



Protecting Children and the Family from the Global Sexual Rights Revolution

By Sharon Slater, Family Watch International

Presented at Warsaw University Marriage Conference

September 29, 2016

Introduction

This paper will provide a broad overview of the global sexual rights revolution that seeks to fundamentally change society as we know it by sexualizing children, redefining the family, and changing societal norms regarding gender and sexual issues. It will then identify some of the entities and actors methodically working to advance a calculated, highly controversial sexual rights agenda, as well as some of the main tools used by sexual rights activists. Finally, this paper will show how children and youth are being groomed by sexual rights activists to advance this sexual rights revolution.

In order to understand the global sexual rights revolution, we must first understand the underlying worldviews of the two main groups now battling over sexual rights. Those who advocate for a more liberal view of sex and gender we will call sexual rights activists, and those who hold a more conservative view we will refer to as pro-family advocates.

Generally, the pro-family view holds that (i) sex is for marriage only, (ii) marriage is between a man and a woman only, (iii) gender is either male or female and cannot be changed, (iv) life is sacred and should be protected, and (v) parents have the right to choose their children's education, especially with regard to sexual matters.

The sexual rights activists' worldview is the polar opposite. They believe that (i) sexual promiscuity is good/healthy, (ii) children are sexual from birth, (iii) sexual pleasure is a human right people have at all ages, (iv) gender is fluid, takes many forms, and can be changed (e.g., Facebook now recognizes over 70 genders),¹ (v) abortion for *any* reason and at *any* time during pregnancy is a human right, and (vi) children have a right to sexual information and activity *without* parental knowledge or interference.

As sexual rights activists seek to advance their radical sexual and gender ideologies across the globe, they have targeted children and are using public schools as their vehicle to indoctrinate the rising generation.

¹ Williams, R. (2014, June 27). Facebook's 71 gender options come to UK users. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/facebook/10930654/Facebooks-71-gender-options-come-to-UK-users.html>

And what is at the center of this battle? The answer is simple. Sex. The sexual revolution could best be described as a battle over (i) what laws and policies nations should enact regarding sexual relations, sexual acts, sexual expression, and sexual health and reproduction, (ii) what the cultural and educational messages regarding such issues should be, (iii) who should pay for the negative consequences of unrestricted sex, and (iv) in the case of pregnancy, what the laws should be with regard to unintended pregnancies and abortion.

Defining Sexual Rights and the Sexual Rights Agenda

WHO and IPPF

A World Health Organization (WHO) publication outlining WHO's sexuality education standards for Europe suggests that youth receive information about their alleged "sexual rights" from International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF).² Unfortunately, IPPF promotes high-risk sexual behaviors as "sexual rights."³ They have over 65,000 service points in over 170 countries and receive millions of dollars from UN agencies. Since IPPF's declaration on "sexual rights" defines these rights as "an evolving set of entitlements related to sexuality,"⁴ to understand what sexual rights are (according to IPPF and the WHO) we must first understand what "sexuality" means.

On this key issue, the World Health Organization helps us out again. Both on their website and in a WHO publication,⁵ they provide us with their "working definition" for sexuality.⁶ It says, **sexuality "...encompasses sex, gender identities and roles, sexual orientation, eroticism, pleasure, intimacy and reproduction. Sexuality is experienced and expressed in thoughts, fantasies, desires, [and] beliefs ..."**⁷ (Emphasis added.)

The WHO publication also states that "The definition of sexual rights reflects an evolving understanding of concepts."⁸ In other words, the definition of sexual rights is an ever-

² World Health Organization. (2010). Standards for Sexuality Education in Europe: A framework for policy makers, educational and health authorities and specialists. Retrieved from http://www.bzga-whocc.de/fileadmin/user_upload/WHO_BZgA_Standards_English.pdf

³ To learn about the ten ways IPPF is harming children, go to InvestigateIPPF.org

⁴ International Planned Parenthood Federation. (2008). Sexual Rights: An IPPF Declaration. Retrieved from http://www.ippf.org/sites/default/files/sexualrightsippfdeclaration_1.pdf

⁵ World Health Organization. (2006). Defining sexual health: Report of a technical consultation on sexual health, 28-31 January 2002, Geneva. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/sexual_health/defining_sexual_health.pdf

⁶ WHO claims these "working definitions" do not represent the official position of WHO.

⁷ World Health Organization. (n.d.). Sexual and reproductive health. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/topics/sexual_health/sh_definitions/en/

⁸ World Health Organization. (2006). Defining sexual health: Report of a technical consultation on sexual health, 28-31 January 2002, Geneva. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/sexual_health/defining_sexual_health.pdf

changing and moving target of rights relating to highly controversial sexual concepts. Even more troubling, however, is the notion that the World Health Organization defers to IPPF, an organization that makes money from the adverse consequences of illicit or unlawful sex, to teach children about sexuality.

For example, this quote from IPPF's "Exclaim!" publication reveals IPPF's core philosophy regarding young people's sexual rights and sexual health:

Young people are sexual beings. They have sexual needs, desires, fantasies and dreams. It is important for all young people around the world to be able to explore, experience and express their sexualities in healthy, positive, pleasurable and safe ways. This can only happen when young people's *sexual rights* are guaranteed.⁹ (Emphasis added.)

IPPF also asserts, "All young people are entitled to sexual well-being and pleasure, ... and how to experience different forms of sexual pleasure is important for their health and well-being."¹⁰

In other words, IPPF believes that to have good health, children should not only be engaging in "different forms of sexual pleasure," but that they are actually "entitled" to "sexual pleasure," which should be "guaranteed" as a legal "right."

A comprehensive look into IPPF's extensive publications will show that IPPF has a very expansive view of what could be considered a sexual right. In fact, IPPF's "evolving set of standards," for sexual rights assert that almost anything and everything relating to sex or sexuality (except for nonconsensual sex) is a right. Hence, evidence can be found on IPPF's various websites and in their publications that children and adults alike are entitled to:

contraception, abortion, sexual expression (cross-dressing, nudity), LGBT rights, pornography (sale and use of), sexual relations, age of consent, sexual orientation, gender identity (identity papers, hormone therapy, sex-change operations, use of public bathroom and shower facilities, etc.), sodomy, prostitution, adoption, fertility services, and sexual education.

WHO instructs educators to teach children about their "sexual rights" as defined by IPPF.¹¹ It should be noted that IPPF has a conflict of interest when seeking to advance high-risk sexual acts as rights, since they profit from providing sexual related services, commodities,

⁹ International Planned Parenthood Federation. (2011). Exclaim! Young People's Guide to 'Sexual Rights: An IPPF declaration.' Retrieved from http://www.ippf.org/sites/default/files/ippf_exclaim_lores.pdf

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ World Health Organization. (2010). Standards for Sexuality Education in Europe: A framework for policy makers, educational and health authorities and specialists. Guidelines for instruction for children age 9-12 years, provide information about sexual rights "as defined by IPPF." Retrieved from http://www.bzga-whocc.de/fileadmin/user_upload/WHO_BZgA_Standards_English.pdf

and procedures such as sexual counseling, condoms, contraceptives, screenings and treatment for STIs (including HIV and AIDS), abortions, and more.

This is very disturbing for a number of reasons. For example, consider IPPF's "Healthy, Happy and Hot" publication. This publication tells youth who are infected with HIV that they have "sexual rights," including a "right to sexual pleasure" through "anal sex, oral sex, rough sex and soft sex," and states that "some people have sex when they have been drinking alcohol or using drugs. This is your choice." Alarmingly, this publication even tells youth they don't have to tell their sexual partners they are infected with HIV! It erroneously informs them that laws requiring youth to disclose their HIV status to their sexual partners supposedly violate their internationally protected sexual rights. Unfortunately, "Healthy, Happy and Hot" is just one of IPPF's many radical and explicit publications and programs.

It makes sense that WHO would send youth to IPPF to learn about sexual rights when you understand that WHO also promotes radical sexual rights and defines "sexual health" on their website to include "well-being in relation to sexuality that includes pleasurable and safe sexual experiences."

A serious problem with these sexual philosophies promoted by WHO and IPPF, however, is that the research shows sexually active children are at a much higher risk for many negative health outcomes, which is why children of minor age should never be encouraged to have any kind of sex or sexual experiences.

Even if the alleged sexual rights being promoted by sexual activists were in fact legitimate or widely accepted rights, which they are not, any sexual rights related to promiscuity should certainly be categorized as rights for adults and not children.

International Entities Promoting the Sexual Rights Agenda

Unfortunately, in addition to WHO and IPPF, there are a number of other powerful and well-funded groups that are aggressively promoting sexual rights and promiscuity for children at the expense of their sexual health and well-being.

Some of the main proponents of sexual rights include Western governments, sexual reproductive health advocacy organizations, and businesses that stand to profit when people are sexually active (e.g., abortion providers, pharmaceutical and condom companies, and businesses that provide reproductive technologies and services). In addition, multiple UN agencies are active proponents of sexual rights and aggressive promoters of "comprehensive sexuality education" (CSE), a radical form of sexual and gender indoctrination that they push in countries around the world to advance sexual rights.

When trying to understand why so many UN agencies are aggressively pushing harmful sexual indoctrination and rights for children, it might be helpful to understand that many of these agencies are largely controlled or heavily influenced by Western governments in partnership with Western NGOs. Since UN agencies are largely funded by the deep pockets of certain nations,¹² these wealthy nations often manipulate UN agencies to do their bidding while making it appear that the sexual rights they are advancing are supported by the United Nations as a whole, and therefore, represent the will of most or all of the nations of the world.

Let's look at how this plays out in various UN agencies.

UNAIDS

Sexual activists use deceptive means to promote the legalization and destigmatization of behaviors related to sexuality by claiming they are “human rights.” If something is pronounced a “human right,” regardless of how harmful or unhealthy, society is expected to accept, respect and protect it. UNAIDS, the agency tasked with preventing HIV infections and ending the AIDS pandemic worldwide, provides us with a good example of how sexual promiscuity and claimed sexual rights are furthered under the banner of human rights. UNAIDS published what they call the “International Guidelines on HIV/AIDS and Human Rights.”¹³ (For an in-depth review of the HIV/AIDS Guidelines, see our Family Policy Brief.)¹⁴ According to this “human rights” approach to eradicating AIDS, they claim governments must legalize:

- “abortion”
- “adultery, sodomy, fornication”
- “commercial sexual encounters” (prostitution), and
- “same-sex marriages”

In these Guidelines, UNAIDS encourages governments to legalize the very high-risk sexual behaviors that *drive* the AIDS pandemic as the *solution* to reduce the spread of AIDS! Equally dangerous is the fact that the UNAIDS Guidelines claim that sexuality education for children is also critical to stemming the spread of AIDS. But the type of education UNAIDS

¹² For example, in 2015 the top donors to the core resources of just one UN agency, UNFPA, included Sweden, USA, Canada, Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, Finland, Japan, Germany, Switzerland, Australia and Belgium. See <http://www.unfpa.org/donor-contributions#sthash.H99N2w8b.dpuf>

¹³ Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2006). International Guidelines on HIV/AIDS and Human Rights. Retrieved from <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HIV/ConsolidatedGuidelinesHIV.pdf>

¹⁴ Family Watch International. (n.d.). Family Policy Brief: The International Guidelines on HIV/AIDS and Human Rights: A Troublesome Paradox for Containing the HIV/AIDS Epidemic. Retrieved from http://www.familywatchinternational.org/fwi/documents/fwiPolicyBriefonInternationalGuidelinesonHIV_AIDSandHumanRightsFinal.pdf

promotes encourages early experimentation and many of the high-risk sexual behaviors that spread AIDS at the highest rates. (See below what UN agencies promote as appropriate sexuality education.) So the issue of which sexual behaviors should be considered to be legal rights is not a question just of morals—it is a question of life and death—as AIDS is a deadly disease.

The OHCHR

The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) also aggressively promotes a similar sexual rights agenda because it is influenced by essentially the same activists. For example, in 2012, the OHCHR released a report on the “human rights based approach to preventing maternal mortality.” This so-called “human rights” based approach calls for States to legalize “sexual and reproductive health services,” including services “such as abortion,” and also promotes comprehensive sexuality education.¹⁵

Over the last several years, the OHCHR also has been at the forefront of promoting LGBT rights with their “Free and Equal” campaign and more. And in 2016, the UN Human Rights Council appointed an independent expert on sexual orientation and gender identity, funded by the OHCHR, who is now traveling the world and pressuring nations to advance LGBT rights.

Also, the UN Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights has claimed, “Sexual and reproductive health rights [SRHR] are human rights. They are not new rights, and they are not optional. They are intrinsic to a range of internationally binding treaties.”¹⁶ Yet *no* binding treaty includes promiscuity as a sexual right as previously mentioned.

The Deputy’s statement goes on to say these rights encompass, “whether, when, how and with whom any individual chooses to have sex ... and how we choose to express gender and sexuality.”¹⁷ Most people would agree that these alleged rights are completely fabricated and are highly problematic for children.

¹⁵ Family Watch International. (n.d.). Family Policy Brief: The Report of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights: “Technical guidance on the application of a human rights-based approach to the implementation of policies and programmes to reduce preventable maternal morbidity and mortality.” Retrieved from http://www.familywatchinternational.org/fwi/documents/fwipolicybrief_technical_guidance.pdf

¹⁶ United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (n.d.). Statement by the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights at Launch of OHCHR information series on sexual and reproductive health and rights. Retrieved from <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=16190&LangID=E>

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

UNESCO

The UNESCO International Guidelines on Sexuality Education¹⁸ published with the support of UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, and the World Health Organization also seek to advance the sexual rights agenda. Consider the following UNESCO learning objectives for various ages:

UNESCO Learning Objectives for Level I (ages 5-8)

- “Girls and boys have private body parts that can feel pleasurable when touched by oneself.” (p. 43)
- “Bodies can feel good when touched.” (p. 48)
- “Masturbation is not harmful, but should be done in private.” (p. 48)

UNESCO Learning Objectives for Level II (ages 9-12)

- “Both men and women can give and receive sexual pleasure.” (p. 43)
- “Relationship between excitement and vaginal lubrication, penile erection and ejaculation.” (p. 44)
- “Many boys and girls begin to masturbate during puberty.” (p. 44)
- “Definition and function of orgasm.” (p. 49)

UNESCO Learning Objectives for Level III (ages 12-15)

- “Both men and women can give and receive sexual pleasure with a partner of the same or opposite sex.” (p. 50)
- “Everyone is responsible for their own and their partner’s sexual pleasure and can learn to communicate their likes and dislikes.” (p. 50)
- “Access to safe abortion and post-abortion care.” (p. 52)

One of the most dangerous concepts promoted by the UNESCO Guidelines is that children can engage in pleasurable sexual behaviors without risk of unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections. Like the UNAIDS Guidelines, these UNESCO Guidelines ultimately will increase the very same negative consequences of sexual behavior in youth that they claim to prevent. (For an in-depth review of the UNESCO Guidelines, see our Family Policy Brief.)¹⁹

¹⁸ UNESCO’s most recent version includes a title change: International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education. While the some of the most offensive parts of the original publication have been toned down due to strong opposition by some UN member states, it still contains disturbing material. The original UNESCO Guidelines have been revised, but the original version can be found here:

http://www.familywatchinternational.org/fwi/documents/int_guidelines_sexuality_education_original.pdf

¹⁹ Family Watch International. (n.d.). Family Policy Brief: The International Guidelines on Sexuality Education: Comprehensive Sexuality Education Defined. Retrieved from <http://www.familywatchinternational.org/fwi/documents/fwipolicybriefunesco2ndREVISION.pdf>

UNESCO justifies its promotion of sexual rights, particularly in regards to sexual orientation, by claiming in their Guidelines, “There are international and national legal instruments regarding sexual orientation.” Yet there are no international binding treaties that even mention sexual orientation. The UNESCO Guidelines also state as one of the learning objectives for 15- to 18-year-olds: “Respect for human rights requires us to accept people with differing sexual orientations and gender identity.”

The problem with these kinds of statements (especially when taught in the classroom) is that they are designed not only to promote respect for the basic rights of people who have differing sexual orientations or gender identities (which most agree would be a good thing), rather, they also are intended to prepare children to respect LGBT sex acts, sexual relationships and sexual expression. And once sensitized to such, children would be encouraged to eventually embrace and act out on their sexual attractions or to experiment with different sexual orientations and gender identities.

UN agencies often claim that the sexual rights they are pushing are simply what many of the world’s youth themselves are calling for from their respective governments. For example, the preface to UNESCO’s sexuality education guidelines states that in relation to contraception, abortion and sexual diversity, “young people are clear in their demand for more and better sexuality education, services and resources.”²⁰ These types of statements do not reveal what youth of their own volition want, but rather, what UNESCO wants, and what they have groomed youth to say they desire, all disguised under the banner of rights.

UNFPA

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) may be the most aggressive UN agency in promoting the sexual rights agenda. UNFPA pushes abortion and seeks to abolish parental rights so they can advance their agenda with children. Their publication, purporting to be a review of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) is quite telling, even by its title, “ICPD and Human Rights: 20 years of advancing reproductive rights through UN treaty bodies and legal reform.”²¹

In this report, in addition to promoting abortion, UNFPA references “*sexual orientation*” 11 times, “*transgender*” 6 times, “*gender identity*” 5 times, and has multiple references to decriminalizing same-sex behavior and implementing public campaigns to eliminate discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. It also is an assault on parental rights wherein it calls upon governments to:

- Remove “*barriers to sexuality education such as parental consent*”;

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ United Nations Fund for Population Activity & Center for Reproductive Rights. (2013). ICPD and Human Rights: 20 years of advancing reproductive rights through UN treaty bodies and legal reform. Retrieved from https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/icpd_and_human_rights_20_years.pdf

- Remove “*barriers to accessing safe abortion services, such as third-party authorization requirements* [parental consent for abortion]”;
- Remove “*barriers in accessing comprehensive sexual and reproductive health services*” [parental consent for adolescents]; and
- Abolish “*laws denying adolescents decision making capacity or requiring that they obtain parental consent.*” (Emphasis added.)

Consider the following additional evidence indicating UNFPA is pushing the controversial sexual rights agenda:

- **UNFPA’s operational review of the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) called “ICPD Beyond 2014” contains more than 500 highly controversial references**, including 391 references to “sexual,” 25 references to “sexual orientation,” 6 references to “prostitution,” 4 references to “transgender,” 18 references to “comprehensive sexuality education,” 44 references to “sexual and reproductive rights,” and 173 references to “abortion.”
- **“It’s All One,” a radical UNFPA-supported curriculum designed to sexualize children has over 112 references to “abortion” and 62 references to “sexual pleasure”** and teaches about masturbation, orgasm, ejaculation, oral sex, sexually pleasing a partner, penis size and more.²²
- **UNFPA co-published a highly controversial review of sexuality education.** A joint UNFPA/UNESCO publication purporting to be a credible review of sexuality education programs in Africa, is in reality a promotional piece that contains 100 references to the controversial “It’s All One” Curriculum.” The review, among other things, claims that the programs that did not promote abortion were inferior and used the “It’s All One” sexuality education curriculum as the gold standard, recommending, for example, that readers “See ‘It’s All One’ Curriculum” ... for a factual treatment of abortion.”²³ It also criticizes African sex education programs for not better promoting sexual diversity including sexual orientation and gender identity.

²² A short video clip showing controversial excerpts from the curriculum can be found at <https://vimeo.com/205359559>

²³ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2012). Sexuality Education: A ten-country review of school curricula in East and Southern Africa. Note that this regional ten-country curriculum review was jointly commissioned by UNESCO, UNFPA and UNICEF for the HIV Prevention Working Group of the Regional AIDS Team in East and Southern Africa (RATESA). Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002211/221121e.pdf>

- **UNFPA funded and promotes a Youth Peer Education Toolkit (YPeer) with disturbing sexual content for young people.**²⁴ For example, it encourages youth to ask their peers, “With whom would you share: your sexual fantasies ... whether you enjoy erotic material ... whether you have fantasized about a homosexual relationship ... whether you have had a homosexual relationship...”²⁵
- **UNFPA promotes controversial comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) as a key component of their work.**²⁶ CSE is one of the “five prongs” in UNFPA’s Strategy on Adolescents and Youth and a key priority of the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan. Outcome 2 of the Strategic Plan commits UNFPA to “increased priority on adolescents, especially on very young adolescent girls, in national development policies and programmes, particularly increased availability of comprehensive sexuality education and sexual and reproductive health services.”²⁷
- **UNFPA partnered with IPPF to convene their highly controversial Global Youth Forum.** They sponsored selected youth from a variety of countries to come to their forum in Bali, Indonesia and claimed these youth represented the views of all of the youth in the world. The Bali Global Youth Forum Declaration has an obsessive focus on sexual rights, seeking to establish LGBTQI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, questioning, and intersex) “rights” for the world’s youth. For example, among other things, it claims the world’s youth demand that all governments:
 - Legalize prostitution, same-sex marriage, and homosexual behavior;
 - Provide “comprehensive sexuality education”;
 - Recognize “young people have autonomy over their own bodies, pleasures, and desires”;
 - Support the sexual rights of all youth regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity; and
 - Provide abortion without parental consent.

²⁴ While the manual contains a disclaimer stating that the opinions expressed in the document do not necessarily reflect the policies of UNFPA, the Y-PEER initiative was funded and spearheaded by UNFPA in partnership with FHI/YouthNet and UNICEF.

²⁵ United Nations Population Fund and Youth Peer Education Network (Y-Peer). (2005). Youth Peer Education Toolkit: Training of Trainers Manual. Retrieved from http://www.y-peer.org/bitrix/templates/landing001/resources/ypeer_tot.pdf

²⁶ United Nations Population Fund. (2014). The UNFPA Operational Guidance for Comprehensive Sexuality Education: A Focus on Human Rights and Gender. Retrieved from <http://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/UNFPA%20Operational%20Guidance%20for%20CSE%20-Final%20WEB%20Version.pdf>

²⁷ *Ibid.*

Rather than a sexual “rights” document, the Bali Youth Declaration would be more aptly called a sexual “wrongs” document, since it would harm the very children and youth that were manipulated into calling for these alleged “rights” if it were implemented.

WHO

While this paper has already shown, in part, how the World Health Organization is promoting the sexual rights agenda, their most egregious example is their European Standards for Sexuality Education.²⁸ These WHO standards instruct educators to teach children the following: (Emphasis added.)

(For Children Age 0-4 years)

“Give information about enjoyment and pleasure when touching one’s body, **early childhood masturbation**,” “Enable children to **gain an awareness of gender identity**,” and “Give the right to **explore gender identities**.”

(For Children Age 4-6 years)

“Give information about **early childhood masturbation**,” “Give information about **same-sex relationships**” and “Help children develop respect for **different norms regarding sexuality**.”

(For Children Age 6-9 years)

“Give information about ... **different methods of conception**,” “Give information about enjoyment and pleasure when touching one’s own body, **early childhood masturbation**” and “Give information about friendship and **love towards people of the same sex**.”

(For Children Age 9-12 years)

“Give information about **different types of contraception ... enable children to use condoms and contraceptives** effectively in the future,” “Give information about **pleasure, masturbation, orgasm**,” and “Give information about **sexual rights as defined by the International Planned Parenthood Federation and the World Association for Sexual Health**.”

²⁸ World Health Organization. (2010). Standards for Sexuality Education in Europe: A framework for policy makers, educational and health authorities and specialists. Retrieved from http://www.bzga-whocc.de/fileadmin/user_upload/WHO_BZgA_Standards_English.pdf

(For Children Age 12-15 years)

“Give information about **gender identity** and **sexual orientation**, including coming-out/homosexuality,” “Give information about **pleasure, masturbation, orgasm,**” and “Enable teenagers to **obtain and use condoms and contraceptives effectively.**”

(For Youth Age 15 and up)

“Help teenagers to develop a **critical view of different cultural/religious norms** related to pregnancy, parenthood, etc.,” and “Help teenagers to develop a **change from possible negative feelings, disgust and hatred towards homosexuality to acceptance and celebration of sexual differences.**”

UN Treaty Monitoring Committees

UN treaty bodies—the UN committees responsible for monitoring compliance with UN treaties—are some of the most aggressive UN entities in promoting the sexual rights agenda. These committees often seek to reinvent or redefine vague or undefined UN treaty provisions, pretending that the original UN treaties contain binding provisions that encompass their invented sexual “rights” relating to abortion and sex. They then pressure nations to embrace these fictitious “rights.” (For more information on how UN treaty bodies overstep their mandates, see our Family Policy Brief.²⁹)

For example, unlike the fixed characteristics of race, sex or religion, “sexual orientation” and “gender identity” are not protected classes in either the UN Charter or in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and were not terms commonly used at the time the binding International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) was negotiated in 1976. Moreover, “sexual orientation” provisions have been specifically rejected many times by UN Member States since 1976. Yet the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has unabashedly argued that the words “other status” in the ICESCR include “sexual orientation” and “gender identity” as an attempt to make them

²⁹ Family Watch International. (n.d.). Family Policy Brief: Threats to National Sovereignty: UN Entities Overstepping Their Mandates. Retrieved from http://www.familywatchinternational.org/fwi/documents/fwipolicybrief_National_Sovereignty.pdf

protected classes and thus international human rights.³⁰ (For more information on the ICESCR Committee’s General Comment #20, see our Family Policy Brief.)³¹

In other words, UN committees are basically reinventing UN treaty provisions and then bullying developing countries into complying with them, even though they have no authority to do so because (i) only UN member states (governments) can establish human rights, and (ii) most matters related to sexuality are left to the states to regulate as a domestic matter and per their national sovereignty.³²

Although the “general comments” or recommendations of UN treaty monitoring committees are nonbinding, unfortunately, many nations believe they *are* binding or feel compelled to act as if they are for various reasons. Let’s explore just a few of the more revealing examples provided by the UN committee that is responsible for monitoring the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC):

- The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child claims in its General Comment #15 that in order for States to be in compliance with the CRC, children must be granted “sexual and reproductive freedom,” “confidential counseling and advice,” and “sexual education, [and] reproductive health services without the permission of a parent, caregiver or guardian.”³³
- The UN CRC Committee, in its General Comment #20 on adolescents (beginning at age 10), claims that in order to be in compliance with the CRC, nations must:
 - Repeal all laws regarding sexual orientation and gender identity;
 - Give girls access to abortion;
 - Remove barriers like parental consent;
 - Destigmatize LGBT status; and

³⁰ The following is a direct quote from General Comment #20 of the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights stating that the phrase “or other status” now includes “sexual orientation” and “gender identity”—“PROHIBITED GROUNDS OF DISCRIMINATION—15. ... The inclusion of ‘other status’ indicates that this list is not exhaustive and other grounds may be incorporated in this category. 32. ‘Other status’ as recognized in article 2, paragraph 2, includes sexual orientation. States parties should ensure that a person’s sexual orientation is not a barrier to realizing Covenant rights, for example, in accessing survivor’s pension rights. In addition, gender identity is recognized as among the prohibited grounds of discrimination; for example, persons who are transgender, transsexual or intersex often face serious human rights violations, such as harassment in schools or in the workplace.”

³¹ Family Watch International. (n.d.). ICESCR Committee General Comment 20. Retrieved from <http://www.familywatchinternational.org/fwi/documents/fwipolicybrieficescrgeneralcomment20.pdf>

³² UN Charter, Articles 13, 55, and 66.

³³ UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2013.) General Comment No. 15 (2013) on the right of the child to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health (art. 24). Retrieved from <http://www.refworld.org/docid/51ef9e134.html>

- Give access to free “sexual and reproductive health services, information and education.”
- The CRC Committee’s General Comment #4 on “Adolescent Health and Development in the Context of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)” claims that States cannot discriminate based on the categories listed in article 2 of the CRC: “race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status.” It then adds this *ultra vires* statement: “These grounds also cover adolescents’ sexual orientation and health status ...” Again, the CRC says nothing about sexual orientation.

The CEDAW Committee, the UN Committee that monitors compliance with the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), between 1995 and 2010 alone pressured at least 83 nations to legalize, remove penalties for, or increase access to abortion.³⁴ Yet the CEDAW treaty says nothing about abortion. The CEDAW Committee also has:

- Recommended the “decriminalization of prostitution” in China.³⁵
- Demanded that Mexico “address the matter of whether it intends to legalize prostitution” and urged it to provide “access to rapid and easy abortion.”³⁶
- Told the Czech Republic that it was concerned about that country’s “over-protective measures for pregnancy and motherhood.”³⁷
- Told Belarus it was “concerned by the continuing prevalence of sex-role stereotypes and by the reintroduction of such symbols as a Mothers’ Day and a Mothers’ Award, which it sees as encouraging women’s traditional roles.”³⁸
- Criticized Slovenia because “less than 30 percent of children under three years of age ... were in formal daycare.”³⁹

Another problematic trend is when vague, elastic terms are inserted into UN documents that are then used to bring in controversial concepts that would have never been accepted by states if they were openly proposed. For instance,

³⁴ Jacobson, T. (2010, June 4). CEDAW Committee Rulings Pressuring 83 Party Nations to Legalize Abortion 1995 – 2010. Retrieved from http://www.c-fam.org/docLib/20101022_CEDAWAbortionRulings95-2010.pdf

³⁵ Concluding observations of CEDAW: China. 05/02/99. A/54/38, paras. 251-336.

³⁶ Concluding observations of CEDAW: Mexico. 14/05/98. A/53/38, paras. 354-427.

³⁷ Concluding observations of CEDAW: Czech Republic. 14/05/98. A/53/38, paras. 167-207.

³⁸ Concluding observations of CEDAW: Belarus. 04/02/2000. A/55/38, paras. 334-378.

³⁹ Concluding observations of CEDAW: Slovenia. 31/01/97. A/52/38/Rev.1, paras. 81-122.

- The term “*or other status*” also appears in two places in the 2030 sustainable development goals (SDGs): First, SDG target 10.2 states, “*By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status.*” (Emphasis added.)

If the definitions of “*or other status*” from the UN CRC and ICESCR monitoring committees’ Comments #4 and #20 are used for SDG target 10.2, it would be understood to call for the social, economic and political “*inclusion*” of individuals with every sexual orientation, including homosexuals and bisexuals, and every gender, including transgender individuals and any of the 70-plus genders recognized by Facebook.

- Second, the phrase, “*or other status*” also appears in paragraph 19 of the SDGs, where it emphasizes “*the responsibilities of all States, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, to respect, protect and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, disability or other status.*” (Emphasis added.)

Using the interpretations of these words in Comments #4 and #20, this paragraph 19 of the SDGs would then call for nations to “respect, protect, and promote” rights for homosexuals and transgender persons, etc. While most people agree that the basic human rights of LGBT people should be respected for the same reason that the basic rights of all people should be protected, it is likely that the phrase “*or other status*” in the SDGs will eventually be used to promote more controversial LGBT rights, including same-sex marriage and adoption rights.

Finally, another UN mechanism that is used to advance sexual rights is the UN’s Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process. Each UN Member State is required to have its human rights record examined by the UN Human Rights Committee every four years. Essentially, the States under review become a pincushion for committee members from certain Western governments to attack their alleged human rights abuses.

Unfortunately, the HRC is stacked with governments who use it to push the sexual rights agenda. For example, already over 1,000 UPR recommendations have been issued to most of the UN’s 193 member countries regarding sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI). Yet, again, no international human rights instruments even mention SOGI. Interestingly, 30

percent of the SOGI pressure came from only four countries (Spain, France, Canada, and the Netherlands).⁴⁰

The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Comment #22 on the right to health, released in May 2016, defines non-discrimination to include a “right of all persons ... to be fully respected for their sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status.” It then asserts that “Criminalization of sex between consenting adults of the same gender or the expression of one’s gender identity is a clear violation of human rights. Likewise, regulations requiring that lesbian, gay, bisexual transgender and intersex persons be treated as mental or psychiatric patients, or requiring that they be ‘cured’ by so-called ‘treatment,’ are a clear violation of their right to sexual and reproductive health. State parties also have an obligation to combat homophobia and transphobia...”

To be clear, Family Watch opposes coercive laws, policies, or practices that would force people into therapy based on their LGBT status, but we also aggressively seek to protect the right for people to *voluntarily* seek therapy with the goal of decreasing unwanted sexual attractions or therapy that will help people accept and be comfortable with their biological sex. We also promote respect for the basic rights of all people, including those who self-identify as LGBT persons. However, Comment #22 requires that people respect not just LGBT persons themselves but also requires respect for their sexual orientations and gender identities, even though extensive studies show that acting out on such inclinations can lead to many negative mental and physical health outcomes for these individuals.

Comment #22 also claims that “The realization of the rights of women and gender equality” requires States to “guarantee all individuals access to affordable, safe and effective contraceptives and comprehensive sexuality education, including for adolescents; to liberalize restrictive abortion laws; to guarantee women and girls access to safe abortion services.”

Thus, Comment #22 is also a huge overreach and a radical interpretation of the right to health, which it claims now includes a right to sexual and reproductive health, which in turn is defined in controversial ways to include abortion and other sexual rights. And this is how UN treaties are manipulated to advance the radical sexual rights agenda.

⁴⁰ Oas, R. (2016, November 17). Center for Family and Human Rights. “Sexual Rights” Proponents Seek Legitimacy Through Universal Periodic Review. Retrieved from https://c-fam.org/friday_fax/sexual-rights-proponents-seek-legitimacy-through-universal-periodic-review/

Distortion of Rights

Children’s rights can be divided into two categories: protection rights and choice rights. Protection rights are the legitimate rights of children to those things that protect them and keep them physically safe such as clean water, food, shelter, healthcare and medicine and protection from abuse or harm. Choice rights are autonomous or adult-like rights that sexual rights activists argue should be granted to children.

Desired autonomous rights for children can include such things as fabricated rights related to privacy from parents, confidentiality, information, sexual education, association, a right for children to sexual expression, to choose their gender identity (i.e., decide if they are male or female), to view explicit materials, and a right to abortion or to control sexuality and fertility. By lumping these kinds of rights together under the banner of “children’s rights,” sexual rights activists are able to further their agenda, seeking to push for autonomous, or choice rights, for even the youngest of children in areas that traditionally fall under “parental rights” that are explicitly protected by binding UN treaties.⁴¹

Pointing to alleged rights to “privacy” or “confidentiality,” sexual rights activists also falsely claim that children have a right to learn about and to act out on their alleged sexual rights without the knowledge and consent of their parents.

While some autonomous rights may be legitimate rights for adults, they create problems when applied to children. The brains of children are not even fully formed until their early twenties, therefore, they lack the impulse control and maturity of adults to handle many of these alleged “rights” in a mature, safe and responsible manner.⁴² Protection rights are essential for the well-being of children and should be supported and promoted, while emerging autonomous choice rights are an attempt to sexualize and indoctrinate children in radical sexual and gender ideologies and behaviors. Treating children like miniature adult “*rights bearers*” by granting them autonomous rights independent from parents puts them at risk of being manipulated, exploited, or even abused.

⁴¹ “Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children”—Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26(3); “The State parties to the present Covenant undertake to have respect for the liberty of the parents ... to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.”—International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 13(3) and International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 18 (4).

⁴² See *Bellotti v. Baird*, 443 U.S. 622, 634 (1979) (Justice Lewis F. Powell) “... the peculiar vulnerability of children, their inability to make critical decisions in an informed, mature manner, and the importance of the parental role in childrearing” together require “the conclusion that the constitutional rights of children cannot be equated with those of adults.”

Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE)

This paper has provided ample evidence of the radical sexual rights agenda being pushed on children across the world by multiple entities. And they all have an alarming common thread: virtually all of the entities that are pushing controversial sexual rights are also pushing comprehensive sexuality education (CSE). This is not a coincidence.

As we at Family Watch International have studied and documented this global sexual rights revolution, we have found that the number one tool of sexual rights activists to advance their agenda is comprehensive sexuality education. Activists know that if they can get to our children and indoctrinate them in their radical sexual and gender ideologies, they will own the future, including shaping relevant laws and our culture. This is why they target children, especially through the schools. Sexual rights activists know well the same truth attributed to Vladimir Lenin when he said, "Give me four years to teach the children and the seed I have sown will never be uprooted."

The new UN LGBT "expert" showed he also understands this strategy well when he stated in an interview with the Argentine media, "But the younger that children can be targeted, the better.... The laws are very open but in the mentality of people, I've seen large variations with respect to empathy toward the LGBTI population."⁴³

In summary, Family Watch International asserts that the number one battle we must win to protect our families is the hearts and minds of our innocent children. This is why we produced a 30-minute documentary, "The War on Children: The Comprehensive Sexuality Education Agenda," made it available for free online (see comprehensivesexualityeducation.org/film/), and subtitled it in many languages. We knew that unless we could actually show parents, and especially governments, how deceptive and harmful CSE programs really are and the radical agenda behind them, no one would ever believe us.

So how does one describe CSE?

Comprehensive Sexuality Education, or CSE, is a radical, graphic, sexual rights-based approach to sex education that sexualizes children and is used to advance the global sexual rights agenda. The American College of Pediatricians calls CSE "one of the greatest assaults on the health and innocence of children."⁴⁴

⁴³ Newman, A. (2017, April 4). UN LGBT Czar on Indoctrinating Children: "The Younger the Better." *The New American*. Retrieved from <https://www.thenewamerican.com/culture/faith-and-morals/item/25742-un-pushing-homosexuality-gender-confusion-on-children>

⁴⁴ To understand the harmful nature of CSE, the American College of Pediatricians recommends viewing our documentary "The War on Children: The Comprehensive Sexuality Education Agenda," which is available to view online at no cost at "ComprehensiveSexualityEducation.org.

CSE is often deceptively promoted as “evidence based, medically accurate, age appropriate, and culturally appropriate,” and claims to encourage “responsible sexual behavior and reproductive sexual health education” or some variation of the foregoing. Wild claims are often made by UN entities regarding what CSE can do. For example, CSE proponents claim CSE will lift people out of poverty, ensure gender equality, prevent violence, preserve health, promote economic development, prevent pregnancy, and prevent maternal mortality. One UN document even claimed CSE will help with climate change. It’s so incredulous that such wild claims most often go unchallenged.

We have helped stopped CSE provisions multiple times at the United Nations and in countries around the world. For example, the outcome documents under negotiation by UN Member States at the UN Commission on Population and Development both in 2015 and 2017 were thrown out because of unyielding attempts to insert provisions requiring CSE. Family Watch has held multiple briefing sessions for UN governments, showing them our documentary and the harms of CSE, and these nations stood strong against the wealthy Western countries, IPPF and UNFPA who were heavily lobbying them to accept CSE.

Another example is Uganda. When our CSE documentary was posted onto their parliamentary network, it sparked outrage among parliamentarians. Subsequently a search was made of their schools, and one of the offensive CSE programs exposed in the documentary was found in a number of their schools. They were livid, and soon after, passed a law prohibiting CSE. But the battle is never over, and constant vigilance is a must. IPPF and other businesses that profit from sexually active youth and UN agencies got together and filed a lawsuit (that is now pending) to strike down the Ugandan law.

Something similar happened in the United States in the state of Utah. Parents who saw our documentary converged on their state capital to oppose CSE. Ultimately, they stopped CSE provisions from being adopted. This happened twice. But now there is a pending lawsuit in Utah also, claiming that Utah’s current sex education laws discriminate against LGBT people, and therefore, CSE must be adopted.

Family Watch has created a website (StopCSE.org), which is full of resources and tools to help people fight CSE wherever they may live. On this website you can also find links to many of the CSE programs exposed in this paper. We help governments as well as parents at the international, national, state and local levels to understand the radical CSE agenda and equip them with tools to fight it.

Although CSE is being pushed in almost every country throughout the world, there is good news. Parents, pro-family advocates, pro-family organizations, and even many politicians around the world are rising up to protest and stop CSE. In some cases, these protests against CSE are part of a larger protest against same-sex marriage and the imposition of

radical gender ideology on children through CSE and other policies. In other cases, the protests are specifically against CSE. And in most cases, they are successful.

Conclusion

A sexual rights revolution is raging across the world with the backing of multiple UN agencies and Western countries. The number one tool they are using to implement their agenda is comprehensive sexuality education. To help us protect the health and innocence of the world's children we invite you to take the following steps:

1. **Go to StopCSE.org and watch the documentary “The War on Children: The Comprehensive Sexuality Education Agenda.** Urge others to do the same, including religious leaders, politicians, government officials, teachers, school administrators, and of course, parents and grandparents. You can also join the Stop CSE coalition on the same website.
2. **To raise awareness of the cultural imperialism exposed in this paper, go to SexualRightsAgenda.org,** and watch the 30-minute documentary, “Cultural Imperialism: The Sexual Rights Agenda.” Encourage others to do the same.
3. **Go to InvestigateIPPF.org and sign the letter to the United Nations and UN Member State governments,** calling upon them to investigate and cease funding IPPF and their 155 affiliates with 65,000 service points across the world that profit from sexualizing children.

We urge all responsible citizens to help us protect the health and innocence of children and the institution of family as the fundamental unit of society.