

CHRISTIANS MUST TAKE BACK THE LANGUAGE: A CLOSER LOOK AT “ABSTINENCE”

By Eunice V. Ray, Founder & President of RSVP America

This paper takes a closer look at “Abstinence” programs in the schools, especially since many well-meaning Christians are so deeply involved and trusting in these programs. I begin my investigation by defining terms. The RSVP Campaign, which I founded, is currently pointing out to parents the different principles and concepts behind the words we often use. A full knowledge of their definitions clarifies the implications of their meanings for our children particularly at law and in public policy. The following definitions are drawn from Noah Webster’s First Edition 1828 *American Dictionary of the English Language*.

Webster noted in his 1828 dictionary that “the principles of Republican government have their origin in the Scriptures.In my view, the Christian religion is the most important and one of the first things in which all children, *under a free government*, ought to be instructed.”¹ As Webster said, “education is useless without the Bible.” The definite meanings of the words in Webster’s American English dictionary departed sharply from Johnson’s dictionary, widely used in England. Johnson rooted his English definitions in poetry, literary classics and other works of men. Only

<p>AB’ STINENCE, n. [L. <i>abstinentia</i>. See <i>Abstain</i>.] In general, the act or practice of voluntarily refraining from, or forbearing any action. “<i>Abstinence</i> from every thing which can be deemed labor.” <i>Paley’s Philos.</i> More appropriately,</p> <p>2. The refraining from an indulgence of appetite, or from customary gratifications of animal propensities. It denotes a total forbearance of the usual quantity. In the latter sense, it may coincide with <i>temperance</i>, but in general, it denotes a more sparing use of enjoyments than <i>temperance</i>. <i>Abstinence implies</i>, previous free indulgence; <i>temperance</i> does not.</p> <p>PURITY, n. {[Fr. <i>Purit</i>—; L. <i>puritas</i>, from <i>purus</i>.]</p> <p>2. Cleanness; freedom from foulness or dirt; as the <i>purity</i> of a garment. <i>Holyday</i></p> <p>3. Freedom from guilt or the defilement of sin ; innocence ; as purity of heart or life.</p> <p>4. Chastity; freedom from contamination by illicit sexual connection. <i>Shak.</i></p>
--

after a long, hard battle over Johnson’s man-based definitions did Webster’s Scripture-based dictionary win the battle for supremacy in America.

Webster defined “**purity**,” “**chastity**” and “**abstinence**” in an American context. But, although the meanings seem similar, there are

critical differences. These differences are vitally important as these words guide us today in the Kinseyan “science-based” sex education that permeate our schools, even under “Abstinence” programs.

Like fasting, “Abstinence,” denotes that one has *chosen* to temporarily deny or limit a *basic* physiological need. But, unlike hunger which *must* eventually be fed or death will follow, an entirely celibate life is not a health hazard nor is survival in anyway jeopardized. Abstinence, *by definition*, means reducing or moderating actions or behaviors, not total denial or elimination. Thus, sex “education” programs in the schools can use the phrase “Abstinence” to allow for anything from “no” to indulging in the full range of “Outercourse” behaviors. Here Abstinence is saying “yes” to *any* sex act, with condoms, *except* the marital act, vaginal intercourse. “Outercourse” is not found in Webster’s 1828 Dictionary. Abstinence is not a clear standard, thus not an answer for children. It is confusing. “Abstinence until marriage” programs can mean “no” sexual activity to those morally based, but any sexual activity except intercourse to those “scientifically” or Kinseyan based.

¹ Noah Webster’s 1828 Dictionary, Also: Horace Mann, the father of progressive education, was opposed to our fundamental conceptions of our American Constitution namely, property, self-government and voluntary union. Mann removed the *spirit* of Constitutionalism and allowed only the *letter* to remain. Horace Mann in the 1840’s removed the Bible from the schools, not the Supreme Court in the 1960’s.

Public schools, which censor Bible reading, and which refuse to post the Ten Commandments, offer children “abstinence” to stifle their “animal” propensities. The Christian standard of *Purity and chastity* denotes the marital act only in marriage, encompassing an entire way of life, in fact, a state of a *heart*. A heart that has overcome sin and temptation by the blood of the lamb, Jesus Christ. A chaste life is much more than temporarily choosing to abstain *from* certain sexual behaviors. Chastity is exemplified in manner, speech, dress, etc. This morally based message is not welcome in the amoral schools of today.

Today, the Church alone is in the rightful position to hold up the purity and chastity standard of judgment. But, if it is to do so, its moral authority in these intimate areas of life must be regained. The Church’s authority was lost to a subtle brand of man-centered science beginning in 1948. There is much failure to point out as a result of Kinsey’s research. As we pass the 50th anniversary of his first report, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Based upon the statistics since 1948, America was measurably healthier when the Old and New Testament dictated the standard and the Biblical chastity model was taught to children by their parents.

The entire education establishment operates on Kinsey’s fraudulent model that “children are sexual from birth.” This model teaches our teachers and public health personnel, who in turn teach (the government) mandated sex education programs. These programs are built on the Kinseyan view that children, bi-sexual from birth, are entitled to “free” sex expression *at any age*, that some pedagogues have defined as including kindergarten. Thus on the “anything goes” Kinseyan smorgasbord of possible sexual delights and practices, hormonally-challenged children who chose “Abstinence,” are “fasting.” They simply “chose” an empty tray or lessor portions as peer and/or media pressures urge them to chose for themselves.

While the Church once owned the table, set for it alone in the presence of its enemies, “Abstinence” programs allow those with the moral perspective a place at the table now owned by the secular Kinseyans. Teaching about intimate matters in the schools is hazardous business at best. “Abstinence” programs are permitted in the schools, not because they are morally based or better for children, but because abstinence is simply another “choice.” “Abstinence” -- along with all the other varieties of natural and unnatural sexual acts and practices offered by sex educators -- is one of the many “choices” children are encouraged to consider about his or her *own* sex life.

Parents are not invested with this authority, the children’s choices are taught on a Kinsey model by Planned Parenthood, SIECUS or any of the “Abstinence” programs. The critical factor, especially for parents, is that children have been freed from parental authority and protections in sexual matters and are emancipated sexual actors. In true Kinseyan form, children are urged to chose “good” and “safe” sexual behaviors. “Abstinence” is one of their many choices; whether a “better” choice or not, it is just a “different” one.

Barbara Dafoe Whitehead in the liberal *Atlantic Monthly* in October 1994 reported that school sex education in schools has failed. **On the evidence, parents remain, the safest, and therefore best, teachers for discussion of sexual matters** with *their own children*. Whitehead says the *most* effective model for discouraging early teen sexual activity and producing happy, healthy children, is a “***moderately strict supervising parent***.” There are those who go farther about the hazards associated with classroom discussions of sexuality calling such activity sexual molestation.

Contrary to the teachings promulgated by sex educators. . . adult perverts are primarily a product of premature sexual experiences or seductions in early childhood. This is true

whether the seduction is due to actual attacks by a child molester, or whether the seduction is due to overexposure to sexual activities in classrooms or in the pornographic media.”²

RSVP is a campaign to restore parental oversight for their children and to equip American mothers and fathers with the information they need in order to regain their GOD-GIVEN right and obligation to instruct their own children in these vital marriage and life issues unencumbered by contrary government intrusion, and inaccurate and harmful Kinseyan-based information. What William Randolph Hearst said in 1948, about the true doctrine of the Republic, still holds true; “...the people, whatever their shortcomings, are the safest depository of power, the best guardians of their own interests.”

In closing, as I have reviewed the variety of sex programs in America’s schools and how they intervene or interfere in the lives of our children, robbing them of their innocence, I am reminded of *Braveheart*. In the movie, the local representative of the King rode into a wedding feast to enforce the “prima nocte,” the government’s intervention into the “first night” of the two virgins. All across America the government accesses our children, intervening in their lives, taking away their God-given modesty and innocence. Government has no right to do so, except that we have allowed it. Now, that assault on innocence is even carried out in the name of “Abstinence.”

² Melvin Anshell, M.D., A.S.P.P., *Killers of Children, A Psychoanalytic Look at Sex Education*, American Life League, Stafford, Va. P. 41.