

during a confrontation; but a defense against extremist attack needs to be planned, too. What should you do when you hear an argument like the following (Woodworth, n.d., 3)?

A modern drive for all-out, tell-all sex instruction from kindergarten through high school is now on! It is a carefully designed program of sex without morality to guide children from infancy to adultery. Christians need to know just exactly the intents and contents of this new mania for school children.

There are a number of things that can be done to defend against an extremist attack. It is important to keep in mind that the vast majority of citizens are concerned, perhaps misinformed, and will respond to reasoning and common sense. Huberman et al. (2008) offer many suggestions about how to approach handling controversy. They include suggestions about handling a public hearing, requests to consider alternative material, the difficult board member, the media, the powerful policy maker, and groups opposed to science-based programs and to comprehensive sexuality education. For example, in a public hearing in a school situation, they suggest that it is important to meet with representatives of the school board before the hearing and ask that the board take the following measures to ensure an effective meeting:

- Schedule a 90-minute hearing (otherwise the debate could on for a very long time).
- Have security available.
- Ask speakers to sign a roster.
- Allow only persons to speak who live in the school district and/or have children in the school system.
- Give each speaker a maximum of 2 to 3 minutes, a time limit established before the hearing.



© Photodisc

The innocence of youth should not be synonymous with the ignorance of youth. Sexuality is a topic that individuals of all ages profit from studying.

Defense Against Attacks by Opponents

Related to a discussion of arguments against comprehensive sexuality education, and condom education, were related to beliefs about their respective efficacy, as well as how policy preferences were related to demographic, political, and social variables, such as political orientation, attendance at religious services, or having an adolescent in the household. Religious and political factors emerged as key characteristics in explaining support or opposition to different sexuality education approaches in the United States. Generally speaking, compared with political orientation and religious attendance, standard demographic characteristics did not account for much of the variance in respondents' beliefs about sexuality education.

Once the reasons typically given for and against education about sexuality have been compared and explained, it is hoped that common sense and reason will prevail. It must be remembered, however, that rationality and objectivity often go out the window when it comes to human sexuality. Program planners must sometimes deal rationally with people who are subjective and emotionally overstimulated. It has been said that as a person's emotional level rises, the functional-intelligence level drops. Our desire might be to handle emotionalism with more of the same, but our best ammunition is still the objective facts supportive of sexuality education.

Classes do not include teaching about sexual techniques. *If fear convinces young people that sexual intercourse is not a good idea, then I'm all for it. Fear-based health education has never worked. Early smoking campaigns emphasizing that cigarettes can kill did not work. Effective education is based on presenting accurate information and helping people learn strategies for changing their behavior.**

Now that you understand the viewpoints of those opposed to sexuality education, you can see why some severe confrontations can occur. Recognizing the types of individuals opposed to sexuality education, the characteristics and stages of extremist attacks, and the many possible reasons some people might be opposed to sexuality education will help