




SEX IN THE GHETTO



Of all the transformations in the moral climate of our country, perhaps the most obvious value-shift has been in the sexual arena. Gone are the days when mommies and daddies lived in the same house, TV bylaws required twin beds for the Ricardos, and few children had heard (or spoken) the *F*-word. Today's American child grows up in a taboo-free society where sex sells everything from hamburgers to shampoo. As sexual pandemonium pulsates through our nation, it wreaks havoc not only in our inner cities, but on the eroding values of Middle America as well.

AS GOES THE FAMILY . . .

To understand our nation's problems with sex, we must first look at problems with sex's divinely-planned tangible result: the family.

In 1965 Daniel Patrick Moynihan tried to point out some "family problems" in his report called *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. The report pointed to the breakdown of the black family and the matriarchal single-mother household as the reason for the dramatic increase in crime, illegitimate births, and sexually transmitted diseases; it also discussed the phenomenon of the transient black father. Although hailed as "prophetic" by later social commentaries like Kay Hymowitz's 2005 article, "The Black Family: 40 Years of Lies," in its day, Moynihan's report was disregarded by government leaders and maligned by social leaders as racist and sexist.

We now know that leaders were foolish to ignore Moynihan's

warning. Back then one in four black children were born out of wedlock; today, it's three in four. And yet, the same driving force of progressive liberalism that denied an honest look at the structure of the black family in the 1960s has cunningly molded thought in the predominantly white and/or middle-class neighborhoods through the decades as well. In the history of this country, there has never been a lower probability that a child of any race will grow up in a family with both parents present. America's future promises to have a majority of working adults who have no memory or concept of a traditional home.

Indeed, forty years after America's leaders ignored Moynihan's alarm, the effects of the breakdown of the family were painfully obvious when Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans in September of 2005: The majority of the impacted citizens were poor and black. Talking heads across the nation blamed President Bush for the ensuing chaos, closing their minds to other possible contributing factors. One glaring statistic they ignored was that approximately 60 percent of all births in New Orleans were out-of-wedlock. Could this be one reason why thousands upon thousands of New Orleans' citizens were unable to leave the city prior to and after the hurricane? Many of these "families" had no father or husband to lead them out, provide them with the necessary shelter and food, or protect them from the appalling conditions that followed.

Unfortunately, out-of-wedlock pregnancies and abortions are prevalent among minorities and those living near or at the poverty level in the large, urban areas of our nation. The National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) reports that in 2002, the rate of births for unmarried Hispanic women was 87.9 per 1000 births, with African American women rating second

highest at 66.2 per 1000. The abortion rate for both of these minority groups was equally staggering. Figures from the NCHS (2001) study show that for every 1,000 black women, 29 abortions are performed, and for every 1,000 Hispanic women, 22 abortions are performed.

When the out-of-wedlock birth rate among black women reaches 75 percent, it's easy for many Americans to blame black neighborhoods for the ills facing much of the inner city, and consequently, of society. But it's important to remember that black social problems are symptomatic of a national problem. Irresponsible sexual behavior has no racial boundaries. For example, the rate of illegitimate births among whites today exceeds the rate among blacks forty years ago. America is approaching the day when one out of every three babies will be born out-of-wedlock.

Do Americans find such blatant immorality offensive? Hardly. Today almost 60 percent of Americans believe that it is morally acceptable for an unmarried man and unmarried woman to have sexual relations. Fifty-four percent see no problem with producing a child outside of marriage, compared to only 43 percent who disapprove.

I don't know about you, but I can remember the days when a single girl who got pregnant went off to live with her aunt in the boondocks and wasn't heard from again for a long time. I am certainly not advocating that parents disown their young, unmarried, pregnant daughters. But I do want to know how we ever came to the place of such overt, public, and socially accepted sexual sin. Why have so many Americans abandoned the moral codes passed down by our forefathers?

Many of you may be thinking, "My forefathers—my father

for that matter—didn't pass anything down to me!" Indeed it is true that some biological fathers are anything but loving familial and spiritual ones. By abandoning their important role in the family, too many American fathers have ensured that with each passing decade, we are becoming more and more a nation of moral moderates. (For anyone politically minded, America's downslide in morals is no respecter of parties: in 2005, 63 percent of Democrats and 51 percent of Republicans said that sex outside of marriage was acceptable.)

MIDDLE AMERICA'S FATHER: ABSENT WITHOUT LEAVING

The devastating effects of the absent urban black father have been much discussed. But what role have Middle America's fathers played in the values war raging in our country? Are they steering their families away from our culture's immoral landmines? If you haven't noticed, most (with the exception of some outspoken evangelical leaders and talk-show hosts) are suspiciously quiet, too wrapped up in stocks and bonds or the sports page to engage in any ethical squall. Or maybe they're just watching TV. . . .

Television networks offer a variety of mind-numbing entertainment for the dedicated couch potato. In the early 2000s, America's number one sitcom was *Everybody Loves Raymond*, a show featuring an overly passive and sophomoric husband, Ray Barone, who cares almost as much about his role as a father as he does about his golf game. Raymond's persistent nemesis and wife, Debra, has to kowtow her husband into taking out the

garbage. She is the main adult in the family, the one who handles the difficult issues and dysfunctional in-laws. And this show, glorifying male mediocrity, is the highest rated television comedy?!

I know that the show is supposed to be a comedy. I know entertainment producers would say to “lighten up” and not take things too seriously. But the best of all comedy is based on truth. If Raymond Barone (I know nothing of the personal life of Ray Romano) is the epitome of the American male, then our offspring have much to worry about. What would Raymond do in times of national crises such as 9/11? What would Raymond do to defend his wife and children if a thief broke into the house? What would Raymond do if his wife wanted an abortion or if one of his kids got hooked on methamphetamines? Would good old, “man’s man” Raymond have a clue? Of course not! His is a world of superficiality and donuts. That is why we laugh at the caricature of Raymond—he is today’s lovable male prototype. He represents a very real and very large segment of American society, the ultimate expression of the Moderate Middle.

I will say one thing for Raymond, though, at least his show’s content is rated PG. That’s more than I can say for the junk targeted at our nation’s teenagers.

FROM *OZZIE & HARRIET* TO *OZZY & SHARON*

We have found the perfect babysitter in Mr. TV: always available, always entertaining—and many children’s primary instructor from toddler-hood on.

Television doesn’t discriminate—99 percent of our homes

have at least one set. America's children watch an average of three-and-a-half hours of TV each day, or twenty-four hours per week. By the time Johnny graduates from high school, he will have spent 18,000 hours in front of a TV. And what will his malleable little mind have ingested? One hundred thousand acts of violence, including 8,000 murders, by the sixth grade. As for sexual content, let's just say that youthful innocence has been thrown out with yesterday's remote control.

According to a 2005 study by the Kaiser Family Foundation, 70 percent of today's television shows include some sexual content, with an average of 5 sex scenes per hour. Viewers craving even more titillation can tune into the top teen shows, averaging 6.7 sex scenes an hour. If our "liberalized" society continues its pattern, these nasty numbers will only rise, considering the number of sex scenes has doubled since Kaiser's first study in 1998. Take heart, though. Studio executives have made sure to combat the sex featured in 70 percent of their shows with a word about "safe sex" in 14 percent of the lineup.

But those statistics are meaningless anyway, right? Just because kids *see* sex doesn't mean they'll *have* sex. In 2004 a group of behavioral scientists funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development asked that very question and published their results in the Rand report.

What did they find? After following over 1700 adolescents (ages twelve to seventeen) for a year, their report confirmed the obvious. Namely, that:

- Watching TV shows with sexual content apparently hastens the initiation of teen sexual activity.

- Watching the highest levels of sexual content effectively doubles the next-year likelihood of initiating intercourse and greatly increases the probability of advancing in other areas of sexual activity.
- Sexual talk on TV has the same effect on teens as depictions of sex.
- Sexual content on TV is far more likely to promote sexual activity among US adolescents than it is to discourage it.

Although the study agreed that other factors also encourage early sexual activity—being older, having older friends, getting lower grades, and engaging in rule-breaking activities like skipping class—it ultimately found that youths who watch the most sexual content on television “act older.” In other words, a twelve-year-old who watches a lot of sex behaves more like a fourteen- or fifteen-year old who watches a little.

Unplanned pregnancies and STDs are more common among those who begin sexual activity earlier. Currently, one out of every four sexually active teens in the United States is diagnosed with a sexually transmitted disease, an estimated four million. The U.S. rate of teen pregnancy, 750,000 per year, is among the highest of all industrialized countries. Researchers say that even a moderate decline in the sexual content of adolescent shows could substantially lower sexual behavior in the teenage population. Faced with these facts, you might think that television producers would feel a responsibility to severely limit the amount of sex on teen shows. However, when confronted,

television executives respond with the token liberal response to any question about vulgarity in the media: “If you don’t like it, turn it off.”

Though I hate to agree with filth mongers, they have a point. Parents must take control—of their remotes and their teens. The Rand study confirmed this by finding that teens who were most likely to avoid or delay sex were those whose parents monitored their activities and clearly disapproved of them having sexual relations. Middle America’s parents must assume their role as guardians of their children.

MUSIC TODAY: NO SHOES, NO SHIRT, NO MORALS

A little contraption called the iPod gives teens access to songs in a way none of us growing up with 8-tracks and LPs ever dreamed. Unfortunately, it can also transport a constant stream of audio pollution into young ears and minds.

Listen to five minutes of a station playing hip-hop and rap for a sample of today’s “taste” in music. The rap that permeates black communities supposedly reflects the lifestyles of inner-city youths in particular and the plight of all blacks in general. In reality these songs don’t just reflect the moral poverty in the projects; they encourage it. Lyrics from Snoop Doggy Dogg’s innocently titled “Puppy Love” describe a man celebrating his sexual conquests and explaining why he is enthralled that he lost his virginity at such a young age. In the final verse, Snoop shows his appreciation to a certain girl that “converted” him to a life of “pimpin”:

SEX IN THE GHETTO

11

*Sometimes I sit and think of how I used to be
 Before I got converted to a D-O-double G
 I'd like to thank that girl
 From way back in the days
 Cause if it weren't for you I wouldn't pimp this way*

With all the millions he's made from selling his soul, Snoop Dogg can afford to celebrate pimpin' and a life of depravity. Those living in poverty-stricken urban areas who suffer immorality's effects have no way of escape. Indeed, millions of African Americans don't applaud the gangster lifestyle; a majority (63 percent) of the black community claim to be "born again." Even so, most of these evangelical, full-gospel, goin'-all-the-way-with-Jesus mothers (and fathers, if they are in the home) allow their children to purchase Snoop Dogg's and other notorious rappers' music.

This isn't just a black issue. In a prime example of integration gone awry, white adolescents have bought tens of millions of dollars worth of rap music over the last decade. Critics praise white rappers Eminem and Kid Rock for the same musical "genius" as Dr. Dre and Tupac Shakur, and their albums make millions in the heartland of America, the Red States. For an example of these rappers' so-called brilliance, read some lyrics from Kid Rock's "You Never Met a Motherf***er Quite Like Me":

*Yep
 I've been on the cover of the Rolling Stone
 I met the president when I was half stoned*

*I been so high I've gotten confused
I been beat down, broke and used
Motherf***er*

(Language like that used to earn young men a bar of soap; today it gets them Grammy awards.)

Musical trash isn't confined to rap; pop and boy-band artists offer up some equally shameless lyrics. For example, Christina Aguilera explains what she expects when she goes to a party:

*Ah, dirty (dirrty)
Filthy (filthy)
Nasty (Christina), you nasty (yeah)
Too dirrty to clean my act up (haha)
If you ain't dirrty
You ain't here to party (woo!) . . .
DJ spinning (show your hands)
Let's get dirrty (that's my jam)
I need that, uh, to get me off
Sweating till my clothes come off*

I shudder to think of all the pre-teen girls who stare at Christina's poster every night when they go to sleep. And yet the same parents who allow their children to purchase this young woman's music complain about the way they dress. After listening to most of today's songs, it's a wonder that teens want to wear anything at all!

No community, wealth, or religious affiliation can immunize young people to the effects of the pervasive in-your-face

sexual content of today's popular music. Brittany Spears and Jessica Simpson, women who today don't know the difference between a dishtowel and a bathing suit, were supposedly raised as Christians. Spears attended a private Christian school in her hometown in Louisiana and encouraged abstinence during the early part of her career. Judging from the lyrics of one of her more recent songs, "Boys," the singer has changed her tune:

*What would it take for you to just leave with me?
Not tryin' to sound conceited but
You and me were meant to be (yeah)
You're a sexy guy, I'm a nice girl
Let's turn this dance floor into our own little nasty world!*

Adding fuel to the fire of sexuality in music are the videos served up twenty-four hours a day on MTV and VH-1. To promote last year's movie flop *The Dukes of Hazzard* in which she played Daisy Duke, Jessica Simpson starred in her own music video rendition of "These Boots Were Made for Walkin'." In it, Jessica shows less of what Jesus would do and more of what Jessica would do with a pink bikini and a bucket of soap. Jessica's shorts were too tight to fit even a small Gideon's New Testament Bible in her back pocket. (Maybe that was her way of spreading the Gospel—attract them with some eye candy and then, when they're not expecting it, lead them in the Sinner's Prayer.)

The total number of Britney Spears albums sold has topped fifty-five million in just five short years. If those sales occurred only in the United States, that would mean that approximately 19 percent of Americans purchased at least one Britney Spears

album. A government Web site estimates that in 2003, the number of (U.S.) children ages 0–17 was seventy-three million, approximately 25 percent of the population. From that information, it can be assumed that an overwhelming majority of American pre-teens and teenagers own Spears’s music and have watched images of her writhing with boa constrictors or kissing Madonna. What mindset are we developing in our children, the future generation of adult Americans, by allowing them to purchase music and view images that would have been considered X-rated prior to the 1980s?

But that’s just it: what we as Americans allow or don’t allow makes the difference in the moral climate of today and tomorrow. While it is easy to blame the Snoop Doggs and the Jessica Simpsons of the world, their popularity hinges on the free market—on our decision to purchase or not purchase their material.

Likewise with television sitcoms and dramas; they survive or die based on ratings. If we don’t watch a show, it doesn’t remain on the air. Television sponsors are all too aware of consumers’ power and can thus be hypersensitive about content. So what if their concern is more about money than ethics? If we put our money where our mouth is, they will listen. Middle America must stand up and say “no” to our children when they want to purchase music, movies, or clothing that conflicts with our moral worldview. We have to be brave enough to walk out (or better yet, never buy a ticket) of the movies that offer images and ideas contrary to our beliefs. A friend of mine walked out on *Titanic* simply because it promoted the notion that it is all right to have an affair with someone else if your fiancé is a real

jerk. Another friend left *Midnight in the Garden of Good and Evil* because of its indulgence in the macabre and witchcraft along with its acceptance and promotion of homosexuality and cross-dressing. And yet, while thousands of middle-class parents across America enjoyed a free Saturday night, their teenage sons and daughters made the vulgar *American Pie* a blockbuster? If we are the country that voted for our current president because of his moral platform, we better act like it.

“FIRST BASE” HAS MOVED

Remember the joy you felt when you first held hands? The thrill of your first kiss? Sadly, today’s adolescents will remember other firsts. America’s *Sex in the City* society has not been lost on our teenagers; our children have gone way beyond watching and listening about sex. Today, activities formerly associated with porn stars and prostitutes are now connected to presidents and preteens.

A recent study on the sexual behavior of teenagers by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention revealed that more than half of American teenagers from fifteen to nineteen years old have participated in oral sex.

The AIDS crisis of the 80s apparently motivated people to “play it safer” in their sexual habits, leading to an increase in oral sex. Add to that a virtual decree by President Bill Clinton that oral sex isn’t really sex, and teens’ raging hormones were set free—after all, it’s safe and you can still be considered a virgin! (Outdated standards at least have an honorary status).

Sarah Brown, director of the National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, told *USA Today* that adults consider oral sex to be “extremely intimate, and to some of these young people, apparently it isn’t as much. . . . What we’re learning here is that adolescents are redefining what is to be intimate.” Now isn’t that sweet? No need to fret over the corruption of our teens, let’s praise their ingenuity instead!

Adolescent oral sex commonly occurs outside of the confines of a steady, monogamous relationship (ever heard of “hooking up?”). Parties are a point of rendezvous, at times allowing for multiple partner interactions. Giving new meaning to the old lyric, “I get by with a little help from my friends,” some teens even perform oral sex as a favor for a friend.

If you are worried that such a casual view toward an act our grandmothers may never have heard of might be dangerous, some professionals aren’t. J. Dennis Fortenberry, a physician who specializes in adolescent medicine, had these reassuring words for *USA Today*, “The fact that teenagers have oral sex doesn’t upset me much from a public health perspective. From my perspective, relatively few teenagers only have oral sex. And so for the most part, oral sex, as for adults, is typically incorporated into a pattern of sexual behaviors that may vary depending upon the type of relationship and the timing of a relationship.” What a relief! If my daughter is having oral sex with her boyfriend—or with her date, for that matter—I won’t have to worry because she’s probably doing other things as well!

Other professionals around the globe (and no doubt here as well) see the increase in oral sex as a positive development. A

2004 British newspaper article titled “Oral Sex Lessons to Cut Rates of Teenage Pregnancy,” described how educators believe encouraging children to participate in oral sex is one effective way to curb teenage pregnancy and STD rates.

Newspapers in America took a cautious, amoral attitude about the CDCP study’s results—ignoring the fact that our nation’s rampant immorality has infected our children, and focusing on how such activities may infect them with diseases. But as one shrewd reporter pointed out, even if your moral standard is the risk of disease, statistics on American teen sexuality should be alarming.

Why? As the good doctor said, oral sex is not the only sexual activity among teens. The CDCP study found that almost the same number of teens having oral sex were having intercourse. And not only that. Few newspapers reported the uncomfortable details, but the study also found that anal sex is on the rise. This trend is serious from a health standpoint because according to earlier data released by the Center, anal sex is far more dangerous than other types: The probability of HIV acquisition by the receptive partner in unprotected oral sex with an HIV carrier is one per 10,000 acts. In vaginal sex, it’s 10 per 10,000 acts. In anal sex, it’s 50 per 10,000 acts. The reporter mentioned above had this to say:

Do the math. Oral sex is 10 times safer than vaginal sex. Anal sex is five times more dangerous than vaginal sex and 50 times more dangerous than oral sex. Presumably, oral sex is far more frequent than anal sex. But are you confident it’s 50 times more frequent?

As for the newspapers' omission of any facts regarding anal sex, he implies liberal politics may have played a role:

If you live in Bergen County, N.J., congratulations. You get the only newspaper in the world that mentioned heterosexual anal sex, albeit briefly, in its write-up of the survey. Two other papers buried it in lines of statistics below their articles; the rest completely ignored it. Evidently anal sex is too icky to mention in print. But not too icky to have been tried by 35 percent of young women and 40 to 44 percent of young men—or to have killed some of them. . . . One in three women *admits* to having had anal sex by age 24. By ages 25 to 44, the percentages rise to 40 for men and 35 for women. And that's not counting the 3.7 percent of men aged 15 to 44 who've had anal sex with other men. . . . The spin that activists, scholars, and journalists have put on the survey—that abstinence-only sex education is driving teenagers to an epidemic of oral sex—doesn't hold up.

Faced with such unpleasant data, many parents in Middle America choose “not to know” what their kids are doing. Others know and do nothing. The price for such apathy may be the shattered spirits and bodies of their children.

SOS: SCHOOLS OVER-SEXED!

What do America's schools have to say about the extracurricular activities of their pupils? Are they taking the reins that parents have dropped to lead our children toward morality?

Individual teachers in our nation make heroic efforts, but taken as a whole, our education system has abandoned its stance as a moral gatekeeper in society. Or should I say changed its stance? After all, values are still taught. They are just the more modern kind. The main values spoken in classrooms today are Moral Relativism, Safety, and that ultimate of all values, Tolerance. Schools today are progressive liberals' preferred forum for ripping anything that might even resemble morality or justice from the hearts and souls of today's children.

Generations of moral codes have become outdated, intolerant nonsense. Instead of "honor your father and mother," children learn that their parents have been incorrectly conditioned in child rearing. ("Be sure to report your parents to the school guidance counselor if they lay one hand on you. It's for their own good.") Instead of being taught to behave themselves, children are given condoms and "safe sex" seminars.

And what do they learn at these seminars? Here are some mind-boggling examples of how public school administrators and teachers are molding your children into future productive citizens:

- 1) Planned Parenthood raised eyebrows by including instructions to use Saran Wrap as protection when engaging in oral and anal sex in their recommended sex-education materials for eighth graders (a supplement during their ongoing battle for condom distribution, I suppose). The National Education Association (NEA), which represents public school teachers, has a section for sex education on its Web site with a link to the

Planned Parenthood site. (Never mind that poor kids trapped in failing schools are insulated from the prime condition that produces improvement: competition. At least they can have Saran Wrap!)

2) In April 2005, administrators of Brookline High School in Massachusetts distributed to hundreds of students a booklet entitled “The Little Black Book” without parental consent or notification. The booklet, written by the AIDS Action Committee, is really a “guide” to the pleasures of homosexual gratification. Included in the booklet are:

- Tips on coming out to friends and family
- How and where to meet other homosexuals
- A guide for drug usage including that of heroine and ecstasy (Not one statement against drug use is made in the entire booklet. In fact, the language sounds as though the authors are endorsing partying with illegal substances.)
- A guide on the “safety” aspects of various forms of gay sex
- A list of “Your Sexual Rights and Responsibilities” including this little gem: “You have the right to enjoy sex without shame or stigma!”

3) In Palmdale, California, elementary students were given a questionnaire containing sex-related questions without their

parents' permission or knowledge. The survey, given to kids aged seven to ten, included a section asking them to rate how often they experienced thoughts or emotions about:

- “Thinking about having sex”
- “Thinking about sex when I don’t want to”
- “Washing myself because I feel dirty on the inside”
- “Touching my private parts too much”
- “Thinking about touching other people’s private parts”
- “Not trusting people because they might want sex”
- “Getting scared or upset when I think about sex”
- “Having sex feelings in my body”
- “Can’t stop thinking about sex”

Understandably outraged, a group of parents sued the school board, complaining that they would not have allowed their children to participate in the survey if they had known of the sexual nature of some of the questions. The 9th Circuit court ruled *against* the parents, rejecting their claims that they had been deprived of their fundamental right to “control the upbringing of their children by introducing them to matters of and relating to sex in accordance with their personal and religious values and beliefs.” According to the all-wise judges, the parents’ right to control their children was not “exclusive.”

Taken all together, these anecdotes spell out a clear message from those running the show today in America’s public

schools: Move out of the way, Mom and Dad, Dr. Ruth has the floor!

READING, WRITING & HOMOSEXUALITY

Of all the agendas infiltrating education today, the homosexual platform has been the boldest and most successful. Marjorie King's 2003 article "Queering the Schools" exposes some of the many underhanded tactics activists use to advance the powerful homosexual movement in today's public schools. As a prime example of their methods she describes a GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network)-recommended resource manual distributed to all K-12 public schools in Saint Paul and Minneapolis:

The manual presents an educational universe that filters everything through an LGBT [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans-gendered] lens. Lesson ideas include "role playing" exercises to "counter harassment," where students pretend, say to be bisexual and hear hurtful words cast at them; testing students to see where their attitudes lie toward sexual "difference" (mere tolerance is unacceptable; much better is "admiration" and, best of all, "nurturance"); getting students to take a "Sexual Orientation Quiz"; and having heterosexual students learn 37 ways that heterosexuals are privileged in society.

King goes on to demonstrate that this “educational” agenda is not confined to the upper grades, but is a comprehensive plan to indoctrinate every child into the homosexual mindset:

Nor is it ever too early to begin stamping out heterosexism. A 2002 GLSEN conference in Boston held a seminar on “Gender in the Early Childhood Classroom” that examined ways of setting “the tone for nontraditional gender role play” for *preschoolers*. To help get the LGBT message across to younger children, teachers can turn to an array of educational products, many of them available from GLSEN. Early readers include *One Dad, Two Dads, Brown Dad, Blue Dads; King and King*; and *Asha’s Mums*.

While certain states have taken the lead, the educational goals of the homosexual movement in general and the GLSEN in particular have tread inroads throughout the entire American landscape. It won’t surprise you that their prize pupil has been the state of California,

where a new state law requires public schools to teach all K-12 students (and K means five-year-olds) “to appreciate various sexual orientations.” What the new law might mean in practice, warned a state assemblyman, was on display at Santa Rosa High School, where invited homosexual activists “talked about using cellophane during group sex and said that ‘clear is best because you can

see what you want to lick,” or Hale Middle School in Los Angeles, where during an AIDS education course, “12-year-olds were subjected to graphic descriptions of anal sex and tips on how to dispose of condoms so parents don’t find out.”

Since most Americans link the lowest levels of morals to inner-city minorities and/or low-income neighborhoods fraught with crime and disease, I looked up Hale Middle School on the California Department of Education Web site to find out its student demographics. Surprise! Surprise! Hale Middle School is located in Woodland Hills, a very affluent city in northern Los Angeles County. Its high number of white students, 48 percent of the student body, dwarfs the overall district average of only 9 percent. What’s more, the percentage of students who receive free or reduced price meals at Hale Middle School is substantially lower than the district, county, and state levels—about 40 percent of Hale students qualify compared to almost 77 percent for the LAUSD and nearly 62 percent for the county.

So where was the outrage from the privileged parents of Hale Middle School? Were they off somewhere polishing their BMWs, congratulating themselves on their open-minded tolerance? I escaped a life of drugs and poverty, and it angers me to find suburban, middle-class, white communities embracing the morals so often associated with the ’hood.

Will anyone speak out against the proliferation of GLSEN programs in America’s schools? Not if surveys are correct. A recent Gallup poll shows that 54 percent of Americans today approve of homosexuals being elementary school teachers and

62 percent feel that they should be allowed to teach high school. If these poll participants represent a true cross-section of American culture, the majority of responders are white and middle class. They can't even be called "a bunch of liberals" either, since numbers show that while four out of ten Americans claim to be moderates and four claim to be conservative, only two say they are liberals. It seems that as more of our children today learn about Dick & Wayne, Middle America is nodding its approval.

Why are only a few people standing loudly and firmly for their conservative beliefs, especially when it involves the future of their children? Many parents have been hoodwinked. Like the overall progressive liberal agenda, the educational agenda of the far-left—especially that of gay activists—employs shrewd tactics in its mission to subvert traditional morality: 1) indoctrinate the principals and teachers, 2) keep the agenda quiet, 3) marginalize parental rights, and 4) marginalize those principles, teachers, and students who don't comply.

Don't think for one second that your child's school is protected. The underhanded tactics of the homosexual movement in the public school system, particularly those of the GLSEN, are extensive. For example, aware that most parents are concerned about safety, several radical activist groups have gained insider access into public schools in its name. Kevin Jennings, Executive Director of GLSEN, explains how they were able to penetrate Massachusetts's schools:

We immediately seized upon the opponents' calling card—safety. . . . We knew that, confronted with real-life

stories of youth who had suffered from homophobia, our opponents would automatically be on the defensive. This allowed us to set the terms of the debate.

He goes on to describe the “great” strides of GLSEN over the last decade:

Today, ten years after we began our mission, more than twelve million students are protected by state laws. Nearly three thousand schools have GSAs or other student clubs that deal with LGBT issues. Over fifty national education and social justice organizations, including the National Education Association (NEA) have joined GLSEN in its work to create safe schools for our nation’s children.

As a result of exploiting the safety issue, GLSEN has been able to pressure eight states to pass “safe school” laws protecting gay and lesbian students. Florida and New York, along with three other states, are considering similar legislation.

And what constitutes a “safe school”? A typical one has pink triangles above the doors of several classrooms to show that these rooms are a “safe” place for gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and trans-gendered students. Teachers are warned not to be critical of students’ alternative lifestyle, but instead to encourage it. If any student dares to rebel against all this freedom, he is castigated for being intolerant—especially if his disapproval stems from religion. (And I thought liberals hated conformity.)

In actuality, “safe schools” are ones that intimidate any student or teacher who doesn’t support the radical homosexual

agenda of GLSEN, PFLAG (Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays), and other radical homosexual activist groups. Under the pretext of protecting homosexuals from being bullied, these extremists pursue their goal: to indoctrinate into our children the belief that everyone has the potential to become a homosexual.

Teachers are under intense scrutiny if they don't comply with the new tolerance regime. Legislation passed in California ensures that no one, even conscientious objectors, is exempt from homosexual indoctrination. After homosexual students in the town of Visalia complained of harassment, their district was punished with a federal court settlement under AB537 (a California safe school law) that forced teachers to receive mandatory gay-rights training. The following year, the district's ninth-grade students were scheduled to attend court-ordered classes taught by the GSA.

How's that for justice? While one wayward school is forced to submit to the propaganda of the GSA (Gay-Straight Alliance), schools across the nation ban students from wearing rebuttal T-shirts that dare to speak against homosexuality. For all their talk of tolerance, gay rights activists have anything but tolerance in mind. They want what they want, they want it now—and they will do anything to get it.

STDS IN AMERICA: WHEN DOING ANYTHING YOU PLEASE LEADS TO DISEASE

With the “anything goes” philosophy reigning in our televisions, music, and school systems, it should be no surprise that one in

five Americans has a sexually transmitted disease. Yet despite our modern knowledge of STDs and the high numbers of infections, social resistance against abstinence programs remains intense.

It doesn't take a rocket scientist to understand that a person who abstains from sexual contact until marriage and who then remains faithful to an equally chaste spouse has an almost zero chance of contracting an STD. If nothing else, practicing this antiquated and prudish tradition invites no harm. Anyone promoting virginity or abstinence today, however, is greeted with smirks and labeled as primitive and intolerant.

The numbers surrounding the most deadly sexually transmitted disease, AIDS, unveil a society spinning out of control. In the year 2003, 18,017 of our citizens died from AIDS, bringing the cumulative total of AIDS deaths to 524,060. Tragic epidemics like this could be avoided if only Americans restrained their sexual behavior. Instead, standing firmly on the platform of unqualified tolerance, our culture has created a society of chaos . . . and death.

An examination of the health crisis we have created reveals that HIV/AIDS has migrated from the homosexual to the heterosexual community, and that today women account for 26 percent of newly diagnosed AIDS cases—quadruple the incidence among women in the 1980s. Black women compose over 70 percent of those cases, making AIDS the number one cause of death among African American women between the ages of twenty-five and forty-four.

Journalist Gwen Ifill jolted listeners of the 2004 debate between Vice President Cheney and John Edwards when she

pointed out that “black women between twenty-five and forty-four are thirteen times more likely to die of the disease than their counterparts.” Although health professionals are still trying to determine the precise channels through which the HIV virus is being transmitted to black women, drug use and sexual promiscuity are clearly contributing factors.

A recent *Newsweek* cover story helped bring more national attention to the HIV/AIDS epidemic among African American women. Unfortunately, its superficial and biased coverage was itself evidence of how such an educated, affluent country continues to propagate this disease. *Newsweek* left the false impression that:

- Traditional values, rather than being part of the solution to this problem, contribute to its cause;
- Men are helpless victims and responsibility lies exclusively with women;
- Choice and responsibility play a minimal role in sexual behavior;
- We can separate the HIV/AIDS problem from the general social and moral climate of our country.

A world in which females of any race can live a lifestyle of abstinence or marital monogamy is such a remote possibility to the *Newsweek* reporters that it did not receive a word of mention in the entire article. The only attention the reporters gave to traditional values was to claim that they make women submissive, and thus supposedly more prone to predatory male

behavior. These modern sages also blamed traditional values for men's reluctance to discuss their homosexual behavior with the women they encounter.

Undeniably, many of the HIV instances appearing in black women can be traced back to the appallingly high percentage of black men who have done time in prison. Prisons are a breeding ground for homosexual behavior and HIV transmission, and when HIV positive men return home and engage in heterosexual sex, their partners are exposed. Even so, *Newsweek* reporters never discussed the relevance of transformative prison outreach programs such as Chuck Colson's, nor did they broach the sensitive area of screening prisoners for HIV before they are released. Once again, political correctness trumped absolute truth in the mainstream media.

SOUTHERN HOSPITALITY?

After hearing the high numbers of African American women infected with HIV, it is tempting for middle-class Americans to sigh in sympathetic disgust, shake their heads over the appalling lives of the "less fortunate," and tune back into the *O.C.* After all, most Americans living outside of metropolitan areas blame the last thirty years' decrease in morality on the people living in troubled inner-city neighborhoods.

But as I have already mentioned, if the most vulnerable in our society has moral pneumonia, then America as a whole has a moral cold. You may be surprised to know that the states with the greatest concentration of sexually transmitted diseases are located in the southeast portion of our country—the region

known as the Bible Belt. For example, southern states have drastically higher rates of chlamydia than other regions. The following statistics suggest that some of that good old Southern hospitality may have crossed the line to immorality:

- Mississippi leads with 14.6% of women ages 15 to 44 who were tested in family planning clinics having the disease.
- Louisiana and Alabama follow with rates of 10.9 percent and 10 percent.
- The only state outside of the South with rates that compare to these is Rhode Island at 10.1 percent.

Other STDs such as gonorrhea and syphilis are most prevalent in southern and midwestern states:

- South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana have the highest rates of gonorrhea, with each state reporting over 300 cases per 100,000 people.
- Tennessee has ten times the rate of syphilis as that of California, and South Carolina has well over three times the rate of gonorrhea than New York.
- Syphilis is so prevalent in this quadrant of the United States that it is almost an exclusively southern phenomenon.

Why is this happening in the South, a region known (and sometimes scorned) for honoring traditional morality? Yes, all

humans make mistakes, and yes, a number of factors contribute to the South's high rate of STDs, including the level of education, use of contraceptives, and the availability of medical services. But still, you wouldn't expect an area of such biblical saturation to breed so many shameful infections. Not in a region where Judeo Christian morality has long been preached, whose residents make up the highest percentage of Americans who claim to adhere to some form of Christianity.

It is true most southerners have heard "Thou Shalt Not Commit Adultery" more than once in their lives, and that many can sing a bona fide gospel hymn. But they are not immune to the siren calls of our progressive society. The ugly scars from America's degeneration are not confined to the back alleys of Detroit or the Vegas strip joints. They are embedded in the rural fields of the Bible-thumpers as well.

GAY LIKE ME

Of all the changes in American morals in the past three decades, the most dramatic has been the integration of homosexuality into everyday American life. Little by little, the gay and lesbian agenda has invaded each public arena, most notably education, entertainment, and politics. Lifestyles once denounced as perverse by all but the fringes of society have maneuvered their way into the mainstream. Believe me, this assimilation was no accident.

Historians point to the 1969 Stonewall riots in New York City as the watershed moment when homosexuality in the United States came out of the proverbial closet. During the 1970s, while

gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgendered people were celebrating their “freedom,” homosexual activists begged the American public simply to tolerate them. Meanwhile, these same activists were developing a calculated strategy to force Americans not only to tolerate their lifestyle, but to endorse and applaud it.

The entertainment industry has played a mammoth role in the mainstreaming of homosexuals. Turn on most any show and you will find that the charming, nonthreatening homosexual friend of today has replaced the nosy housewife neighbor of yesterday. With the deliberate and clever integration of lovable gay caricatures and entertaining storylines, studio executives have opened the door for homosexuals to be welcomed into every American household.

Just take a look at NBC’s *Will and Grace*, a television comedy series wildly popular with both audiences and critics. It features Grace Adler, a straight female interior decorator, who moves in with Will Truman, a hard-working, friendly gay lawyer. The other leading male character on the show is Will’s friend, a flamboyant and silly homosexual man who garners most of the laughs. The two men play off of each other like Andy Taylor and Barney Fife in the 1960’s *The Andy Griffith Show*, yet they are both homosexual. What an ingenious way to create a sense of “normalcy” for the gay lifestyle—baseball, apple pie, and a fuchsia boa with high heels!

Lest you think this indoctrination has been the natural progression of our illuminated society, remember that an active agenda has existed for decades to legitimize the homosexual lifestyle. Shockingly candid evidence of this agenda ran in *Christopher Street Magazine*, a revered gay rights magazine of

the late 1970s and early 1980s. Excerpts from its article outlining “Six Principles for the Persuasion of ‘Straights’” reveal how the public homosexual image has been shrewdly manipulated and crafted:

1. The first order of business is desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights. The principle behind this advice is simple: almost any behavior begins to look normal if you are exposed to enough of it. . . . The visual media . . . [is] a gateway into the private world of straights, through which a Trojan Horse might be passed. . . . The National Gay Task Force has had to cultivate quiet backroom liaisons with broadcast companies and newsrooms in order to make sure that issues important to the gay community receive some coverage.
2. Portray gays as victims, not as aggressive challengers. In any campaign to win over the public, gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the role of protector. . . . We must forego the temptation to strut our “gay pride” publicly whenever it conflicts with the Gay Victim image.
3. Our campaign should not demand direct support for homosexual practices, but should instead take anti-discrimination as its theme. [*Hence, the*

improper equating of racism with discrimination against homosexuality.]

4. Make gays look good. In order to make a Gay Victim sympathetic to straights you have to portray him as Everyman . . . the campaign should paint gays as superior pillars of society . . . in no time, a skillful and clever media campaign could have the gay community looking like the veritable fairy godmother to Western civilization.
5. Make the victimizers look bad. . . . To be blunt, they must be vilified . . . we intend to make the anti-gays look so nasty that average Americans will want to dissociate themselves from such types.
[And I thought all the gay-love floating around our nation was from our own innate kindness!]
6. Solicit funds . . . those gays not supporting families usually have more discretionary income than average.

The homosexual movement's tactics have so cleverly seduced our society that it is nearly impossible for Middle America not to fall for its radical agenda, an agenda demanding many of us to surrender beliefs rooted in our families for generations. Honestly, what "bigot" today could disapprove of the sincere, savvy Will Truman or the funny, huggable Jack McFarland of *Will and Grace*? The duo-tyranny of the thought police and societal pressure has such a strong grip on American

society that most of us today will not breathe a word in public against homosexuality for fear of being ostracized and maligned. (With friends like that, who needs hate crimes?)

“I PRONOUNCE YOU MAN AND . . . HUSBAND?”

An absolute endorsement by the list of “Who’s Who” in America is not enough for the gay and lesbian movement. They want to overhaul the American family. In the past ten years, the battle over gay marriage has taken center stage in our culture. Cries for a national acceptance of gay marriage have been bolstered by sympathetic stories in the news media, liberal-voting regions across the country, and politicians who invent ways to circumvent the law.

Most Americans can recall when the mayor of San Francisco broke state law and began issuing “marriage” licenses to a few thousand homosexuals. His renegade antics were likely applauded in the state of Massachusetts, the only state that recognizes same-sex marriages. Others joining the gay parade are California, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine, New Jersey and Vermont, all granting same-sex unions a similar legal status to civil marriage.

But in other areas of the country, such aggressive moral apathy struck a nerve. Nineteen states now have constitutional amendments explicitly barring the recognition of same-sex marriage, while even more have legal statutes defining marriage to two persons of the opposite sex. More ballot measures are pending, and all successful Defense of Marriage Acts have

passed by considerable majorities, even in Oregon, a state where same-sex “marriage” proponents anticipated its defeat.

The fight isn’t over, according to the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. After Texas became the nineteenth state to overwhelmingly pass a constitutional amendment defending traditional marriage, Matt Foreman, the group’s executive director said, “All that today’s results show is that it is profoundly wrong and profoundly un-American to put the rights of a small minority of Americans up for a popular vote. This is not democracy; this is tyranny of the majority.”

His accusing remarks were typical far-left spin. But unless Middle America stays on guard, the moral gains made by adopting these acts will mean nothing. True, a 2004 CBS poll revealed that over 73 percent of Americans are against the legal recognition of gay marriages. But there was a sharp difference in opinion among various segments of society. For example, strong opposition to gay marriage correlated with the level of religious attendance, older age, Republican Party affiliation, and residence in the southern states. African Americans also greatly favor a constitutional amendment defining marriage. On the other hand, levels of support for gay marriage were higher among the young, the nonchurchgoing, the Democratic-Party-affiliated, and those who lived in the western states and New England.

The most troubling pro-homosexual demographic from the survey—and the most telling about the shifting morals in our nation—was the young. While only 12 percent of those in the over sixty-five age bracket approved of gay marriage, a whopping 43 percent (the highest of any demographic surveyed) of those between the ages of eighteen and twenty-nine

approved. These numbers reveal two things: first, that the homosexual indoctrination of our schools is working, and second, that America's future voting block may lean way toward the left.

Meanwhile, as Middle America breathes a sigh of relief that traditional marriage has crossed the first hurdle of state constitutional amendments (pressure for a federal marriage protection amendment still exists), many groups continue to actively fight for the legal recognition of same-sex marriage, including such Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered (LGBT) groups as HRC, Lambda Legal and NGLTF, and the issue-specific groups of Marriage Equality and Freedom to Marry.

For the time being at least, Americans continue to affirm the ideal of traditional marriage in the voting booths. But what about their daily lives? Do Middle Americans support marriage with their actions?

The National Marriage Project, a nonpartisan research institute at Rutgers University, recently released its annual study on the condition of marriage in America. The report found that not only does the United States lead the world in divorce rates—around 50 percent—but also that fewer Americans today are marrying than at any other time in recent history. Our nation's marriage rate has fallen by nearly 50 percent over the past three decades, and by 20 percent since 1995.

This marriage reduction doesn't mean passion is dead. Since 1960, the same year Mr. Moynihan wrote *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, unmarried cohabitation in the United States has increased by 1,200 percent. Just as Moynihan warned Black America that it needs to change to prevent the deterio-

ration of its society, voices of caution now speak to Middle America.

In an online article titled “Traditional marriage under fire: Who’s really to blame?” conservative policy analyst Daniel Allot tells apathetic modern Americans that the reason for marriage’s breakdown is neither legal nor political, but cultural. He discusses how, influenced by an invasive entertainment industry, American society has altered its view of matrimony from a “’til death do us part” commitment, to a self-serving, emotion-based “as long as it works” deal.

Allot argues that a generation of young Americans has grown up among evidence that traditional marriage does not work. He also points out that since same-sex marriage does not even exist in societies where marriages thrive, heterosexuals’ trivial view towards marriage has catapulted activists’ case for gay marriage.

Read his dead-on admonition:

Clearly, the key players in the battle over marriage are not politicians, judges or homosexual activists, but rather the millions of heterosexual couples who have thumbed their noses at marriage and abandoned the institution. . . . In the two-front war over marriage, the importance of opposing efforts to foist same-sex marriage on an unwilling public cannot be overstated. But, for those who truly care about the health of an institution that has been the bedrock of healthy families and societies for millennia, the push for same-sex marriage should also serve as a wake-up call as to just how fragile

the institution has become at the hands of heterosexual couples. It is high time that the passion with which many Americans oppose same-sex marriage be matched with an equal amount of passion for the well-being of their own marriages.

We have come full circle to where I began my thoughts on the sexual state of America: the family. Certainly, the traditional American family is under siege, with the challenges for young parents never greater. The no-limits brand of freedom promoted in our country today—more aptly termed “license”—has sanctioned behaviors once considered abhorrent, abnormal, and deviant. As a result, we have seen crime rates skyrocket, sexually transmitted diseases multiply, and families crumble. In the name of “freedom,” our permissiveness has brought upon us not the wrath of God, but the consequences of our own actions.

What is the cure for a society which has exchanged love and personal responsibility for lust and personal gratification? There is only one answer, and that is to reestablish our roots in personal responsibility and the traditional sense of right and wrong. Unless Middle America reins in our sexual lives and returns to decency, we will only sink further. We may find ourselves referring to these current, decadent times as “the good old days.”