Abusive Charms

Eroticized Classrooms Target the Most Vulnerable

by Judith Reisman & Mary E. McAlister

In its online encyclopedia, the FCC notes that it is "a violation of federal law to broadcast indecent or profane programming during certain hours . . . when children are more likely to be in the audience . . . to protect children from harmful content."[1] Many states also have laws that make it illegal to expose children to obscenity. Nevertheless, in at least seventeen states, so-called obscenity exemptions have been made for schools, museums, public libraries, and other venues.

What agents conspired to sneak obscenity exemptions into the very places where "children are more likely to be in the audience," so that teachers can present obscenity as education? This "education" can occur not merely during classes designated as "sex education," "health education," and the like, but throughout the school day in other subjects at the teacher's discretion. The phenomenon caused by such obscenity exemptions is known as the "eroticized classroom."

The Eroticized Classroom

Among the new resources brought into the classroom as part of the federal education standards known as Common Core are materials that, but for the obscenity exemptions, would be illegal to provide to children. For example, per Common Core recommendation, at least one school district in Colorado has included Toni Morrison's 1970 novel, *The Bluest Eye*, on its reading list for eleventh graders. This salacious novel presents a pedophile's rapes of young girls as romantic fantasies. Some of its passages are unprintable here, even using asterisks. Moreover, the obscene descriptions of incest, rape, and pedophilia are presented from the perpetrator's point of view.[2]

One widely used sex-education book designed for high school and middle school students gives children explicit instructions on how to apply a condom.[3] Another book, made available to elementary-school students as young as age ten, features drawings of homosexual "lovers," fully nude children, and boys and girls masturbating. The book assures students that such activities "are perfectly normal."[4]

Obscenity as education also extends to the mechanics of homosexual sodomy. For example, in 2012, a Maine middle-school principal allowed a group called the Proud Rainbow Youth of Southern Maine to give a presentation to students about tolerance of the homosexual lifestyle. In a Q & A session afterwards, youth and teachers listened as the group provided details about homosexual foreplay.[5]

Such presentations are a natural outgrowth of the recommended reading lists, which since 1983 have included the book *One Teenager in Ten,* which contains explicit first-person depictions of children's sexual experiences with adults:

> "I was in seventh grade when I moved in with my 32-year-old-lover. . . ."
> "I was in fourth grade and had sex with my uncle. . . ."
> "I was twelve . . . [when] my dance teacher . . . brought me out."

> "I'm fifteen, and have sex with this guy Reggie, who is 23."[6]

All these books and presentations, and myriad others too numerous to list, are part of the eroticized classroom. Such sex education programs mirror the techniques used by predators to groom children for sexual abuse and exploitation.[7] Moreover, brain science,[8] social science, and history demonstrate that these things are harmful to children, making it plain that obscenity exemptions should never be granted to teachers and others in positions of influence over children.

No Fleeting Expletives

Justice Antonin Scalia's words in *FCC v. Fox Television Stations* are relevant here. In that 2009 case, the Supreme Court sided with the FCC in rejecting Fox's request for an obscenity exemption for the use of "fleeting expletives" in its TV shows. Writing for the majority, Justice Scalia said it was obvious that such an exemption would expose children to a plethora of obscenities:

> [E]ven in the absence of evidence, the agency's predictive judgment (which merits deference) makes entire sense. To predict that complete immunity for fleeting expletives, ardently desired by broadcasters, will lead to a substantial increase in fleeting expletives seems to us an exercise in logic rather than clairvoyance.[9]

Justice Scalia also suggested that the process of gathering evidence to prove that exposure to obscenity harms children was both unnecessary and harmful in itself:

> One cannot demand a multiyear controlled study, in which some children are intentionally exposed to indecent broadcasts (and insulated from all other indecency), and others are shielded from all indecency. . . . Here it suffices to know that children mimic the behavior they observe—or at least the behavior that is presented to them as normal and appropriate. Programming replete with one-word indecent expletives will tend to produce children who use (at least) one-word indecent expletives. Congress has made the determination that indecent material is harmful to children.[10]
>
> If empirical evidence is not needed to prove that even fleeting expletives are harmful to children, then such evidence is certainly not needed to prove that sexually explicit texts and images in the eroticized classroom are harmful to minors, especially when delivered under the authority of the school. Indeed, the use of an obscenity exemption to deliberately expose children to indecent material under color of education is precisely the kind of unconscionable experimentation on children that the Supreme Court rejected in *Fox.*

Moreover, schools are ignoring the fact that some of the children who are exposed to sexually graphic imagery in school are likely to be sexual abuse victims. "Sex education" further traumatizes such anguished children by exposing them to sex talk technically cloaked as diversity education, AIDS education, bullying prevention, or the like. The psychological assault of erotic pedagogy also puts children at risk of becoming victims of predators or, in increasing cases, child predators themselves.

Because viewing obscenity triggers psychoactive substances with negative properties in a person's brain, police officers, doctors, and others who *must* view obscene materials operate under strict standards of care to protect them from the harms caused by exposure.[11] Yet no such standards of protection exist for *children* exposed to porn in the classroom.

Shakespeare's words in *Othello* could apply to the eroticized classroom:

> Is there not charms
> By which the property of youth and maidhood
> May be abused? Have you not read, Roderigo,
> Of some such thing?

Notes

1. www.fcc.gov/encyclopedia/regulation-obscenity-indecency-and-profanity.
2. Macey France, "Common Core Approved Child Pornography," *Politichicks* (Aug. 23, 2013): www.politichicks.com/2013/08/warning-graphic-common-core-approved-child-pornography.
3. Richard Barth, *Reducing the Risk: Building Skills to Prevent Pregnancy, STD & HIV,* 4th ed. (ETR Associates, 2004), 120.
4. Robie Harris, *It's Perfectly Normal: Changing Bodies, Growing Up, Sex, and Sexual Health,* 3rd ed. (Candlewick, 2009).
5. Christian News Network (Nov. 5, 2012): http://christiannews.net/2012/11/05/principal-under-fire-for-exposing-middle-school-students-to-explicit-diversity-day-foreplay-talk.
6. Ann Heron, *One Teenager in Ten: Writings by Gay and Lesbian Youth* (Alyson Publications, 1983), 33–34, 48–49, 60, 67.
7. National Center for Victims of Crime: victimsofcrime.org/media/reporting-on-child-sexual-abuse/grooming-dynamic-of-csa.
8. Donald L. Hilton Jr. and Clark Watts, "Pornography addiction: A neuroscience perspective," *Surgical Neurology International* 2:19 (Feb. 21, 2011): ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3050060.
9. *F.C.C. v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.,* 556 U.S. 502 (2009).
10. Ibid.
11. Judith Reisman, "Picture Poison: Viewing Pornography for a Living Can Be Deadly," *Salvo* 23 (Autumn 2009): practicalhomicide.com/Research/ReismanSV10.pdf.