuality education has always been a small component of the life skills curriculum in primary schools and life orientation in high schools. However, what our government realised is that we are a country that has a massively high rate of HIV, STIs, teenage pregnancy and gender-based violence and that the current curriculum is not effective in addressing those issues.

So, what they’ve done is to look at the gaps in their curriculum, measured it against UNESCO’s (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) technical guidelines on sexuality education and filled the gaps with what they call comprehensive sexuality education – which is a programme that has been introduced by, and is coming from, UNESCO and others. [It] has been introduced worldwide in countries and has proven itself to be a radically graphic and explicit program teaching our children how to have sex while they learn about the risks and consequences of sexual behaviour at an early age.”

“When we look at the facts on UNESCO’s own study, CSE has been shown to actually be ineffective in addressing the concerns government has. It’s been shown to be ineffective in increasing abstinence, increasing condom use, has been shown to be ineffective in decreasing

STI's and HIV and actually increases early sexual debut, sore sex, paid for sex and sexual assault...so for these very reasons we approached government and said 'There is no binding legal obligation on South Africa to implement CSE, so why would we do it?'," explained Badenhorst.

Lack of consultation and undermining religious teachings

Worryingly, Badenhorst also indicated that the major stakeholders in the process – parents and teachers – have been “*completely left in the dark*” and have had little to no say in the rolling out of the programme in South African schools.

From a religious perspective, devout Muslims and Christians alike have expressed deep concern at the normalisation of things these religions are widely understood to rule on as illicit and immoral.

The CSE therefore directly undermines what some religions, such as Islam or Christianity, might teach.

“Once we start saying that something is or isn't normal, that it will or will not hurt you, that many boys and girls do it so why not you and that it's ok [to do these various things]... then we are getting into the terrain of value-judgement.

It [the CSE] glamourises sex rather than teaching children from a health-based approach.”

The Muslim Judicial Council said it was still conducting its own research into the DBE's proposal and would provide a comment later this week.

Leader of the ACDP, Reverend Kenneth Meshoe has condemned the curriculum, calling it “wicked”.

He explained that for South African schools, who are largely still battling to become competitive in the fields of mathematics and science, it is deplorable that these schools should now attempt to focus on teaching young children about the various forms of sexual intercourse.

“We are not happy that government wants to teach children what their [political leaders'] parents did not teach them – immorality.

They want to ensure that that which has been unacceptable throughout our lifetime now is becoming acceptable. What also makes many parents unhappy is that parents were not consulted,” said Meshoe.

“...to now want to teach children about oral sex, anal sex and other forms of sex is totally unacceptable. They should be focusing on improving the skills of our children and making our children competitive when they leave school. What government wants to do is to impose immorality on the South African population. What they are doing is immoral and totally unacceptable.”

The largest concern seems to stem not from the fact-based educational approach, but rather from more contemporary understandings of sexuality, morality and gender. Religious groups

and persons are finding that their children are being exposed to and taught what is or isn't socially, morally or religiously acceptable by an institution that has not been explicitly mandated by them to do so.

According to FOR SA, *“The Department’s project has been funded by, amongst others, USAID and involves a review of the old curriculum to incorporate UNESCO’s highly controversial International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education (ITGSE), contributed to by the notorious abortion agency Planned Parenthood. The Department’s decision to incorporate ITGSE in the new curriculum comes despite scientific studies showing that the ITGSE curriculum and approach are ineffective in achieving its apparent objectives...particularly in African contexts.”*

School sex-education curriculum slammed – 31 Oct 2019 (Herald Live)

Should teachers be educating children on the nitty-gritty of sex?

That is the debate in SA at the moment and there are mixed feelings when it comes to the Comprehensive Sex Education programme touted to be introduced in schools from 2020.

While some parents say they do not want their kids to be taught “harmful and illicit” ideas on human sexuality, others say there are two sides to the coin.

The new curriculum will teach grade 7s about kissing, dating and masturbation and sex while younger grades will learn about “private parts” and deal with identifying sexual violence and the stigma of HIV/Aids, among other things.

A petition “Stop CSE in South African Schools” has been circulating, with school governing bodies in Nelson Mandela Bay sharing a link to the petition in WhatsApp groups for parents.

The petition, created by the Family Policy Institute, has been signed by 101,035 people and there is a call for more signatures.

The petition claims that most CSE programmes teach that promiscuity is a right, promotes dangerous alternative sexual practices, exposes children to pornographic images and demeans traditional, moral, religious and cultural values.

Family Policy Institute founder and CEO Errol Naidoo said the institution first launched the campaign against CSE in 2016, when concerns were raised by one of their sister organisations.

The campaign was relaunched in September 2019.

“I was alerted of the dangers of CSE by international pro-family organisations — Family Watch International and the UN Family Rights Council,” Naidoo said.

“We were again inundated with concerns about CSE from parents and churches across the country when we launched the first Family Policy Institute Petition against CSE in SA in partnership with CitizenGo.

“We later launched the online letter outlining seven critical reasons why CSE must not be implemented in SA to the department of basic education along with the Protect Children SA Coalition,” Naidoo said.

He said the organisation, in partnership with a church in the Western Cape, had planned a march to parliament on Saturday November 30.

There, they will hand over the letter with the tens of thousands of signatures from citizens and organisations demanding that the government scrap CSE in SA.

“The memorandum will outline seven common-sense actions the government can implement to significantly reduce sexual exploitation, abuse and violence against women in SA,” Naidoo said.

The main concerns raised by the organisation and parents across the country is that CSE is not a traditional form of sex education.

“CSE promotes and legitimises a particular ideology that is in direct conflict with the values of the vast majority of parents in SA.

“CSE is devised by the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) — the largest abortion provider in the US.

“CSE was not conceived in SA or even Africa.

“SA parents have not been consulted about this nor are they informed about the high-risk sexual practises CSE teaches their children.

“CSE deliberately bypasses parental authority and rights and targets children with sexual perversion,” Naidoo said.

Bay businessman and father of three Patrick Gedza said that before reacting to the decision, parents should ask why the department had decided to introduce the programme.

Gedze said he believed that the introduction of CSE was a sign that parents were failing to play their role.

“Don’t get me wrong, I am not supporting the decision but I am one person who will ask the critical question as to why the decision came about.

“As a parent you need to have the kind of relationship with your children where you address issues.

“If you don’t do that, the government will always take the last resort which is often an extreme and, unfortunately, it means we have failed as parents.

“There are always two sides to a coin — we should be sitting down and asking why the government came to this decision,” he said.

Department of basic education spokesperson Elijah Mhlanga slammed the petition, saying it “continued deliberate misrepresentation of facts regarding some of the content in the Life Orientation subject”.

He said: “We have noted with concern that a certain organisation persists in misleading the public by publishing the wrong information resulting in unnecessary confusion and panic among South Africans.

“The Comprehensive Sexuality Education has been part of the curriculum since the year 2000.

“Research findings indicate high birth rates among adolescents and teenagers.

“In addition, more than a third of girls and boys [35.4%] experience sexual violence before the age of 17.

“This has necessitated the great need for the department to provide age-appropriate child-abuse-prevention education that builds resilience, confidence and assertion among young people, who often do not know when they are being violated by sexual predators.”

Mhlanga said the department’s strategy was informed by comprehensive research.

“The 2016 review of International Technical Guidelines on [sex education] found that the evidence base for CSE had expanded since 2008.”

He said because of the review it was decided to expand the programme starting in 2020.

Are the new Comprehensive Sexuality Education lesson plans really too much? – 31 Oct 2019 (Parent 24)

The new proposed Sexuality Education curriculum has parents and teachers all over the country up in arms, but if we remove the hysteria and look at the curriculum with an open mind, is the new curriculum really that bad?

The facts

The Department of Basic Education (DBE) says that Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) has been part of the Life Orientation subject in schools since 2000, and that no new content has been added to the curriculum.

According to a local publisher of school content, the DBE has recently developed their own material, which includes scripted lessons the teachers are asked to follow exactly. These

materials are not publicly available, and local publishers are not expected to redevelop study materials, as the curriculum technically has not changed.

The DBE describes these Scripted Lesson Plans (SLPs) as designed to assist educators to teach "scientifically accurate, evidence-informed, incremental, age appropriate and culturally appropriate" sexuality education within the Life Skills and Life Orientation Curriculum Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) in the classroom.

These SLPs use a "human rights approach which allows adolescents and young people to develop appropriate life skills to support healthy choices and promote gender equality". Recent news reports based on information from Freedom of Religion South Africa (FOR SA) have revealed what appears to be extracts from these new plans, and include "graphically explicit" scenarios, examples of sexual assault, group discussions on the topic of "private parts", and more.

Ministry Spokesperson, Hope Mokgathle, told Parent24 the Department was not aware of the leaked curriculum.

Why SLPs?

The DBE aims to provide curriculum-based CSE as a way to prevent HIV and STIs infections, unwanted teen pregnancies and school related gender-based violence, with the ultimate aim of keeping children in schools.

The department reports that programmes like these have resulted in a "steady decrease in new infections" amongst adolescent girls and young women (from 2000 to 1300 infections per week) and in unwanted pregnancies (from over 99 000 in 2013 to 82 00 in 2017 pregnancies among learners).

Students with access to these CSE programmes reportedly adopted "health seeking behaviour" such as using contraception and condoms, and getting tested for HIV more frequently.

The Department maintains that the provision of sexuality education will equip learners with the "knowledge and life skills that will empower them to make informed decisions and choices to ensure that they live healthy lives and realise their full potential."

The objections

According to FOR SA, the development and planned roll out of the new curriculum has been "mired in controversy and secrecy", and the religious organisation is calling for parents to object.

They recommend writing to Parliament, but suggest that mass protest action may become "critically necessary" to prevent the potential January 2020 implementation date.

They also claim that teachers feel "very uncomfortable delivering the content" and that "many parents" say the type of "graphic and ideologically-laden content" used is "completely inappropriate".

President of the SA Teacher Union (SAOU) Chris Klopper has called the content "grossly insensitive" and called for a boycott by teachers who object to the new SLPs.

The Department has previously addressed many of these concerns, which can be found here and below.

Is it that bad?

In 2015 a UNESCO funded global review found that CSE was key to gender equality and reproductive health. Exposure to comprehensive sex education led to a reduction of sexually transmitted infections (STIs), HIV, and unintended pregnancies, showing a positive impact on safer sexual behaviours, delaying sexual debut and increasing condom use.

With South Africa's high rates of GBV, HIV, STIs, teen pregnancy and so on, the addition of comprehensive scripted lesson plans does seem like a good idea. But just how detailed and "graphic" the new content actually is, remains to be seen.

Ministry Spokesperson, Hope Mokgathle, told Parent24 the Department was not aware of the 'leaked' curriculum.

UPDATE: Michael Swain, executive director at FOR SA, told Parent24 that they were "given the opportunity to view the Scripted Lesson Plans (SLPs) and Educator Guides (Grades 4 – 12) of the revised CSE curriculum by a political party, who had in turn requested and were provided with these by the DBE following their briefing to the Basic Education Parliamentary Portfolio Committee in September."

Nonetheless, judgment must be reserved until the DBE officially releases the content and calls on parents, teachers and stakeholders to comment.

Netherland NGO Representative Reveals How He Manipulated Ugandan UN Delegation

Wandega explains that he learned how to do this from other activists at a Rutgers WPF conference in Ghana. These NGO activists (likely also employees of Rutgers WPF) got on African government delegations in their respective African countries to also influence UN negotiations on controversial sexual issues.

In a previous interview, when asked what the main challenge is in Uganda, Anslem responded,

“We need to show how comprehensive sexuality education can be an effective instrument to improve sexual and reproductive health and rights.”

This is just another way that western governments and UN agencies (most of them are funded by and thus controlled by Western governments) manipulate governments in developing countries to advance their controversial sexual rights/LGBT/abortion agenda. And comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) is their main tool to advance their sexual agenda. In other words, Wandega is simply a paid lobbyist for the Netherlands.

Sexual rights activists claim the only way to save lives and prevent serious health problems in Africa is to advance sexual and reproductive health rights (SRHR), and the only way to advance such rights is to implement comprehensive sexuality education in all of the schools.

This sounds really great until you understand that SRHR is the main banner under which controversial sexual rights for children and LGBT and abortion right are advanced. This is why Anslem Wandega asserts that CSE is the banner for advancing SRHR. However, tragically, many of the alleged sexual rights that are advanced under the banner of SRHR actually cause many of the health problems SRHR is claimed to prevent.

The SRHR agenda is a very deceptive agenda that is sister to the CSE agenda, and many governments have been deceived by it, especially in Africa.

A Description of Rutgers WPF from their website: [Highlights added.]

“Rutgers WPF is an international centre of expertise on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) founded and based in the Netherlands. Our research and many of our projects are carried out in the Netherlands and most primary and secondary schools here use our sexuality education packages. Our expertise is also applied worldwide. We support our partners internationally (across Europe, and in Africa, and Asia) to improve sexual and reproductive health and the acceptance of sexual rights and gender equality [COMMENT: abortion and LGBT rights] in their countries.”

Anslem Wandega, Rutgers WPF representative in Uganda, will attend the CPD as a civil society representative in the Ugandan official government delegation. In his blog, Anslem tells how he advocated with his government to get into the delegation and how he prepared himself for the CPD.

One in Four

In Uganda, people are faced with several challenges related to their sexual and reproductive health and rights. For instance, the teenage pregnancy rate is 25%, meaning that one in four girls under 19 has a baby or is pregnant. With 57% of the country's population being under 18 years old, Uganda has one of the highest teenage pregnancy rates in the world! It is therefore of paramount importance the Ugandan government changes laws, policies and programs to ensure young people have access to sexuality education, health services and contraceptives. Strong commitments at the United Nations, at the Commission on Population and Development, help to push the Ugandan government towards this direction.

A strong outcome of the CPD does not happen by itself. Civil society needs to advocate with their governments to ensure their support for SRHR. To influence the negotiation process, it is important for me personally to be close to the Ugandan government delegation. What can be closer than to be part of the official government delegation attending the meeting? This became my ultimate goal in the run up to the actual conference.

Advocating the Ugandan government

The preparations started at the beginning of March when I took part in a workshop with civil society from six African countries, organized by Rutgers WPF in Accra, Ghana. The meeting was a great catalyst as I picked lessons from the other participants on how they had successfully worked with their government delegation during last year's CPD. The advice and technical support from the advocacy team at Rutgers WPF also formed a major fillip in the process.

Upon return, I did not sit on my laurels. Through my contacts with UNFPA and UNDP, I was able to join the CPD48 Uganda National Organising Committee. The committee, which met several times in the past weeks, was so open to my proposals to support SRHR that they included it in the official country statement [Comment: remember he is representing a netherlands organization and srhr is always opposed by the african group un experts. Why? Because "sexual and reproductive health rights" = "sexual rights" (since "sexual" modifies "rights"). This is highly controversial at the UN because "sexual rights" has never been defined, and therefore, can mean anything, and so it is used to deceptively promote LGBT, abortion and prostitution rights as well as CSE rights, etc. SRHR for children is even worse. The more accepted phrase at the UN is SRH and RR which = "sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights" because in this phrase, "sexual" does not modify "rights." SRHR is NEVER accepted in any binding UN document for good reason—it is very dangerous.] and their position regarding the outcome document. Key issues which were included are among others: improving maternal health, ensuring access to sexual and reproductive health information and services, [This is defined by cse advocates to include CSE] empowerment of adolescents and young people, addressing all forms of inequalities, ensuring autonomy and empowerment of girls and women, strengthening health systems, addressing HIV/AIDS, realising human rights of all, recognising the link between the ICPD and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and financing for ICPD Program of Action as well as the post 2015 development framework.

Ready to go

While packing my bags to finally travel to New York, I feel excited. As a member of the official government delegation, I will be able to enter the negotiation room. This puts me in the ultimate position to influence my government's position, and therefore the overall negotiation process. I am looking forward to a fruitful CPD and get those strong commitments that will help and push my country to reduce its teenage pregnancy rate and improve SRHR for all.

8 April: Preparations

This year advocate Merel Heilmann will be part of the Dutch government delegation, Yvonne Bogaarts and advocate Rineke van Dam are supporting more than 15 partners from Africa, Asia and the Arab region to influence the outcome of the conference. To follow the activities of Merel, Yvonne, Rineke and all the partners in the coming week, you better know what's at stake...

What is the CPD about again...?

During a landmark event in 1994 in Cairo, 179 governments agreed on the International Commission on Population and Development (ICPD) Programme of Action (PoA). For the first time, governments looked at population issues and sustainable development from a human rights perspective. Key is the connotation of sexual and reproductive health and rights as an indispensable factor for sustainable development.

For instance, the PoA stipulates that government should ensure access to modern contraceptives; sexuality education; prevention, testing and treatment of sexually transmitted infections (including HIV/AIDS), and maternal health services, including safe abortion for all, without any form of discrimination.

What's at stake?

This year's CPD takes place in a period that the world stands at a cross-roads. The Millennium Development Goals are expiring in 2015, and as we speak negotiations are taking place at the United Nations on what should come after (also called the Post-2015 development agenda). Rutgers WPF, together with a great number of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) around the world, wants SRHR to be firmly embedded in the Post-2015 development agenda. Moreover, it should be aligned with the ICPD commitments made in the PoA, to avoid parallel or conflicting processes.

Luckily, this year's topic for the CPD focuses on the connection between the two agenda's. It is therefore a great avenue to advocate for strong references in the discussions and the final outcome Resolution to sexual and reproductive health and rights.

Advocates from Africa, Asia and Arab countries

Sexual and reproductive health and rights is a hot topic at the United Nations, always causing heated discussions between member states. [COMMENT: This shows that ANSLEM understands the controversy. He knows what he is doing.] It is therefore crucial that civil society organizations work with their governments to make sure they support SRHR as a key factor in sustainable development. Rutgers WPF capacitates and supports CSOs from African, Asian and Arab countries to do that. After intense strategy meetings with the advocates earlier in the year, they are well positioned to influence their government's position. Some have already been accepted to join their official government delegation as a civil society representatives!

What is the main challenge in Uganda?

Introducing comprehensive sexuality education at a young age will prevent many sexual and reproductive health and rights challenges. In Uganda many parents and professionals do not feel free to talk about sex or think their children are not of such age yet. However, police statistics show that adolescents as young as 14 years are having sex, some are in marriages while others are having children. They need to be well informed before they are faced with life changing events such as body changes during adolescence, an unwanted pregnancy or becoming HIV-positive . . . Education will help to reduce discrimination around sexual diversity. It will be very phased and we cannot change attitudes in a year or 2, but with the right message and the way it is delivered we will be able to make changes.

A base line of prejudice

A study in Kenya showed that staff working in our local sexual and reproductive health and rights partner organisations regarded homosexuality as sinful, un-African and not natural. Homosexuality is also illegal in Kenya, as it is in nearly eighty other countries. But after seven months of sensitisation training, entering into discussions with local gay organisations, examining the science and the personal impact of homophobia, things started to change.

Learning to unlearn

Thanks to the programme, staff and management in these partner organisations have changed their attitudes to sexual diversity, recognising and accepting it as part of their work. They were able to unlearn much of what they thought they knew about LGBT people. And at the end of the programme they were able to share their experience with their regional partners from Tanzania, Malawi, Ethiopia and Uganda.

Accepting inclusivity

The training ran differently in Indonesia, where the need to integrate the needs and rights of LGBT people was included in policy and programming sessions. Here the emphasis was on human rights. Indonesian culture is permeated by sexual diversity, but religion is a barrier to its discussion and acceptance. Both of these programmes have shown that personal and cultural prejudices as barriers to the inclusion of LGBT people in services can be successfully overcome.

Info about the Rutgers WPF found at www.rutgerswfp.org:

The Netherlands

“Rutgers WPF is a leader in comprehensive sexuality education in the Netherlands, where sex education is now part of the compulsory curriculum. Our materials are used in primary and secondary schools across the country. We also address the needs of the pupils of special schools or in vocational education and vulnerable groups like migrants and refugees. And we work with qualified and trainee teachers.”

Fraudulent Kinsey Sex Research (Family Watch)

With the backing and credibility of Indiana University and funding from the Rockefeller Institute, Kinsey conducted pseudo-scientific research on human sexuality, attempting to prove to the world that children are sexual from birth.

In the 1950s and 60s, in the name of “scientific research” for his institute, Kinsey personally interviewed thousands of people regarding their sex lives. He insisted on knowing every detail and documented the answers. He was especially proud of his “nonjudgmental” interviewing skills, which enabled his subjects to more freely disclose the most intimate details of their sex lives. Kinsey hired additional “sex researchers” and trained them in this same approach, sometimes even requiring them to engage in sex acts in his attic, often while being filmed, ostensibly in the name of science.

Today, students of sexology sometimes are required to participate in Sexual Attitude Restructuring Seminars (SARS), which largely mirror Kinsey’s original methods. The SARS include watching hours of pornography depicting a wide array of explicit sexual acts to help them “readjust” their sexual attitudes and become desensitized to even the most bizarre and potentially harmful sexual behaviors. In theory, this allows them to counsel others in a nonjudgmental way.

The Kinsey Institute’s claimed findings on human sexuality were initially published in Kinsey’s books, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (collectively known as “The Kinsey Reports”). The Reports have been used to promote pedophilia, incest, abortion, homosexuality, promiscuity, adultery, the legalization of same-sex marriage and much more.

The most controversial work of the Kinsey Institute, however, is the research they have promoted since 1948 on child sexuality. In *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (which was reprinted in 1998 and is widely available), the Institute published the notorious Table 34, which documents the “sexual responses” of children from infants through teens as recorded by their adult male abusers. These pedophiles conducted sexual experiments on hundreds of children by bringing them to what the experimenters called “orgasm” (screaming, weeping, fighting the sexual “partner”) and timing these responses with a stopwatch.

John Bancroft, M.D., former director of the Kinsey Institute, in his paper, “Alfred Kinsey and the Politics of Sex Research” said that Alfred Kinsey was, “particularly interested in the observation of adults who had been sexually involved with children.” It was Kinsey’s obsession with the sexual responses of children that led to the publication of the infamous Table 34 in Chapter 5 of *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, which documents the sexual abuse of several hundred children.

Kinsey proudly asserted, “We have now reported observation on such specifically sexual activities as erection, pelvic thrusts, and several other characteristics of true orgasm in a list of 317 pre-adolescent boys ranging between infants of five months and adolescence in age.” Table 34 in Kinsey’s book includes these data: an 11-month-old baby experienced an alleged “orgasm” ten times in one hour; a four-year-old child and a 13-year-old boy experienced 26 such alleged “orgasms” in a 24-hour period.

The Kinsey Institute’s sex research has been largely dismissed by qualified researchers for failing to meet even minimal standards of accepted research design. For example, Kinsey and his team intentionally selected non-representative, sexually deviant research subjects, many of whom were convicted sex offenders that were interviewed in prisons. Kinsey then attempted to draw conclusions about the prevalence of these deviant behaviors in the entire U.S. population.

This was clearly done in an effort to normalize unhealthy, abnormal and extreme sexual behaviors. In fact, it was the Kinsey Institute's flawed research that spread the widely accepted myth that 10 percent of the U.S. population was homosexual, which laid the foundation for the homosexual activist movement in the U.S. and now worldwide. (The actual number has since been found to be approximately two percent, although the Kinsey Institute still publicizes the 10 percent figure.)

The Kinsey Institute admits that many of their research findings on sexual norms were based on interviews with incarcerated criminals, prostitutes and paedophiles rather than normal, healthy members of society. Kinsey Institute researchers have since acknowledged the extremely serious problems with their sampling techniques.

Kinsey's coauthors have also since admitted that their prison histories ignored scientific sampling techniques and focused on the most deviant sex offenders, including those who had practiced incest, rape, and pedophilia. In fact, former Kinsey Institute director, Paul Gebhard, said regarding their research, "At the Indiana State [Penal] Farm we had no plan of sampling—we simply sought out sex offenders and, after a time, avoided the more common types of offenses (e.g., statutory rape) and directed our efforts toward the rarer types."

This flawed sampling technique made sexually deviant behaviors appear to occur far more often in the general population than they actually did, thus, greatly influencing public thinking about sexual norms and sex-related laws.

John Bancroft, a former director of Kinsey's institute says, Kinsey "rebelled against what he regarded as the destructively repressive sexual mores of his time." Kinsey believed that there were "only three kind(s) of sexual abnormalities: abstinence, celibacy, and delayed marriage," ironically, all practices that promote legitimate sexual health. The Kinsey Institute promotes anal sex with condoms as "safe" despite scientific evidence to the contrary.

Kinsey's fraudulent, misrepresentative, and misleading data based disproportionately on sexual and social deviants were used by courts and policymakers to make decisions and policies that have affected the lives of countless people.

To date, the Kinsey Institute has covered up the sexual abuse of children in the name of "science" and has refused to allow public examination of their original data or to reveal the sources from which they were derived.

Kinsey's claim that children can and should be sexual from the earliest stages of life has become the basis for virtually all modern comprehensive sexuality education programs taught around the world.

For more information go to www.stoptheKinseyInstitute.org.

Uproar over Comprehensive Sexuality Education – 29 Oct 2019 (IOL)

The implementation of Comprehensive Sexuality Education will not only be inappropriate for pupils from Grade 4, but teachers will also not be comfortable teaching the curriculum. This

is according to the South Africa Teachers Union's operational director Johan Kruger, who added that the implementation would be unacceptable.

Comprehensive Sexuality Education has been in the spotlight following a media report that from next year, textbooks for Grade 4 to 12 learners would include a curriculum approach that treats masturbation, sexual consent, gender non-conformity and single-parent families as mainstream.

Kruger said the union indicated to its members to leave the curriculum out if not comfortable with it, adding that there would be support provided if action was taken against them.

“This is totally unacceptable. We have actually indicated to our members that if they are uncomfortable to teach this curriculum they can leave it out and if there is action taken against them we will support them,” he said.

Kruger said the teachers needed training as it was a difficult topic to teach.

“It is important that teachers get training in order to be able to handle this topic and present to learners. “I was a school principal myself, and it is not every teacher that can actually provide sexual orientation education to learners. You have to have training to do it because it is a difficult topic.”

In addition, he said pupils were not ready emotionally, and the implementation would just confuse them even more.

“Children are definitely not ready for this stuff it is very explicit information. Pupils in Grade 4 are emotionally not intelligent to handle this information. “The information is not applicable for children in that grade and age. You are going to confuse a child even more.”

The curriculum has caused concerns, with some parents questioning why their children should be exposed to such topics at school. The department previously said the new curriculum would be targeted at Grade 4 to 12 learners and cover healthy lifestyles to sex education. It said Grade 4 learners would be taught in the most appropriate and sensitive way about how babies were conceived, among other topics.

Last week, the ACDP lambasted the department, calling it to rather focus on improving the appalling state of literacy and numeracy in schools instead of teaching children about sex and masturbation.

CSE Update – 05 Nov 2019 (For SA)

<https://youtu.be/WooCK6xU9oQ>