

The Blumenfeld Education Letter

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge." HOSEA 4:6

Vol. 7, No. 7 (Letter #71)

EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld

July 1992

The purpose of this newsletter is to provide knowledge for parents and educators who want to save the children of America from the destructive forces that endanger them. Our children in the public schools are at grave risk in 4 ways: academically, spiritually, morally, and physically — and only a well-informed public will be able to reduce these risks.

"Without vision, the people perish."

Premarital Sex, Condoms, and AIDS: What Should We Tell Our Children?

Those of us who reject the notion that sex education should be taught in schools must face the matter of dealing with this issue at home. Our sex-saturated culture requires that we offer our children an alternative view, one that will give them the information as well as the moral attitude needed to grow and survive in this hedonistic society.

The first duty of parents is to demonstrate to their children that their family life is based on the same Biblical precepts which were the guiding principles of the Founding Fathers of this nation. They must demonstrate this by their obedience to God's law. When parents live in obedience to God, the job of educating their children in matters of morals is much easier because they have the world's best guidebook, the Bible, to instruct them. In addition, parents who live in obedience to Biblical precepts serve as good role models for their children.

No one doubts that children need guidance. If they don't get it at home, they will get it elsewhere. The last place you want your child to get guidance is in the public school where the distribution of condoms is

the only solution our corrupt educators can offer these days.

Fathers and Sons

It is the job of fathers to educate their sons in these matters. A father who is the spiritual leader of his family sets an example to his son who then sees his relationship to the opposite sex not in terms of lustful conquest or seduction but in terms of a search for a life companion with whom he can build a family like the one his parents have. And what are the Biblical values on which a good family is based? Love of God and adherence to His commandments, love for one another, patience, mutual consideration, loyalty.

And the one character trait that undergirds all of these values is self-discipline and self-restraint. If the Bible teaches us nothing else, it teaches us to restrain our passions and lusts. Today we live in a culture which does everything it can to stimulate desire. Music, television, movies, the arts, pornography appeal to the basest instincts in our makeup. And unless we have the means within us to withstand this assault on our senses, we can

The Blumenfeld Education Letter is published monthly. Sources of products and services described are not necessarily endorsed by this publication. They are intended to provide our readers with information on a rapidly expanding field of educational activity. Permission to quote is granted provided proper credit is given. Original material is copyrighted by The Blumenfeld Education Letter. Subscription Rate: 1 year \$36.00. Address: P.O. Office Box 45161, Boise, Idaho 83711. Phone (208) 343-3790.

easily be led to self-destructive behavior.

That is why the first line of defense must be the family itself where Biblical values are taught. A father who lovingly holds family devotions every evening after dinner is doing more to provide his children with the armor of God than anything else I can think of. The habits of childhood are those that remain with us through thick and thin for the rest of our lives. Children who are blessed with parents who provide such devotions are prepared to face the world with standards of conduct that will guide them through any predicaments they may face.

Premarital Sex

Probably the single most pressing moral issue facing youth today is that of premarital sex. For most people in America, however, it is not a moral issue at all. It is an accepted way of life. Not only acceptable, but desirable. The acceptance of condom distribution by so many parents indicates that the public in general now considers this sort of promiscuous behavior to be perfectly normal. But the simple truth is that premarital sex is the cause of more social problems, more unhappiness, more societal dysfunction than any other activity young people engage in. One would think that American parents, instead of approving of condom distribution, would begin to question the permissive philosophy which has led to this moral anarchy.

Premarital sex has led to widespread abortion, unwed motherhood, a life on welfare, fatherless families, venereal diseases that may lead to sterility and death, unhappy emotional entanglements, the awakening of a sexual appetite that may lead to promiscuity, prostitution, and perversion, loss of self-esteem, abusive sexual partners, degrading lives of alcoholism, drug addiction, nervous breakdowns, etc. All one has

to do is read the supermarket tabloids or watch Geraldo, Phil Donohue and other TV shows to see firsthand the swamp of depravity America has become. And the descent to depravity usually starts with premarital sex.

Yet, there isn't a national leader with the guts to make premarital sex a national moral issue. The former Surgeon General, C. Everett Koop, waged a campaign against cigarette smoking because of its harmful effects on smokers. But when it came to AIDS, he sent out a pamphlet which urged the nation's children to use condoms. Premarital sex is causing much more harm to America than cigarette smoking ever will, but Dr. Koop wouldn't touch the subject with a ten-foot pole. The AIDS problem alone should be enough to justify a national crusade against premarital sex, for AIDS in and of itself threatens to turn America into a diseased, debilitated society.

Teaching Our Children

How do we teach our sons and daughters the dangers of premarital sex? By telling them the facts of life. Each one of our children wants to have a long, happy, productive life. The vast majority of them want to have families. And so you tell them that if that's what they want, then the worst thing they can do is engage in premarital sex, for it will most likely derail whatever plans they have for that idyllic happy family.

Adults are supposed to have the wisdom that comes with experience. Many of us know from personal experience the price that one pays for the follies of youth. But some of us will insist that our children must have the freedom to learn from their own experiences, to make their own mistakes. After all, in this ever-tolerant, free democracy they must be free to experiment to their heart's content, regardless of the consequences. The people in the soap operas do

it, and isn't that what life is all about?

No, that is not what life is all about, and the soap opera is not a model to be emulated. In fact, it ought not even be watched.

We have an absolute duty to warn our children of the dangers involved in premarital sexual activity. We tell children to stay out of the road because they may get hit by cars. We warn them about playing with matches. We buy protective gadgets for the home so that our children will not get hurt. We take them to dentists and doctors for preventive treatment. It stands to reason that we should warn them about making that first big emotional and moral mistake: engaging in premarital sex.

So how do you protect them from making their first big mistake. First, you teach your son to be a man — not a *Playboy* rabbit — who respects the young ladies he dates, and if he can't respect them, he ought not to date them. You teach him to find one particular young lady he can fall in love with. You teach him to court her as a gentleman, to marry her and build a family which will be the lifelong source of his happiness. Couples who do *not* engage in premarital sex will more likely stay together in happiness and contentment than those who do.

You teach your son that the job of a young man is not only to find a satisfying profession or career but to build a good family and home life, and he can only do that with a faithful wife. Fidelity is the cornerstone of a happy marriage. Infidelity not only destroys marriages but children as well.

Teaching Your Daughter

What do you tell your daughter? First, if you've brought her up with love and care in the context of a Bible-believing home, you probably won't have to tell her very much. She probably already knows about the many possible consequences of premarital

sex. If she meets a young man from another Bible-believing family, then, of course, chances are good that they will make a very happy couple.

But if your daughter is attending the local high school and is under great pressure from her friends to get with it and do what everyone else is doing, then you must warn her against premarital sex. Warnings are stronger than advice, but you should not have to give warnings to a daughter who loves you, trusts you, and values your guidance. In matters of sex, a father's advice is very important, for he knows the nature of the male animal and what his daughter will have to contend with and must avoid.

A simple way to do this is to describe two scenarios and ask your daughter which one she prefers. The first scenario is Biblically based. In it, boy meets girl, boy and girl date, boy and girl get to know one another and fall in love, their families meet, boy and girl get engaged, boy and girl get married, go on honeymoon, create a home, have children. The result, in most cases, will be happiness based on love, devotion, shared struggle, the affection of children and, above all, loyalty.

The second scenario is more in keeping with the New Morality. Boy meets girl. Boy and girl have sex. Girl gets pregnant. Boy deserts girl. Girl has an abortion or becomes an unwed mother. No love, no devotion, no loyalty anywhere. Girl may also get a venereal disease. Boy, like Magic Johnson, may get AIDS and succumb to an early death. Girl may give birth to a child with AIDS. Girl may go on welfare to live a life of poverty. Children are raised in a socially confusing, unstable environment. The cruel part of this scenario is that the momentary sexual pleasure for which these teenagers' sacrificed their future happiness was probably no more exciting than a bar of chocolate.

Ask your daughter which scenario she

prefers, which one makes more sense. Ask her which scenario is more likely to produce happiness, healthy children, material comfort, and economic security. Ask her if premarital sex is worth sacrificing one's chance for a decent, lifelong relationship with a loving husband. Ask her in what way can premarital sex possibly lead to the kind of family happiness she wants, the kind of happiness that requires love, loyalty, constancy, tolerance, patience, devotion, sacrifice, mutual consideration, responsibility, long-range planning, and common sense.

Aggressive Girls

These days we are learning that the girls have become quite aggressive in initiating premarital sex. Why? Hasn't anyone told them of the risks involved? Hasn't anyone told them that they are going to make it almost impossible for themselves to have that long, happy, healthy and productive life?

Premarital sex only serves to satisfy the desire for immediate excitement and gratification. And more often than not, the "gratification" leads to self-loathing rather than self-satisfaction. And when girls begin to hate themselves, they become susceptible to any boy who offers them the least bit of attention, even when these boys turn out to be paranoid and abusive.

Some girls actually think that the way to get a guy is through sex. Girls who think that they can control boys with sex are more than likely to find themselves in abusive situations. Because when they begin to withhold sex and arouse jealousy they create a frustrated, angry male who can endanger them physically. Premarital sex can be used by some girls as a weapon, but weapons are used in warfare, not in love.

Premarital sex often leads to promiscuity which has its own dangers of disease,

emotional upheavals, degrading situations, addictions, and jealousy. It's very difficult for a girl to find a good husband with that kind of lifestyle. It's very difficult for her to maintain loyalty to one man if she has had many relationships.

Love is a manifestation of responsibility, and that responsibility is impossible without self-discipline. So that is what you must instill in your children: the sense of self-restraint and self-discipline without which loyalty is impossible.

Irresponsible Males

Tell your daughter that she will never find happiness with an irresponsible male who wants to use her only as a transitory sexual object. If she is trying to find a man to love and marry, she won't find him among the most irresponsible boys around. A boy who coaxes a reluctant girl into sex is trying to steal her innocence. His goal is selfish pleasure. A boy who lacks self-control and self-restraint in matters of sex is a boy who lacks the virtues needed to be a good husband and father. A girl should steer clear of such a boy and recognize him for what he really is: a thief.

The schools are distributing condoms to the students. But what does a condom symbolize? It symbolizes lust, promiscuity, and sin. It symbolizes the desire to cheat reality. The young people today engaging in premarital sex, thanks to the permissiveness of parents and educators, will be in the divorce courts of tomorrow, having forfeited their chance at happiness for the momentary excitement and emotional highs of reckless behavior.

The key to happiness is a durable, loyal attachment to someone you love. An emotionally satisfying attachment is more important than a momentary sexual experience without love, without rhyme, without rea-

son. How many of these casual sexual affairs lead to happiness or a durable lifelong love relationship? These casual affairs create all sorts of emotional obstacles to the very kind of loyal relationship one should be seeking.

About ninety percent of the girls attending high school today will at some time in the future become mothers. They should give that prospect some serious thought. They should think of motherhood not in terms of an accident in the back seat of a car, but in terms of a marriage and family. They should be taught to look beyond the moment, to think of tomorrow and of the children they will probably bear. And they should seek a civilized courtship as the rational road to that happy state.

Another Teacher Quits And Speaks Out

Edward A. Rauchut, like John Taylor Gatto, recently quit his position as a teacher in the public schools. What follows are excerpts from an article by him which appeared in the October 30, 1991 issue of *Education Week*:

I just quit my job as a public-high-school English teacher. I taught in some of the worst academic and vocational schools in New York City and, most recently, in a high school reputed to be one of the best academic schools in the Midwest. Lately I became more embarrassed than ever to admit I was a high-school teacher. More to the point, I became unwilling to be part of a dysfunctional system that refuses to admit it isn't working. . . .

With very few exceptions, I watched for 14 years as student after student entered and left high school having learned next to nothing during his or her four-year term. And the problem is not in someone else's backyard, not in someone else's school district: It's systemic. My experience has convinced me that if the purpose of the public schools were to prevent children from acquiring an education, they could not do a better job than they are right now, at this very moment, in classrooms all across the nation.

Ours is an educational system that labels children learning-disabled and then calls for more tax dollars to remediate the problem it created. It is an anti-intellectual, morally bankrupt system whose values-clarification classes and bogus drug- and sex-education programs contribute to the very addictions they sanctimoniously claim to solve. It is a system that crushes our children's intellectual curiosity and then demands they learn anyway.

. . . To keep teaching children the same way when that way is not working is a form of institutional madness. In terms of our children, it is blatant child abuse. . . . To the degree that the educational bureaucracy participates in reform, to that same degree educational reform is destined to fail. Put simply, the educational bureaucracy will always transform the best reform ideas into models of its own bureaucratic mediocrity. . . .

Our public educational system is a monopoly founded on anti-intellectualism and bogus theories of learning. As such, real education has always been its enemy, the single greatest threat to its very existence, a persistent reminder of its failed mission to teach our nation's children. . . . Real education would put the child-detention centers we call schools out of business. Real education would close schools of education by forcing real subjects to be taught in them. . . .

It is simply not in the interest of the educational establishment to change, and it is politically naive to believe that this or any other bureaucracy will voluntarily self-destruct. Reform in the hands of the educational bureaucracy is simply another way to legitimize status quo school systems or reinforce even greater central planning and bureaucratization. . . .

Pulling out of a system that hurts the people it claims to be helping may now be a necessary first step in bringing about real reform. The cruelest injustice would be to continue to expect our children to succeed in a system that will always fail to educate them. To stand by and watch this happen is unconscionable: teachers, of all people, ought to know better. We see it happening every day.

As I cleaned out my desk, one image persisted — a long discarded image: the independent child, reading a book, a child free from "media centers," "computer classrooms," "cooperative-learning strategies," "whole language," "outcome-based instruction," "writing across the curriculum," "peer tutoring," "strategic planning," "resource rooms," "thinking skills," and all the rest in the latest stream of intellectually vacuous educational gadgets and fads. . . . The schools could not have done a worse job.

Comment: Over 40-million American chil-

dren spend up to twelve years in a dysfunctional school system that is systematically destroying their minds and morals. Edward Rauchut calls it "institutional madness" and "blatant child abuse." And he is absolutely right. He says that teachers, of all people, ought to know better, because they see it taking place right before their very eyes. And that's why so many good teachers are quitting.

But the tragedy is that the system is controlled by the mediocrities who apparently enjoy the power they wield. Their job is to maintain the delusion that education is actually taking place in the schools and that the failure of the students to learn is the fault of the students, not the system. That's why you hear celebrities on T.V. admonishing our children to "stay in school," "don't drop out," "a mind is a terrible thing to waste." What they don't tell the children is that their minds will be crippled if they stay in the public schools.

Dropouts do not leave school because something wonderful is happening to them there. They drop out because they've come to the conclusion that the the school isn't teaching them anything of value and that their time is being wasted. Time is also a terrible thing to waste! In fact, it is far healthier for the young adult to reject being a parasite locked in a detention system that doesn't teach and go out into the world of work and earn a living. Public education is little more than forced parasitism.

Ninety percent of the editorial writers, TV commentators, and corporate spokesmen who bemoan the failure of our schools, invariably attribute the failure to lack of public support, lack of federal funding, lack of parental participation, etc. They glorify every lunatic program the educators come up with. They laud the wonders of whole language and the newest new math. They ignore those of us who have been exposing

these frauds for years. And then they wonder why the new programs don't produce the excellence the educators promised.

They never come to us for answers. They simply go back to the same educational charlatans for more of the same. And the cycle begins again. The educators are experts at recycling the same old excuses and arguments and calls for "reform." They know that the public memory is short but its guilt is long. And they shamelessly trot out the old slogans that have worked so well in the past: "A mind is a terrible thing to waste." "If you think education is expensive, try ignorance." The president of the National Education Association probably repeats them in his sleep.

My argument these days is not with the inert couch potatoes who send their children to public schools like programmed robots, but with the activists who know every detail of the corruption and incompetence that pervades the system but have not yet taken their own children out of it. They exhaust themselves flailing at school boards that are as responsive as the chairs they sit in. They fight constant battles with their children's teachers, with principals and superintendents. And in the end they lose because the teachers and principals and superintendents know it's the government who pays their salaries, not the parents. It's all a game of money and power, and as long as the parents keep sending their children to the government schools, fending off parental complaints is just part of the educator's job.

If it weren't for the homeschool movement we would have given up on the American people long ago. We would have considered them to be as brain-dead as their educators. But, thank God, parents are waking up. Slowly but surely. This year there have been more homeschool conventions, conferences and book fairs than ever before. That's what education reform is really about.

Vital Reading: A Profile in Courage

AIDS: What the Government Isn't Telling You by Lorraine Day, M.D., Rockford Press, Palm Desert, CA, 301 pages, \$25.70 (Available through the *Blumenfeld Education Letter*).

Recently, John Kennedy and his sister, Caroline Kennedy Schlossberg, gave the Profiles in Courage Award to Gov. Lowell Weicker of Connecticut for having the "courage" to inflict an income tax — one of the tenets of the *Communist Manifesto* — on the people of his state. A very peculiar idea of what courage is. Perhaps the Kennedys are confusing courage with stupidity.

If the Kennedys had really wanted to recognize a truly courageous individual, they could not have done better than give their award to Dr. Lorraine Day, the orthopedic surgeon who has risked her career as well as her life trying to get the medical establishment to provide adequate protection for health-care workers against accidental AIDS infection and provide protection for the uninfected public from this deadly disease.

Dr. Day's book should be required reading for all of those "educators" advocating the distribution of condoms to school children. In fact, the book ought to be read by everyone in America concerned about maintaining one's health as the AIDS plague spreads throughout the country. "Our leaders are playing a deadly game with our lives and the lives of our children," she writes.

Concerning condoms, Day warns: "Long before AIDS started ravaging America, women knew that condoms weren't safe. The newest figures on pregnancy show that condoms are just about the most unreliable form of birth control. With the regular use of condoms, 14.2 percent of women will get pregnant, even though an ovum is receptive to sperm only three or four days in a month.

AIDS can be transmitted any day of the month. . . . It is irresponsible of 'educators' to suggest to America's youth that they will be safe if they are equipped with a condom."

Dr. Day first became aware of the AIDS problem as an orthopedic trauma surgeon living and working in San Francisco, the city with not only the highest incidence of AIDS infection but also with the most politically powerful homosexual lobby in America. She writes:

"AIDS is the most politicized disease mankind has ever known. Special interest groups have helped subvert the health care policies we have in place — good policies that should apply to all diseases. . . .

"I feel deeply about AIDS and what it will do to our future. . . . It has become a cause for me entirely by default, because when I stand in the operating room, I stand in human blood. There is blood everywhere — in my shoes, on my sleeves, and all over the floor. There is blood on every instrument and power tool I use. . . . That blood is potentially as deadly as somebody's pistol held to my temple. I don't know who will trigger it. I'm not allowed to know."

Believe it or not, a surgeon is prevented by law from testing his or her patients for AIDS. As Chief of the Orthopedic Surgery Service at San Francisco General Hospital, Dr. Day found that both the medical establishment and the federal government's Centers for Disease Control practice what is known as "AIDSpeak," which, for all intents and purposes, "sells you that old line of the Depression era that warns 'the only thing you have to fear is fear itself.'" Dr. Day warns:

"AIDSpeak, if allowed to indoctrinate you, will blur your fear of the virus. You can't afford not to have fear. You must have fear. You must. You can't afford to let somebody else's political, social or sexual agenda foist a deadly virus on you unsus-

pectingly, a microbe that kills every body it invades."

But the government is more concerned with appeasing certain interest groups than protecting the public. Day writes: "Our public health agencies were set up by your money and my money to track and control contagious diseases and to protect the uninfected. With this disease, it is the other way around. Our agencies protect the infected and sacrifice the uninfected. AIDSpeak has been relentless in making us believe that anonymity is sacrosanct and of a higher order than safety."

"The only way this disease can be controlled" argues Day, "is to prevent those who are infected from giving it to those who are not infected. . . . We will never be able to control the epidemic without knowing who is infected."

According to Dr. Day, there are now 500,000 AIDS-infected people in the New York City area alone. How many of them are unknowingly infecting others? How many of them are health-care workers?

In the early days of the epidemic, the infectious-disease experts told health-care workers that they could not get AIDS through needlesticks or from contact with the body fluids of an AIDS patient.

But everything changed on October 2, 1987 when the staff at Dr. Day's hospital were informed that a woman nurse in the hospital had become infected through a single needlestick. "I sat there, stunned," writes Day. "In the past six, seven years, I had been stuck a hundred times — and more. If I had gotten stuck with a contaminated needle, I could be dead."

From then on Dr. Day made it her business to find out the truth about AIDS and how it was spreading. Early on, the public had been told by the experts that blood transfusions did not pass on the virus. But when it was discovered otherwise, the blood banks

deliberately misinformed the public.

Dr. Day writes: "It took 14,000-16,000 victims with HIV from transfusions to get our authorities to admit that death was being kept refrigerated and frozen in blood bank inventories and that, maybe, it was time to test."

But even the tests are not foolproof. Donors who are infected with the AIDS virus may not develop the antibodies which show up on tests for as long as three and a half years.

"The general public stance," says Day, "is that this virus can't transmit via kissing, through sharing of utensils, by shaking hands or via aerosols. One risks professional lynching, practically, if one suggests mosquitoes, bedbugs, ticks or flies. . . . The truth is no one has done the proper studies."

We suggest that before any student is given a condom that he be required to read Dr. Day's book. The schools are deliberately allaying fear of the HIV virus instead of instilling it. Fear is the proper protective reaction to a life-threatening situation. But our educators are stripping students of their natural fear and giving them a false sense of security.

The important message of this book is that we cannot depend on the educators or our government to protect us from the deadliest virus ever to threaten the human race. As Dr. Day writes, "In one small drop of HIV-infected blood there lies the potential destruction of all human beings. This virus respects no borders and no boundaries. It respects no democracy, no power, no prayer, no money. It cannot tell the difference between Mother Theresa and Charles Manson. If it gets into yet another body, it will replicate. . . . Science and reason can kill HIV. A human rights slogan, no matter how ringing, cannot."

For your own protection, read this book.