

To: MN House Preventive Health Policy Division Members

My Opposition To Comprehensive Sex Ed (CSE) HF358

By Kathleen Nydegger, Chapter Chair MN Mass Resistance

Submitted 2-23-2021

I would like to ask members of this committee to consider why proponents of HF 358 want CSE to be taught in classrooms to children as young as kindergarten and continuing through 12th grade and, that the training include graphic detail. Key word here is “why.” What is the reasoning for this training? The content should be discussed. But, subsequently, the bigger question becomes “why.” Why teach young children this content of which they will not have the maturity to understand it anyway.

Consider that the promoters of CSE include SIECUS (Sexuality Information and Education Consortium of the US) and they advertise CSE this way: “We are not just talking about preventing STIs and unintended pregnancies. We are talking about creating large-scale social change.” Why isn’t “social change” defined? What changes does SIECUS intend to make? SIECUS needs to be specific in defining the “changes.” SIECUS expects us to drink the cool aid and not know what is in it.

Planned Parenthood, the largest teacher of CSE, describes the importance of CSE this way: “It is important for all young people around the world to be able to explore, experience and express their s-exualities ... This can only happen when young people’s s-sexual rights are guaranteed.” And Planned Parenthood says, “s-sexual pleasure [is] important for all young people.” (Interestingly, this will guarantee Planned Parenthood increased revenues in the future. So why wouldn’t they be behind all the sex they can encourage children to have.)

In a post from the *tumblr* social media platform, Planned Parenthood described its values: “Since the number of s-sexual partners you’ve had doesn’t say anything about your character, your morals, or your personality – or about anything at all really– there’s nothing bad or unhealthy about having a big number of s-sexual partners.”

The author of this Bill, Rep. Sydney Jordan said “CSE is not about values. It is about facts.”

In responding to Rep Jordan’s first sentence on values, I would like to know how CSE is not about values? I would claim that the majority of informed parents would contend that CSE undermines parental rights along with traditional values.

I believe that any adult familiar with children know that young children are extremely malleable and easily influenced.

Rep Jordan says it is about “facts.” That is correct. And what are the facts? The “facts” are that children will be taught how to masturbate, that a-nal s-ex can be safe, what coming to climax is like, or that explicit drawings, even of young people in bed together, as displayed in

the book: *It's Perfectly Normal*, are shown in mixed classrooms and presented as normal activity for them.

This focus on sex, and sexual pleasure encourages sexual behavior leading to devastating consequences such as pedophile abuse, pregnancy, STDs, and changing one's sex that bring long-term, irreversible consequences. And these consequences lead to depression, suicide and eventual deep regrets. Yet proponents of this Bill claim they are saving children from depression and suicide. The facts do not back up these claims.

Children cannot understand the ramifications of changing genders. Children who do change genders, face a lifetime of medical intervention and sterility and this choice can never be reversed. There are many heart-breaking stories of 'transgender regret' and, seeing no way out, they resort to suicide.

I ask committee members to consider: why is this agenda being pushed? Who is behind this and why? What is the purpose of spending valuable class time brainwashing children, using pornographic illustrations and graphic descriptions, that will remove all natural and protective boundaries and encourage sexual exploration?

Based on the above reasons, I am asking the Committee to reject Comprehensive Sex Ed HF358.