

THE

MICHAEL
MCHUGH
CHRONICLES

By RANDY ENGEL

by the same author

SEX EDUCATION - THE FINAL PLAGUE

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number:
96-97109

The McHugh Chronicles

Copyright © 1997 by Randy Engel

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the author.

First printing, 1997.

Second printing, 1997.

Printed and bound in the United States.

Preface

1.

Father James T. McHugh
And The Origins Of Sex Of Sex Education
In Catholic Schools

2.

Father McHugh - A Trojan Horse
In The Pro-Life Camp

3.

Msgr. McHugh And
The March Of Dimes

4.

Bishop McHugh And The Natural Family
Planning Follies

5.

Bishop McHugh As The Vatican's
Spokesman On Population Affairs

Postscript

Index

PREFACE

On June 16, 1989, the *Catholic Star Herald*, the official organ of the Diocese of Camden (NJ) issued a 96-page, *Installation Commemorative*, honoring The Most Reverend James T. McHugh, S.T.D. as Fifth Bishop of Camden. In a tribute to Bishop McHugh, Joyce Lively, Director of the Camden Diocesan Pro-Life Office called him the “father” of the Pro-Life Movement in the United States, (1) while diocesan attorney, Martin F. McKernan, Jr., praised him as a priest who “single-handedly started the pro-life movement in this country, and his concern with the right-to-life of every American has been a hallmark of his entire priestly career.” (2)

The Vatican’s top official to the Mission of Permanent Observer of the Holy See to the United Nations, Archbishop Renato Martino, called McHugh one of the “foremost Catholic population experts.” (3) Msgr. Joseph DeAndrea, a former attaché to the Mission of Permanent Observer of the Holy See to the United Nations, stated that Bishop McHugh was “instrumental in proposing that abortion not be adopted as a population control measure.” (4)

In a lengthy feature titled, “A National Figure: Fighting for Life and for the Family,” Camden diocesan priest-columnist, Father Edward A. Igle, wrote that, during the turbulent 1960s, the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) “relied heavily on then Msgr. McHugh for thorough research, clear articulation of Catholic positions and ideals, and openness to dialogue with those who challenged Church teaching.” (5)

Igle then quoted Bishop McHugh himself:

I was there at the time of *Humanae Vitae*. I knew firsthand the crisis that it provoked in the Church and the difficulties at the Catholic University of America (with Fr. Charles Curran and other dissenters). I knew all of the people in the theological debate and I was comfortable with the teaching of *Humanae Vitae*... I guess I always regretted that a lot of those who protested so strongly didn't draw back a little and try to see the encyclical in terms of the lives of the people. (6)

Concerning the highly volatile question of classroom sex instruction, Igle noted that McHugh does not object “to sex education as such,” but that he (McHugh) is an adamant defender of parental rights. Again he quoted McHugh: “Any consideration of education in human sexuality must be premised on the importance of the family and confidence that it can fulfill its socializing and educative role.” (7) On the population issue, Igle reported that early in 1972, McHugh became embroiled in President Nixon’s controversial Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. “Msgr. McHugh attacked the Commission’s procedures as well as its conclusions, especially its advocacy of legalized abortion as a tool to achieve population stabilization,” Igle said. (8)

With regard to national debate over the March of Dimes’ eugenics policies, which is covered in depth in these chronicles, Igle stated that while many argued that the Church should condemn the foundation for its anti-life activities and warn Catholics against contributing to the organization, McHugh would have none of that. “Msgr. McHugh refused to do either. Instead he argued that amniocentesis is a morally neutral procedure, and he supported the March of Dimes,” Igle said. (9)

According to Igle: “Clearly under Msgr. McHugh, the role of the National Family Life Bureau was changing. The times were demanding that it address incredibly politicized issues that were testing the fiber of the American family: poverty, the war in Vietnam, abortion, and marital breakdown.” (10)

In a section titled "Vatican Service," *Camden Star Herald* news editor Kevin McLaughlin highlighted the important role played by Msgr. McHugh in matters related to ethics, family life and population affairs. McLaughlin cited McHugh's particular concerns related to human test-tube conceptions and the subsequent birth of Louise Brown, as articulated by McHugh at the Third World Congress on Human Reproduction in West Berlin in 1981. (11)

Bishop Thomas Kelly, former General Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops/United States Catholic Conference, summed up McHugh's efforts in the pro-life and family life arena this way:

Msgr. McHugh has labored heroically and with great success in promoting the well being of the family and the sacredness of human life. To say that this is the noblest of callings scarcely does justice to his accomplishments, but it at least begins to suggest the importance of what he has done. (12)

What is particularly incredible about these tributes paid to Bishop McHugh as a supposed defender of the preborn child and the rights of the family, and as an opponent of contraception, eugenics, population control, divorce and artificial reproduction, is *not* the fact that they are untrue, which in itself is bad enough, but that Bishop McHugh should be so bold and over-confident as to permit these statements to become a matter of public record, thereby exposing himself and his past deeds up to public scrutiny and further criticism by his Pro-Life opponents.

The Soviets have a name for McHugh's attempts at media manipulation and exploitation. They call it *dezinformatsiya* (disinformation), that is, a systematic effort to rehabilitate persons or reconstruct events or statements through the dissemination of false information or to distort or withhold information so as to misrepresent the real situation. (13) And the *real* situation in this case, is that Father James T. McHugh misused his position and office as NCCB/USCC Family Life Director and later Director for Pro-Life Affairs, and Vatican advisor to the Holy See's Office of Permanent Observer at the United Nations:

- To bring so-called "sex education" programs into parochial and public schools--programs which are anti-child, anti-educational, anti-family, anti-civilized and anti-human.
- To create a false, controlled anti-abortion movement in the Church while sabotaging legitimate efforts within the Pro-Life Movement to stop the slaughter of innocent preborn children.
- To undermine the Catholic Church's magisterial teachings on contraception, divorce, abortion, prenatal diagnosis, eugenics, and *in vitro* fertilization, and to serve as a damage-control agent for the Eugenic Establishment (including the National Foundation/March of Dimes) in the United States and an agent provocateur for the Population Control Establishment on the international scene.

Throughout all this, McHugh has demonstrated an uncanny ability not only to survive one pro-life debacle after another, but to move quickly up the ecclesiastical ladder from monsignor and papal chamberlain (1972), to auxiliary bishop (1988), to the rank of Bishop (1989). Whether or not he receives the red hat and is given a more prominent archdiocese (perhaps New York or Washington, DC) remains to be seen.

In comparison to some of his contemporaries from the Family Life Office years, including the deceased apostate priest, Father Walter Imborski, and the late Father George Hagmaier, C.S.P. who committed suicide, McHugh has continued to lead an extraordinarily charmed life.

It is common knowledge that since his earliest years at the Bishops' Secretariat in Washington, DC, McHugh has enjoyed the patronage and protection of a number of high-ranking American prelates including the late Terence Cardinal Cooke, Chairman of the Bishops' Committee for Pro-Life Activities; Archbishop Theodore E. McCarrick of the Archdiocese of Newark, where McHugh served briefly as an auxiliary bishop; and most importantly, the powerful, and now deceased, Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, Archdiocese of Chicago, who was a key player on the elitist New York-based Council on Foreign Relations, founded in 1921 to advance the cause of a one-world government (dictatorship). (14)

Among the European hierarchy, the late Cardinal-Archbishop Leo Jozef Suenens of Malines-Brussels, appears to have bestowed his particular favor upon Father McHugh. In turn, McHugh reciprocated with years of loyal service to the influential prelate. It was Suenens, readers may recall, who led the assault against the Church's traditional teachings concerning the primary and secondary ends of marriage at Vatican Council II. Suenens believed that conjugal love (not the procreation and education of children) should be the final measure of the morality of the marital act. (15) It logically followed that he became an advocate of contraception. All these viewpoints found favor in young McHugh's eyes.

In 1970, Cardinal Suenens, a future leader of the Charismatic Movement, made the international press scandal sheets when he attended a Progressive Theological Congress on Sex, held at a Franciscan church in Brussels, at which *avant garde* facilitators floated a giant plastic phallus (male reproductive organ) up from the altar at the end of the youth-dominated Congress, sending their adolescent delegates into a state of pandemonium! (16) We'll return to the activities of Cardinal Suenens and of Cardinals Bernardin and Cooke later in this book. Presently, it is time to return to the United States and begin our examination of the early career of Suenens' young protégé, Father James T. McHugh, at the NCCB/USCC Family Life Office.

References

1. Fr. Edward A. Igle, "A National Figure Fighting for Life and for the Family," *Installation Commemorative*, A Supplement to the *Catholic Star Herald*, Camden, NJ, June 16, 1989, p. 26.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
3. Kevin McLaughlin, "Vatican Service: An Expert at the U.N. International Conferences," *Installation Commemorative*, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Igle, p. 23.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
8. *Ibid.*, p.23.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
11. McLaughlin, p. 33.
12. Igle, p. 25.
13. For a complete description of the techniques and purposes of "disinformation" see Anatoliy Golitsyn, *New Lies for Old: The Communist Strategy of Deception and Disinformation*, Dodd, Mead, & Company, NY, 1984.
14. See James Perloff, *The Shadows of Power: The Council on Foreign Relations and the American Decline*, Western Islands, Appleton, WI, 1988.
15. Michael Davies, *Liturgical Revolution: Pope John's Council*, Augustine Publishing, Devon, England, 1977, p. 67.
16. Piers Compton, *The Broken Cross*, Veritas Publishers, Western Australia, 1984, p. 134. The report on the Youth Congress was published by the Belgian News Service and quoted in *Il Giornale d'Italia*, September 17, 1970.

Father James T. McHugh and the Origins of Sex Education in Catholic Schools

A Tale of Two Meetings

The dates are 8 to 14 September 1929. The place is Wigmore Hall, London. The great cosmic event is the Congress of the World League of Sexual Reform (WLSR) led by sexology gurus, Havelock Ellis, Mangus Hirschfeld, and August Forel. The conference boasts a star-studded cast of international players who deliver no less than 101 lectures and talks on classroom sex instruction, eugenics, birth control, population control, homosexuality, masturbation, artificial insemination, sterilization, abortion, divorce, pornography, surrogate sex, feminism, prostitution, venereal disease (sex hygiene), and other subjects of the erotic revolution. (1) Featured speakers include World League president and prominent homosexual, Dr. Mangus Hirschfeld, singing the glories of eugenics and the need for legal reform in the sexual sphere, including the removal of anti-sodomy laws. His equally reform-minded colleague, Professor C.E.M. Joad, delivers an opening address on Sex and Religion, challenging traditional religious views on family life and the meaning of sex. Writer Vera Brittain ridicules the fear of biological sex knowledge and demands sex instruction in schools, and even before school age. Adolescents are to be instructed in scientific and systematic sex, with special emphasis on birth prevention techniques, so that they become conditioned to viewing sex primarily as a “recreational” as opposed to a “procreational” act. Birth control advocates, Dr. Marie Stopes and Dr. Kurt Bendix display a wide assortment of contraceptive ointments and pessaries. During their lectures they complain bitterly that few unmarried women are taking advantage of either their advice or their wares. The repeal of anti-abortion laws is one of the London Congress’ foremost concerns. The World League’s final resolution states that abortion should be allowed for medical, economic and eugenic reasons, and that “No child is to be born without the wish of the parents.” (2)

Inside the hallowed walls of Wigmore Hall, the world’s sexual *avant-garde* hails the proceedings as a historic milestone in their ongoing assault on Western civilization and Christianity. They are optimistic, but with little reason. Outside, in the real world, traditional moral forces led by the Roman Catholic Church and the leading secular satirists of the day have come forward to meet their challenge and begin raining havoc on the sexologists’ parade.

On 31 December 1929, less than four months after the World League for Sexual Reform meeting in London, Pope Pius XI sends the first of two Vatican thunderbolts against the anti-life, anti-family forces. In his *Encyclical Letter on Christian Education of Youth*, the Pontiff attacks all forms of pedagogic naturalism and singles out for particular condemnation the error of “so-called sex education”:

Far too common is the error of those who with dangerous assurance and under an ugly term propagate a so-called sex education, falsely imagining that they can arm youth against the dangers of sensuality by means purely natural such as foolhardy initiation and precautionary instruction for all indiscriminately, even in public, and worse still, by

exposing them at an early age to the occasion, in order to accustom them, so it is argued, and as it were to harden them against such dangers. (3)

Such persons grievously err in refusing to recognize their inborn weakness of human nature, and the law of which the Apostle speaks warning us against the law of the mind; and also in ignoring the experience of facts, from which it is clear that, particularly in young people, evil practices are the effect not so much of ignorance of intellect as of weakness of a will exposed to dangerous occasions and deprived of the means of grace. (4)

Pius XI's prohibition of classroom sex instruction is then reinforced by a Holy Office Writ in 1931 that states that "no approbation whatsoever can be given to the advocacy of the new method [i.e., sex education or sex initiation]." (5) Furthermore, the Holy Office makes clear that the prohibition is binding in conscience on all Catholics since the prior encyclical is "a fundamental document on education from the standpoint of the natural law and the law of the Church." (6)

One year later, in his famed *Encyclical on Christian Marriage*, Pius XI again defends the sublime dignity of chaste wedlock and burns the ears of the sexologists with his scathing attack on divorce, adultery, onanism, contraception, abortion and sterilization. Nor is Pius XI alone in his defense of marriage and family life, as is evidenced by the 1929 publication in the United States of James Thurber and E.B. White's hilarious, stinging satire on the sexology movement of the day, *Is Sex Necessary? Or, Why You Feel the Way You Do*. (7) The combination of Vatican opposition and strong pro-family secular forces represented by White and Thurber, insures that poor Mangus and Company are doomed to another 30 years of preaching to the choir!

AASEC Meets Four Decades Later

At this point, dear reader, let us transport ourselves to a second sexology conference where the faces have changed, but the ties that bind remain the same. The date is 29 March to 1 April 1973. The place is Washington, DC. Once again, the leaders of the World Sexual Reform Movement, (now dominated by Americans, not Europeans) have assembled under the aegis of the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors (later "Therapists" was added).

Created in 1967, AASEC completed the Planned Parenthood-World Population, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) anti-life trilogy. AASEC's mission is to teach the teachers, that is, to train and accredit an army of professional sex educators. It is their task to reconstruct a new sexual morality on the ruins of the old, in public and parochial schools across the United States. The AASEC agenda is virtually identical to the 1929 World League meeting in London. Both include life-long "sex education" (with special emphasis on reaching out to the mentally and physically handicapped), eugenics, birth control, population control, homosexuality, masturbation, artificial insemination, sterilization, abortion, and medical prostitution (sexual comradeship), etc., etc. etc.

Oddly enough, another Dr. Ellis is on board as a keynote speaker. He is clinical psychologist and marriage counselor, Dr. Albert Ellis, who delights the assembled coterie of sex reformers and libertines with obscene language, while lashing out against recalcitrant parents, traditional values and the "goddam" Catholic Church and Orthodox Jews. (8)

SIECUS co-founder and first Executive Director, Dr. Mary Calderone, herself a beneficiary of a Sexual Attitudinal Restructuring (SAR) program designed to offset her natural aver-

sion to homosexual acts, pleads with the audience for the removal of existing sexual deviancy laws still on the books in 44 states. (9) Calderone, who served as National Medical Director to Planned Parenthood for eleven years before launching her national SIECUS "Sex Is For Fun" campaign in 1964, is best remembered for her models of copulating chickens used to instruct kindergarten children on the mechanics of sex, (10) and her titillating conversation promoting masturbation and a range of 'outercourse' activities for adolescents. Known as the 'Grandmother of Sex Education' by her admirers and 'Typhoid Mary' by her critics, Calderone receives a warm reception from her audience for her pioneering sex instruction efforts in public and parochial schools and college campuses across the nation.

A few speakers punctuate their talks with sexually explicit commercial Technicolor films, some of which are also being shown in a corner of the hotel lobby where any passerby, including children, can stop and watch until the projector bulb burns out. (11) Representatives from the local Hillcrest Abortion Clinic are on hand at the AASEC meeting to outline the new and expanded strategy of the abortion industry's war on pre-born children following the January 22, 1973, *Roe v. Wade* Supreme Court decision.

In much the same way that their European predecessors had addressed their followers at Wigmore Hall, this new generation of leaders of the Sexual Reform Movement expresses confidence in the righteousness of their cause. Central to their belief system is the promise that universal sex instruction of the young will open the door to a new sexual Utopia, freed from the shackles of religious repression and prohibitions. Unlike their forebears, however, they are no longer just preaching to the choir!

The Collapse of the Opposition

By 1973, the paradigm shift in America's sexual mores was almost complete. Traditional religious and secular views on marriage and family life, at all levels of society, had been undermined and in many cases simply uprooted. Initial toleration had been followed by public acceptance of fornication, adultery, divorce, birth prevention, abortion, sterilization, homosexuality, artificial insemination, and pornography. Explicit SIECUS-AASEC-Planned Parenthood sex initiation programs had become an institutionalized component of American education.

It would be much too simplistic, and far wide of the mark, to automatically assume that this paradigm shift had resulted solely from some new cunning or superior strategy emanating from the Sexology Movement itself. As I have taken pains to illustrate, making allowances for a slight change in scenery and costume, the AASEC program of 1973 had little to recommend it to decent society over the 1929 program of Mangus Hirschfeld. Rather, it would be more accurate to state that the Movement's success in transforming private vice into public virtue was made possible, only after its main opposition, the Catholic hierarchy in America, collapsed. And the *sine qua non* of that collapse--one of the earliest warning signs of the impending moral disaster for the Church and the nation--was the flirtation and fatal embrace of classroom sex instruction programs in Catholic schools by the American bishops. This chapter tells the story of that tragedy, and the man who played the leading role in bringing it about, Father James T. McHugh (now Bishop).

What Was Lost

Before describing how Father James T. McHugh became the grand architect of classroom “sex education” in Catholic schools in the United States, it may be helpful to reflect for a moment on the vision of Catholic marriage and family life that the American hierarchy upheld and defended up until the late 1950s.

From the time of the First Provincial Council of Baltimore (1829), the American bishops performed exceedingly well in their public defense of Catholic marriage and family life. Immigrant Catholic families, sheltered in their ethnic ghettos, initially resisted the worst excesses of American secularism under the protection of their Ordinary and their pastors, together with the support of these ethnic parishes and various Catholic services and charities.

The following clear and precise quotations reflect the candor and courage which the American hierarchy once displayed in their pastoral letters and declarations, variously on the sanctity of married life, on education of youth, and on rejection of vices which attack the very heart of the Catholic home, most especially: divorce, pornography, and birth control, and later, “sex education,” sterilization, abortion and population control. These quotes also reflect the true concern that our Catholic bishops once expressed collectively for not only the Catholic families, and especially the children entrusted to their care, but for the Common Good (the *bonum commune*).

Yes! the characteristics of the child, as St. John Chrysostom well observes, are the characteristic of the saint...God has made you the guardians of those children to lead them to His service on earth, that they might become saints in Heaven. “What will it avail them to gain the whole world if they lose their souls?”... Woe to him that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were tied around his neck, and that he were drowned in the depths of the sea?

[Pastoral Letter to the Laity, 17 October 1829] (12)

We deplore the enormous scandal of some who, having already contracted marriage, enter into new engagements during the lifetime of their lawful consorts.

[On Divorce, Pastoral Letter, 1843] (13)

...[I]t is the idealism of the truest and most practical sort that sees in marriage the divinely appointed plan for cooperating with the Creator in perpetuating the race...Where such ideals prevail, the fulfillment of marital duties occasions no hardship. Neither is there any consideration for the fraudulent prudence that would improve upon nature by defeating its obvious purpose, and would purify life by defiling its source.

[On Onanism, Pastoral Letter, 26 September 1919](14)

The destruction or serious impairment of home life has brought about a selfish, and inhuman propaganda of birth prevention.... May our Catholic families courageously and with firm trust in God reject the modern paganism, and seek the priceless riches of large, happy, and blessed families!

[Undermining the Home: Pastoral Letter, 25 April 1933] (15)

We voice a grave warning against the propaganda of so-called planned parenthood, which violates the moral law, robs the family of its nobility and

high social purpose, and weakens the physical and moral fiber of the nation. [*Neopagan Views on Marriage, The Essentials of a Good Peace, National Catholic Welfare Council Statement, 11 November 1943*] (16)

Fathers and mothers have a natural competence to instruct their children with regard to sex. False modesty should not deter them from doing their duty in this regard....We protest in the strongest possible terms against the introduction of sex instruction into the schools to be of benefit. Such instruction must be far broader than the imparting of information, and must be given individually.It [sex] can be fully and properly appreciated only within a religious and moral context. If treated otherwise, the child will see it apart from the controlling purpose of his life, which is service to God.

[*The Child: Citizen of Two Worlds, Catholic Bishops of the United States, 17 November 1950*] (17)

United States Catholics believe that the promotion of artificial birth prevention is a morally, humanly, psychologically and politically disastrous approach to the population problem....They will not, however, support any public assistance, either at home or abroad, to promote artificial birth prevention, abortion, or sterilization whether through direct aid or by means of international organizations.

[*Explosion or Backfire?, 19 November 1959*] (18)

The above quotations cover a span of over 130 years. They are representative of a well-defined pattern or paradigm of thought and behavior in the sexual sphere held in common by Catholics in America, lay, clerical and religious, until the late 1950s. Readers will want to take note that on the specific issue of classroom sex instruction, the position of the American hierarchy could be summed up in one word: NO!

The Paradigm Shift at the U.S. Catholic Conference

Tragically, in less than one decade, traditional Catholic beliefs and practices related to marriage and family life would undergo a paradigm shift that would so distort and transform the Catholic moral landscape in America to the extent that it would become difficult to believe that one was talking about the very same institution, the Catholic Church in the United States! Nowhere was this paradigm shift more in evidence in the mid-1960s than in the offices of the newly reorganized National Conference of Catholic Bishops and its civil entity, the United States Catholic Conference in Washington, DC (19), particularly, the USCC's Family Life Office under the directorship (some say dictatorship) of Father James T. McHugh, soon to become the "American Church's" master draftsman and point man for Catholic "sex education."

McHugh: His Early Years In the Newark Archdiocese

James Thomas McHugh was born in Orange, NJ on January 3, 1932, the only son of James T. and Caroline McHugh. He was a product of Catholic education from grade school to high school, and received his A.B. from Seton Hall University and his seminary training at Immaculate Conception Seminary in Darlington, New Jersey.

On May 25, 1957, at the age of twenty-five, McHugh was unfortunate enough to be ordained in the Archdiocese of Newark, which by then had become an important Modernist conclave under Archbishop Thomas A. Boland. McHugh served as assistant pastor at two area parishes for nine years, but there does not appear to be any evidence that he had ever been a pastor. His main interests appeared to lie outside the realm of ordinary parish life. Father McHugh's links with the Anti-Life Movement were established early in his clerical career. In 1962 he was appointed to the Newark Archdiocesan Family Life Apostolate which pioneered sex instruction in Newark's parochial schools. The Apostolate's peculiar "Family Life" orientation was made manifest when it co-sponsored a sexology workshop with the humanist-based Educational Foundation for Human Sexuality of Montclair State College (NJ) on June 17, 1970. At the workshop, Dr. Alan Guttmacher, President of Planned Parenthood, called for the repeal of anti-abortion laws, and three SIECUS directors, Frederick Margolis, Wardell Pomeroy and Ira Reiss, were honored for their contributions to the "science" of sexology. (20) In the early 1970s when sex initiation programs were getting a foothold in Catholic schools throughout the state, McHugh's superior, Archbishop Boland, lent his approval to the controversial *Fox Life Education Program* for Catholic grade school children, notorious for its preoccupation with masturbation and explicit sexual descriptions and clinical terminology. (21)

When Archbishop Boland resigned in 1974, his replacement, Archbishop Peter Leo Gerety, continued the assault on childhood innocence and purity of Catholic school children. Gerety took the lead in getting the New Jersey bishops to approve the state's mandatory sex education program for public schools (Kindergarten through 12th grade). Later, Gerety tried to justify his actions under the guise of "providing for the common good!" He also signed a Pastoral Letter mandating that all New Jersey parochial schools comply with the State's sex education mandate! One true pastor, Father Paul Wickens, and a handful of parochial teachers who protested the triple violence against the child, the family, and God's ordinances, as revealed through the Natural Law and the magisterial teachings of Holy Mother Church, were quickly sent packing.

In 1965, Father McHugh, transferred to Catholic University of America in Washington, DC from Fordham University in New York City, to continue his graduate studies in sociology. At Catholic University, he came under the academic tutelage and influence of priest-dissenter, Father Charles Curran, whom McHugh later came to view as a mentor. When McHugh became Director of the Family Life Division of the NCCB/USCC, he would promote a number of Curran's anti-magisterial opinions and writings on contraception, abortion and artificial human reproduction.

Alliance With Anti-Life Axis

Father McHugh was appointed to the post of National Director of the NCCB/USCC's Family Life Division in 1967. The office had been created by the American bishops in 1931 to promote marriage preparation and family life (Cana and Pre-Cana Courses). Tragically, by the time Father McHugh had completed his stint with the Family Life Division in 1975, there was precious little left of "Family" and even less of "Life."

McHugh's appointment was made with the approval of the NCCB/USCC President, Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit, together with the active support of another ambitious, rising young prelate, Bishop Joseph Louis Bernardin of Atlanta, the first General Secretary of the NCCB/USCC. Neither the liberal Cardinal Dearden, who was known to be in favor of a change in the Church's prohibition of contraception, nor the theologically *avant garde* Bishop Bernardin, appeared to have any difficulty with Father McHugh's use of the Family Life Division to promote the interests of the SIECUS-AASEC-Planned Parenthood axis.

Claire Chambers, author of the classic sexology exposé, *The SIECUS Circle*, states that in 1967 (the same year he became Family Life Director), McHugh claimed to have helped found AASEC. He also claimed to have collaborated with SIECUS founder, Lester Kirkendall, in drafting AASEC's policy statement. (22) Whether this is the full truth or mere braggadocio on the part of McHugh, AASEC records clearly identify the young priest as a member of the Advisory Committee of AASEC. This same Family Life Director also actively participated in AASEC's 1969 Annual Convention sponsored by the Ortho and Emko Companies, manufacturers of contraceptive foam.

McHugh regularly used the Family Life Office to promote and defend the anti-family, anti-life views of SIECUS, which he favorably described in one of his 1970 diocesan syndicated column appropriately called "The Ties That Bind," as "a private, non-profit organization which supplies information and materials to encourage the development of sex education in local communities." (23) McHugh reserved his criticism for the opponents of SIECUS and classroom sex instruction whom he linked to "ultra-conservative pressure groups." (24)

Nor did McHugh attempt to hide his pro-contraceptive views. For example, one week before Pope Paul VI issued *Humanae Vitae*, Father McHugh openly stated his belief that "responsible parenthood, in its ultimate understanding," required the use of contraceptives in any pre-marital intercourse to insure that the act be absolutely non-productive. Later he qualified his remark by stating that providing contraception to a young girl "means we've failed that girl." (25) McHugh made these statements at a Rockefeller Foundation-funded Conference on "Sex Education, Family Planning, and Family Life Counseling in the Medical School Curriculum" held at Creighton University School of Medicine from July 17-18, 1968.

At that same conference, Franklin Brayer, M.D., Director of Georgetown University Hospital's Center of Population Research, stated his concern about the American bishops' reticence in incorporating a sex instruction program into the parochial school curriculum. According to Brayer, him and Father McHugh were concerned that, for some unknown reason, the hierarchy seemed unable to bring themselves to recognize that parochial schools are a natural teaching mechanism for classroom sex instruction. (26)

Brayer's statement supports this writer's contention that it was Father McHugh, in cooperation with certain NCCB/USCC leaders and bureaucrats, and not the American hierarchy *per se*, that brought sex initiation programs into Catholic schools and Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (CCD) classes. This popular post-Vatican II Modernist practice of seeking hierarchial and/or papal approval after-the-fact proved very effective in the case of "sex education" and continues to be of great use to the "American Church" in other areas including so-called "liturgical reform."

"No Fault" Divorce

On the related family-life issue of divorce, McHugh's Family Life Bureau did nothing to impede so-called "no-fault" divorce legislation from sailing through a number of State legislatures in the early 1970s with no serious opposition from either the NCCB/USCC or the respective states' Catholic Conferences.

According to pro-family attorney Marion Walsh, writing in his *Christian Political Action Newsletter* in the Spring of 1973, when the NCCB/USCC and the Omaha Archdiocese failed to alert the public to the dangerous implications of "no-fault" divorce, he and other Catholic laymen were forced to do their job for them. Walsh and other Catholic laymen paid high-dollar for an anti-"no-fault" ad run in the secular press as a paid political announcement. (27) Unfortunately, these eleventh hour efforts failed to stop the mounting attack on marriage and family life in Nebraska and many other states that would shortly follow its lead.

Keeping Bad Company

Certainly, Father McHugh never lacked for clerical and lay company at his Family Life Office, most of it, bad company! His closest collaborators, who helped design sex education guidelines and programs for Catholic schools, were, like McHugh, members of the AASEC-SIECUS-Planned Parenthood Alliance described in my introduction.

Some of McHugh's more notorious fellow-travelers, who came through the revolving door of his Washington, DC Family Life Office during the late 1960s and early 1970s, were Rev. Walter Imbierski, Father John L. Thomas, S.J., Gerald T. Guerinet, M.D., Fr. Robert C. Baumiller and Father George Hagmaier, C.S.P.

- **Rev. Walter Imbierski** was a major player (at the USCC Family Life Division) in the development of the new "sexual catechetics" that replaced traditional doctrinal catechetics in Catholic schools during the late 1960s. He also was instrumental in undermining the Catholic Church's teachings on marriage and family life from his own Chicago Diocesan Cana office by exploiting weakness already present in the early Cana and Pre-Cana Movement. (28)

Father Imbierski's interest in promoting the philosophy and practice of contraception ("family planning"), and sex initiation programs for Catholic school children as well as adults, led him to accept a position on the Board of Director of SIECUS while simultaneously serving on McHugh's Family Life Advisory Board.

In June 1969, at the request of Father McHugh, Imbierski became a member of the Family Life Division's Task Force on Sex Education, which was used primarily for the evaluation and future planning of "sex education" programs for Catholic school children. His noxious *Becoming a Person Program* was promoted by McHugh and quickly spread like a plague to Family Life offices in Catholic dioceses from coast to coast. (29)

Second and third generation BAPP clones, including the Benziger Family Life Program (BFLP), are currently in widespread use in Catholic elementary and secondary schools. (30) Bishop McHugh was, and continues to be, a private consultant on sex education programs for the Benziger Publishing House.

Like a number of Cana priests, Father Imbierski got carried away by his own errors, left the priesthood and the Church, and entered into civil marriage with his secretary, Miss Frances Marzec, a co-author of the *BAPP*.

- **Father John L. Thomas, S.J.**, also a member of SIECUS' Board of Directors, was another familiar face at McHugh's Family Life Office. In 1960, Thomas participated in the Family Life Forum of the Sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth that endorsed universal "family life education, including sex education." (31) Four years later, he gained further distinction in anti-life circles by delivering a keynote address at Planned Parenthood-World Population's Annual Convention in Dallas, Texas, where he publicly challenged the Catholic Church's condemnation of contraception. (32)

That same year, 1964, Thomas was busy lining up several dozen theologian dissenters in the United States and Europe to put pressure on the Vatican to accept "The Pill." In the Summer of 1968, one week before *Humanae Vitae* was issued, Thomas erroneously predicted that the Catholic Church would approve of medically acceptable birth control methods other than sterilization, a point of view with which the young McHugh agreed. (33)

Thomas was on chummy terms with Searle Pharmaceuticals, the chief manufacturer of "The Pill," who awarded Thomas a grant so that the priest could disprove (unsuccessfully) the abortifacient action of "The Pill." Personal correspondence held by this writer indicates that as late as 1977, McHugh was also denying the abortifacient qualities of both "The Pill" and the intrauterine device (IUD).

As McHugh prided himself on having a first name relationship with PP-SIECUS officer Mary Calderone (she called him "Jimmy"); so also was Father Thomas proud of his close relationship with Planned Parenthood's President, Dr. Alan Guttmacher, an international celebrity in the world-wide campaign to legalize abortion, euthanasia and population control.

Given Father Thomas' anti-life connections and pronouncements, it caused no small degree of consternation to the Pro-Life Movement when McHugh featured the priest-dissenter's views in his national *Respect Life Program 1978-1979*. In his monograph, *The Family in a Pluralistic Society*, Thomas, identified by McHugh simply as "a prominent sociologist from Georgetown University," does his best to subtly undermine *Humanae Vitae*. (34)

- **Gerald T. Guerinot, M.D.** served on the SIECUS inspired and controlled AASEC Training and Standards Committee, while simultaneously being Chairman of the Committee on Sex Education for the Diocese of Rochester, NY. Like Imborski, Guerinot was a member of McHugh's celebrated Task Force on Sex Education which congregated at the Family Life Office in the late 1960s to develop sex curriculums and plot their strategies.

Dr. Guerinot's Rochester Committee designed the original *Education In Love* syllabus later picked up and published by Paulist Press. This vile sex instruction program featured SIECUS sensitivity training techniques, explicit sexual materials for co-ed classes and a Modernist "theology" based on the heretical Dutch Catechism. Its bizarre bibliography promoted the works of numerous anti-life writers. Like Imborski's *Becoming A Person Program, Education In Love* received official approbation from McHugh's Family Life Division. (35).

- **Fr. Robert C. Baumiller**, a geneticist at the Kennedy Institute for the Study of Human Reproduction and Bioethics at Georgetown University, was and has continued to be a close colleague of McHugh, who likewise is an advisor to the Kennedy Institute.

In 1972, Baumiller made national headlines as a faculty advisor to a group of Georgetown University medical students who published a 46-page sex manual endorsing homosexuality and pushing contraception. (36) Baumiller later raised more clerical and lay eyebrows (but not Father McHugh's) when he claimed that it is acceptable to use a donor who is not the husband, in artificial insemination. This position, of course, contradicts the teachings of the Catholic Church that prohibits human artificial insemination without exception, and holds the particular procedure approved by Baumiller to be adultery.

Again, like Father McHugh, Baumiller was compromised early in his clerical career by the National Foundation/March of Dimes (NF/MOD), the nation's number one promoter of eugenic abortion. (37) Operating initially under a generous grant from the March of Dimes, Baumiller continues to conduct eugenics-based "Clergy Counseling" sessions for naive clerics and hospital chaplains around the country.

The common eugenics bond shared by Baumiller and McHugh is relevant to the sex education issue because all SIECUS-type sexuality programs contain a eugenics component. First they promote birth control that separates sex from procreation. Then they advocate the divorcement of procreation from sex, leaving the door ajar for human artificial reproduction including artificial insemination and *in vitro* fertilization. Second, these programs introduce youth to eugenic prenatal diagnostic techniques in connection with women's other "reproductive options" such as contraception, sterilization, and abortion.

- **Father George Hagmaier, C.S.P.** was a member of SIECUS and a consulting editor to *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality*, a monthly journal for physicians, saturated with SIECUS propaganda. Father John L. Thomas was also a contributing author to this same publication. (38) In 1968, Hagmaier shared the podium with SIECUS Board member David Mace at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations. This organization, founded in 1939, has been dominated by SIECUS executives since the mid-1960s. (39)

In the February 25, 1970, issue of *National Catholic Reporter*, Hagmaier, speaking in his capacity as the Associate Director of the Paulist Institute for Religious Research, claimed that there are no longer moral absolutes against masturbation, fornication or homosexual acts.

We [i.e. Hagmaier and other young theologians] have re-examined the meaning of sexuality and we have found that sexual experience goes far beyond the mere physical and reproductive interchange and that sexuality can also serve all kinds of basic needs and therefore the evaluation of behavior in this area has to be different... therefore, using your homosexual question, there are individuals who as far as we know today, are not going to be able to relate heterosexually and therefore we have to devise a set of moral principles that will make them care, trust, love... (40)

As noted earlier, the Paulist Press produced *Education in Love* based on the original Rochester Diocesan sex education program.

Fr. Hagmaier committed suicide in 1971.

McHugh Promotes Interfaith Statement on Sex Education

Having briefly examined the biographies of some of McHugh's more nefarious associates, let us now return to the "scene of the crime," and retrace (step-by-step), those actions and events at the U.S. Catholic Conference and McHugh's Family Life Office, which contributed to the undermining and eventual demise of the American bishops' stand against so-called sex education.

One of McHugh's first official acts to promote sex education programs in Catholic schools was to endorse an "Interfaith Statement on Sex Education," in June 1968, in cooperation with the Rev. William Genne of the Family Life Office of the National Council of Churches and Rabbi Mordecai Brill of the Committee on the Family of the Synagogue Council of America. (41) Need I mention that Genne, a vocal SIECUS pro-abortion and a member of the Association for Voluntary Sterilization (42) and Brill, who served as an AASEC convention workshop leader, (43) both traveled in the same anti-life circles as Father McHugh?

The "Interfaith Statement" contained such pearls of wisdom as "It [sex education] must stress the many points of harmony between moral values and beliefs about what is right and wrong that are held in common by the major religions on the one hand and generally accepted legal, social, psychological, medical, and other values held in common by service professions and society generally," (44) and "It [sex education] should teach that sexual intercourse within marriage offers the greatest possibility for personal fulfillment and social growth." (45) The Brill-Genne-McHugh "Interfaith Statement" endorsed a fully integrated sex education program throughout the entire school curriculum, Kindergarten through 12th grade.

That same summer, and again in 1969, the Family Life Office held a series of Sex Education Workshops at Catholic University of America. Most of the 200 participants being groomed to fill the ranks of AASEC/SIECUS cadres were teachers and administrators from Catholic schools.

Sex Education: From Prohibition to Obligation

However, before releasing its own set of official “sex education” directives and guidelines to the superintendents of Catholic schools, the USCC needed to bring the American hierarchy more fully into line with the McHugh initiative. The need was especially acute since this initiative clearly clashed with the still intact magisterial prohibition against classroom sex instruction found in Pope Pius XI’s encyclical on *Christian Education of Youth* and the Holy Office’s subsequent affirmation of the ban. There was also the little matter of the bishops’ own 1950 statement *opposing* all such programs. Finally, it is important to remember that the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and its civil arm, the U.S. Catholic Conference, are non-canonical, non-judicial bodies. The documents they issue carry no weight of their own save that of the consent given to them by individual bishops. But not to worry! Within six months of the signing of the “Interfaith Statement on Sex Education,” McHugh and Company would manage to overcome these “trivial” obstacles!

On November 15, 1968, the American bishops issued their Pastoral, *Human Life In Our Day*. This document turned the Church’s traditional prohibition against “sex-education” on its head. That which was strictly prohibited as a violation of the Natural Law and the teaching Magisterium of the Church, had, as if by an act of magic, become “a grave obligation.” (46) Addressing the issue of classroom sex instruction, the document claimed that due in part to “the new circumstances of modern culture and communications,” it had become necessary to assist families in this area by providing “systematic” provisions for such instruction for parochial and CCD students. (47) In truth, the only “new circumstances” were a disintegration and collapse of hierarchial spine!

The pertinent paragraph from *Human Life in Our Day* reads as follows:

61. In accord with the Decree on Christian Education of Vatican Council II, we affirm the value and necessity of wisely planned education of children in human sexuality. We are under a grave obligation, in part arising from the new circumstances of modern culture and communications, to assist the family in its efforts to provide such training. This obligation can be met either by systematic provisions of such education in the diocesan school curriculum or the inauguration of acceptable education programs under other diocesan auspices, including the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. (48)

In order to retroactively justify their radical departure from the Church’s prohibition against classroom sex instruction, the drafters of this pastoral document appealed to ambiguously written documents from Vatican Council II, in this case, the Council Fathers’ *Declaration on Christian Education*, which contains but one solitary reference to the education of youth in sexual matters. (49)

Sex Education: The Big Push Is On

In April, 1969, the USCC Family Life Office, acting in unison with the already heavily infiltrated and discredited National Catholic Education Association (NCEA), sent to all superintendents of Catholic schools, a copy of *Guidelines for the Formation of a Program of Education in Human Sexuality*. This mailing was followed by a brief survey to diocesan superintendents to assess which sex education programs, if any, were already in place. Results from 116 dioceses showed that 19 of them had already added sex initiation programs to their parochial school curriculums. The two most frequently mentioned were Imborski’s *Becoming A Person Program* and the Rochester Diocese’s *Education In Love Program*. Both carried McHugh’s

personal imprimatur. As a result of the USCC/NCEA prodding and the American bishops' apparent sanction of classroom "sex education," 54 dioceses reported that they would be implementing such programs within one to two years. (50)

In 1969, the Family Life Office, again with NCEA cooperation, published an 86-page booklet *Sex Education: A Guide for Teachers*, edited by Father McHugh. This SIECUS inspired "Guide" consisted of a series of six articles on various aspects of human sexuality, a set of guidelines for the formation of "sex education" programs in parochial schools, and a bibliography of books and multi-media materials. Here are some of the highlights of the "Guide."

The opening article, "Sex Education of Children and Adults," was written by William Zeller M.D., Director of Psychiatric Education at the Institute of Living, an exclusive sanatorium favored by many American bishops for the treatment of pedophile (actually mostly homosexual) priests. The Zeller contribution is your basic Freudian bird's-eye view of the psycho-sexual and gender development of a child from birth to adolescence to adulthood. Of course, my fellow writer Professor S. L. Varnado of the University of Alabama, wrote (and I agree) that he had never met a Freudian child (if one ever existed) "who is a little sexual psychopath who falls in love with his mother and yearns to do away with his father." (51) But, undoubtedly, universal sex instruction beginning at the level of the playpen will bring an abrupt end to any remaining natural vestiges of childhood innocence in sexual matters and further stimulate the premature sexual seduction of children.

Zeller's dialogue on child development is purely secular and heavily weighted on the side of youthful judgement. Young people are identified as possessing positive qualities of self-discipline, integrity and unselfishness. Parents, however, are characterized in less attractive terms such as being confused, fearful, and unsure. Obviously they need to share their burden with those professional child seducers who have "studied sex behavior and customs intensively." (52)

Editor McHugh permits Zeller to push both SIECUS and AASEC:

Within the past few years, a number of national organizations have done pioneering work in this field [sex research]. Among these organizations would be the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States [SIECUS], the American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors [AASEC], and the Interfaith Commission on Marriage and Family.... The philosophy set up by these modern sex educators has been widely circulated, but the gist of the message bears repeating: "...sex is not a problem to be controlled but a great force to be utilized; not a relationship to be played at by children, but an intense and vital excursion, admission to which must be earned by some degree of maturity." (53)

Not only does Zeller suggest that Catholic teachers build bridges to two of the nation's most influential pro-abortion and pro-homosexual organizations, but he also pushes their "realistic and humanistic philosophy with regard to sex and sex education." After correctly identifying this "philosophy" as "situation ethics" or the "new morality," Zeller suggests that this "new code" which has been consistently condemned by the Church, enjoys some "merit" including "respect for human relationships and to some extent upholds the sanctity of the family." (54) Zeller holds out for the "evolution of ever more enlightened attitudes toward sex and society." (55)

In another McHugh approved article, "Sex Education and Psychological Readiness," Rev. John A. Meyer states that the idea of parental competency in the area of sex instruction of their offspring has been largely a myth. Parents are incapable of handling this task alone and require support from schools and teachers, he charges. "This must be the overpowering conviction [of teachers], no matter what sort of negative reactions might be encountered [from

parents] in attempting to implement a total program of education in human sexuality," Meyer warns. (56)

In his own contribution to the "sex education" dialogue, "Conscience Formation and Moral Values," McHugh quotes from the works of well-known dissenters from *Humanae Vitae* and proponents of "situation ethics," including Rev. Richard McCormick, S. J., Rev. Bernard Haring and Mary Perkins Ryan. Father McHugh's bibliography includes one of Father Charles Curran's many early controversial anti-magisterial articles, "The Christian Conscience Today." (57) It is both instructive and interesting to note that Father McHugh rarely, if ever, talks in terms of "moral absolutes," preferring the more subjective and personalistic term: "values."

The "Guide's" recommended reading list includes *Your Child's Sex Life* by Father Imbiorski and Valerie Dillon. The latter is a frequent contributor to McHugh's *Respect Life Program*, and *Learning to Love* by Father Marc Oraison, a French priest whose public views on homosexuality were scandalous enough to elicit Rome's censure. (58) In terms of visual aids, seventy-five percent of the films recommended in this "Guide" for use in Catholic schools are SIECUS-recommended films. One such film is "The Game," that depicts a teenage boy's seduction of a young virgin. The sharing of his exploits with his peers, brings forth crude sexual references to the hymen and to coitus. (59)

The Family Life Office/NCEA 35-page companion booklet, *Sex Education: A Guide for Parents and Educators* is only slightly less innocuous in beating to death traditional Catholic sexual morality. Its bibliography is very similar to that found in *Sex Education: A Guide for Teachers* reviewed above. Part II of this smaller guide describes a model diocesan program of sex instruction for parents similar to that developed by SIECUS and AASEC. The obvious presumption that parents have even the least modicum of knowledge about sex is not in evidence. Parents, according to this supplemental text, need to be provided with "accurate and up-to-date information" on the theological, medical and psychological aspects of human sexuality. (60) They need to be made "comfortable with their sexuality" through the use of "group facilitators" and "sensitivity-training" experts. (61) Lastly, they need to be told how the parochial school, in which their children are enrolled, plans to educate their children, sexually speaking, for the next 8 to 12 years or so. To demonstrate that even sex can be made boring through bureaucracy, these program calls for a small coordinating committee, a program director, and discussion group leaders who will designate, plan, "sell," enlist, evaluate, utilize, supervise, elicit and lead the various sexual encounter groups. (62)

Part of the rationale given to parents for the inclusion of sex instruction in schools is that such instruction is "a basic prerequisite for effective family planning. An understanding of human sexuality is essential to understand methods of controlling conception and their effectiveness." (63) There is no reference to *Humanae Vitae* even though these guidelines were published well after the encyclical was released.

As I reviewed these early attempts to mainstream SIECUS-type sexual conditioning programs into parochial schools across the nation, I was reminded of the brilliant quip of Father William Smith, formerly of St. Joseph's Seminary at Dunwoodie, NY, in a later document on classroom sex instruction guidelines produced by the Catholic bishops of New Jersey in 1983: "If you held your breath between mentions of virtue in these guidelines, you'd die." (64)

The Ruin of Souls

So-called sex education, however, is no laughing matter! It is a moral disaster for *everyone* it touches, most especially, children. In the words of well-known psychiatrist and sex education critic, Dr. Melvin Anshell, M.D., such programs are "far from comical; they are tragic!" (65) According to Anshell, classroom sex education programs are responsible for the decimation of youthful consciences and the production of affectionless robots capable of "engaging in all sex acts with indifference and without guilt--the characteristics of pimps and

prostitutes.” (66) These programs are anti-child, anti-educational, anti-family, anti-civilized and anti-human, Anchell insists. (67)

From a strictly spiritual perspective, the French writer, Claude Tresmontant, states in his treatise on bad catechetics, that it might be more merciful to simply drop a bomb on the children since the latter results in mere “physical destruction” or “physical death” while the former results in “interior and spiritual destruction” and “annihilation.” (68)

As Tresmontant observed, “One can massacre children by a bombardment, but one can also slowly depress them, demean them, degrade them, turn them from their finality, and that under the influence of the ambivalent milieu, of the teaching one gives them, of the vision of the world one proposes to them. Along these lines one can degenerate children.” (69)

Drinking From Other Poisoned Wells

While Father McHugh was busy overseeing the planned destruction of the moral and spiritual life of Catholic children through the medium of public sex instruction in Catholic schools along the lines described by Anchell and Tresmontant, other poisoned wells were being opened up at the U.S. Catholic Conference within earshot of McHugh’s Family Life Office.

In March 1968, the National Council of Catholic Women (NCCW), whose national office was housed in the NCCB/USCC building, published an article by E. James Lieberman, M.D., titled “How Not to Teach Children About Sex.” The article was later reprinted and given wide distribution by SIECUS.

Lieberman, a long-time foe of the U.S. Coalition for Life, was a one-man anti-life institution. He was a Director of SIECUS, a member of the Population Crisis Committee, and a leader of National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws’ Medical Committee (NARAL). Lieberman eventually opened a chain of the nation’s most lucrative abortion mills. In Lieberman’s own words, “It (abortion) is an enhancement of life, and it supports the rights of every child to be reared by someone who cares... no one has the right to impose his religious views on anyone else...No child should be compelled to enter the lives of unwilling parents, much less the corridors of understaffed, over-crowded institutions.” (70)

As if the action of NCCW in giving Lieberman an entree into the nation’s Catholic homes was not despicable enough, on May 26, 1968, the National Association of Catholic Men (NACM), invited SIECUS co-founder, Dr. Mary Calderone, to make a radio guest appearance on The Catholic Hour. Calderone, a Quaker, was interviewed as an expert in the field of “sex education.” She warned her Catholic listeners against standing in the way of the school’s and the Church’s efforts to guide children toward “a mature, responsible, creative sexuality.” (71) Catholic Hour listeners were not told of Calderone’s former position as National Medical Director of Planned Parenthood-World Population, which at the time of her appearance, was into feticide in a big way.

The promotion of two of the nation’s most infamous anti-life organizations by two of the nation’s most powerful Catholic lay organizations could not have taken place without at least the tacit approval of Father McHugh who enjoyed a close relationship with both the NACM and the NCCW.

The appearance of Calderone and Lieberman under Catholic auspices coincided with an intense media campaign by SIECUS to promote classroom sex instruction in public and parochial schools. On October 16, 1969, The National Committee for Responsible Family Life and Sex Education, a SIECUS front, ran an expensive pro-sex education advertisement in *The New York Times* which carried the names of a number of Catholic sponsors including Father Charles E. Curran, Reverend Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., and Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh. (72)

This SIECUS ad was part of a larger national campaign conducted by the viciously anti-Catholic Hugh Moore Fund. The Fund’s Campaign to Check the Population Explosion also

ran ads in *The New York Times* that declared: "Pope Denounces Birth Control As Millions Starve!" and "Population Explosion Nullifies Foreign Aid." (73) The Hugh Moore ads were signed by an influential assortment of Rockefeller clones including Eugene R. Black (World Bank), Frank W. Abrams (Standard Oil of NJ), George Champion (Chase Manhattan Bank), Marriner S. Eccles (Federal Reserve Board), Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick (Riverside Church, NY), Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senator from Alaska, Jonas Salk, M.D. (The Salk Institute), Albert B. Sabin, M.D. (Cincinnati College of Medicine), Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, John Rock, M.D. (Harvard Medical School), The Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherril (World Council of Churches), Dr. Louis Dupre (Georgetown University), and Dr. William V. D'Antonio (University of Notre Dame). (74) A number of these individuals will make a later appearance on the pages of these chronicles.

McHugh Supports Artificial Reproduction

By the early 1970s, Father McHugh's spheres of influence as an "authority" on family life and population control had spread far beyond the mere confines of his Washington, DC office. His views on classroom sex instruction, divorce, artificial insemination, *in vitro* fertilization, abortion, "family planning," and population control were introduced into formal Congressional hearing records. His opinions were eagerly sought out by the religious and secular press. His weekly column on family life, "The Ties That Bind," had become a staple of diocesan newspapers across the nation. Not unexpectedly, McHugh's views and opinions (expressed as a representative of the NCCB/USCC) more often than not clashed with the teaching Magisterium of the Church.

For example, in his syndicated column of July 10, 1969, which appeared in *The Catholic Standard and Times* of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, McHugh defends a variety of experimental human reproductive procedures prohibited by the Roman Catholic Church, including *in vitro* fertilization. In a brilliant piece of "newspeak," McHugh commented favorably in his column on a June 13, 1969 *Life* magazine article, "Challenge to the Miracle of Life," by *Life* science editor Albert Rosenfeld:

According to the *Life* article, scientists are now seriously experimenting with new ways to initiate the reproductive process that would not require the act of conjugal love between husband and wife. There is the possibility of implanting the male sperm within the woman medically, and there is the possibility of removing an already fertilized ovum from one woman and implanting it in another, a process that has so far only been tested in animals.....Many scientists are convinced that we will also discover how to join sperm and ovum outside the woman's body, thereby initiating the life process in a test tube. Then there is the possibility wherein the female egg, without fertilization by the male sperm, doubles its supply of chromosomes, thereby fertilizing itself. Since this is not uncommon in lower forms of life, scientists conjecture that we will discover the key to initiating the chromosome duplication, perhaps by use of electric shock, some special X-ray process, or the laser beam. (75)

It's still a matter of guesswork as to how successful scientists will be, but if only a few of their theories work out, we will have more control of the life process than we are presently prepared to accept. (76)

As a *devoté* of "scientific sex" in the classroom, McHugh had little difficulty in supporting scientific sex in the laboratory. He urged his Catholic readers to open their minds to such possibilities.

The important point to grasp at the onset is that such speculations are not an insult to God nor a denial of His creative plan. There is no reason why God's power to summon man into existence must be limited to the reproductive process as we know it now. Indeed, there is no reason to presume that the Divine plan does not go far beyond our present scientific speculation and encompass evolutionary breakthroughs that are even beyond our imagination. (77)

Actually, as McHugh must have been aware, these "speculations" were by 1969 realities. We know, for example, that during the late 1940s, medical researchers like John Rock, M.D., the future "Father of the Pill," were conducting lethal *in vitro* experiments using tiny human embryos, deliberately conceived and then retrieved from the wombs of women scheduled for a hysterectomy. (78)

McHugh Waves White Flag of Surrender At Federal Birth Control Hearings

On August 7, 1970 Father McHugh, testified on behalf of the NCCB/USCC on the Federal Government's first, multi-billion dollar Five-Year Plan for domestic population control programs, (Title X of the Public Health Service Act), then before the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. (79) His presentation was *pro forma*.

McHugh was well aware, although it was not public knowledge at the time, that the question of any meaningful, organized opposition by the American hierarchy to government birth control programs had already been rendered moot. The NCCB/USCC, with the cooperation of John Cardinal Patrick Cody of the Archdiocese of Chicago and sundry other equally culpable U.S. bishops, had already cut an under-the-table deal with the Birth Control Establishment five years earlier. (80)

In 1968, the American hierarchy had quietly permitted Title X (Programs Relating To Population Growth (Sec. 291 of the Foreign Assistance Act) to be signed into law, following carefully orchestrated marathon hearings held by the Subcommittee on Foreign Expenditures of the U.S. Senate, chaired by population control zealot, Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska. (81) This last time around, however, the American bishops, acting through the NCCB/USCC bureaucracy, selected a different but equally deadly strategy, one that remains to this very day.

The essence of McHugh's message to the House Subcommittee, considering Title X domestic population control programs, was that the American bishops were willing to let the measure pass providing it contained an anti-abortion amendment. McHugh drafted this mischievous amendment himself and recruited Congressman John Dingell (D, MI) to offer it on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives as an amendment to the Family Planning Services and Population Research Bill.

McHugh's original wording of the Dingell Amendment, as it came to be called, was that no funds shall be used (under Title X) for "abortion as a method of contraception." It was later modified to read, for "abortion as a method of family planning." In the end, this regulatory (not prohibitory) language not only proved to be worthless in stopping government agencies from promoting and funding abortion, but proved to be positively dangerous to the long-term interests of pre-born children.

First, it should be clearly understood that the Dingell Amendment was only a "qualified" anti-abortion amendment; that is, it did not absolutely prohibit abortion but only "abortion as a method of family planning." It did not exclude well-known abortifacients such as "The Pill,"

Norplant, or the IUD. It did not exclude abortion for reasons of "health," rape, incest, or "eugenic indication."

Second, the Dingell Amendment did not prohibit the use of Title X funds to research and develop new chemical or surgical means of abortion under the euphemism "population research."

Third, and most importantly, this entire federal population control program would be administered (and policed) by the Anti-Life Establishment itself.

The well-known pro-life researcher, Joseph J. Giedraitis of Tucson, Arizona, who reviewed thousands of pages of Title X Government Accounting Office audits, has shown that, while the Dingell Amendment was theoretically designed to exclude payments for abortion-on-demand, as well as all abortion related activities such as counseling and referral, Congressional intent was routinely subverted by birth control agencies (with the connivance of Federal officials charged with implementing the Government's "family planning" programs and policies). The result was that Title X funds were used to foster abortion programmatically by ignoring abuses, and fiscally, by countenancing inadequate reporting and accounting practices. In private communications sent to this writer, Giedraitis documented how the Dingell Amendment could be circumvented merely by having the grantee stipulate that abortion was not used "as a method of family planning" but as a "health procedure" to address a condition of the patient or of the fetus (eugenic consideration). Thus, while the Dingell Amendment is, in theory, an anti-abortion amendment, in practice it has proven to be an "Abortion on Demand" Amendment!!!

Further, Giedraitis' investigation proved that federal "family planning" funds, and private funds from foundations and corporations that were earmarked for abortion and abortion-related activities and propaganda, were held in common. This routine commingling of funds made it impossible to distinguish funds for audit purposes.

Certainly, if these problems arose with domestic population control funding, one can well imagine the futility of attempting to monitor foreign programs administered by the Agency for International Development (USAID) for multi-layered international anti-life programs of the United Nations and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

It is also important to point out that having adopted an "anti-abortion amendment only" strategy, the NCCB/USCC never assigned one of its many attorneys to regularly monitor Title X programs and grants to insure that the Dingell Amendment was being vigorously enforced. Instead, this task fell by default to pro-life groups like the U.S. Coalition for Life and pro-life individuals like Giedraitis.

An important aside to McHugh's formal, rather staid testimony before the House Subcommittee, was his impassioned impromptu statement to the Committee members on the necessity of universal sex instruction: "I would like to make clear that one of the concerns of the Family Life Bureau, and an important personal concern to me, one which has required a great deal of effort over the past 2 to 3 years, is the whole question of sex education, from birth to maturity." (82)

McHugh concludes with his hope that programs of sex instruction would give another generation of Americans "... a positive attitude toward their own sexuality and considerably more information about it than most of us were benefited with as we passed from adolescence to adulthood. I think this is a priority." (83)

Anti-Life Flood Gate Opened

On November 20, 1970, three months after Msgr. McHugh's disastrous testimony, the NCCB/USCC released a two sentence statement titled "Birth Control Laws."

Sec. 1. We are strongly opposed to involvement of the federal or state governments in the area of population control or family planning.

Sec. 2. There are always inherent risks to human freedom, danger of invading human rights and too great a danger of assuming that family planning will solve all the problems of poverty, racism, and social injustice by this oversimplified expediency. (84)

Case closed!

Thus it was that the American bishops, who had the power to stop passage of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act (which had little Congressional support), permitted the measure to be signed into law. At that very moment, the Federal Government's war against life began in earnest. The anti-life apparatus was assembled and installed. Planned Parenthood's own Dr. Louis Hellman was immediately appointed Director for the new Office of Population Affairs within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). Hundreds of millions of tax dollars flowed into Hellman's "Stop The Stork" anti-baby campaign and then out into the coffers of the nation's Anti-Life Establishment. Various Rockefeller-controlled enterprises such as Planned Parenthood, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and The Population Council moved some of their personnel and agents of influence into Hellman's new population control center at HEW, the National Institute of Health (read Death), and the Agency for International Development (USAID) with the Department of State. The small window of opportunity that had briefly opened for the Pro-Life Movement to stem the bloody tide of abortion in the United States was closed and nailed shut! Meanwhile, at McHugh's NCCB/USCC Family Life Office it was business as usual!

McHugh Testifies Before Rockefeller Commission

On April 14, 1971, Father McHugh testified again on behalf of the NCCB/USCC before John D. Rockefeller III's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The Commission was proposed by President Richard M. Nixon in a presidential message on population on July 18, 1969, and officially established by an act of Congress on March 16, 1970. (85)

Following his formal testimony which consisted of a selection of post-Vatican II statements on family policies, population control and abortion, McHugh was asked a number of pointed questions by various Commission members.

On the matter of birth control, McHugh stated:

Within the framework of present Catholic teaching, the use of rhythm is the most widely acceptable moral means of birth control. I think it would take a great a great deal more time than we have here to go into the refinements of the use of our economical types of contraceptives in specific instances and for specific purposes. (86)

On the issue of research into new methods of birth control McHugh stated that he entertained the possibility that "...[A]ny number of new chemical methods of contraception could be discovered or could be presently under research that would be morally acceptable with Roman Catholic teaching." (87)

Later, Planned Parenthood's Charlie Westoff quizzed McHugh on his (McHugh's) well-known advocacy of universal sex education. Westoff, smelling fresh blood, was anxious to get

on the public record whether this Catholic school-based sex instruction would include instruction in "family planning" concepts and methods. McHugh obliged him.

First, McHugh admitted that the issue of sex education had been a more volatile subject than birth control and abortion for him. Nevertheless, he reiterated his belief that sex education "... must begin in the first grade and continue until the child completes his formal education...I believe a factual presentation of different methods of conception control might very well be part of a sex education program." (88) Of course, this position is contrary to Church teaching which holds that general group instruction to minors in sinful behavior, (information and instruction on contraceptive/abortifacient use) is immoral and pedagogically prohibited.

Another Commission member, Bernard Berelson from Rockefeller's Population Council, then quizzed McHugh extensively on the issue of abortion--specifically when does human life begin. McHugh told Berelson, "...[T]here seems to be considerable, both scientific and legal evidence, that the child from the moment of conception has rights which should be protected." McHugh then qualified this statement with another one that appeared to open the door to early anti-nidation abortifacients. "There is not a universal understanding as to the precise moment that life begins, but again, if in terms of both the genetic and biological data conception certainly is thought to be no later than implantation. So if you are going to take that (implantation) as your starting point then the law has to protect the individual human being embryo from that point (implantation) on," McHugh stated. (89)

McHugh Advances His Clerical and Professional Career

Far from being unceremoniously removed from his post as National Family Life Director by the American bishops for his promotion of the AASEC/SIECUS/ Planned Parenthood agenda, and his erroneous public statements which contradicted and served to undermine traditional Church teachings on sexual morality and the Natural Law, McHugh used his position at the NCCB/USCC as a stepping stone up the Catholic Church's bureaucratic and ecclesiastical ladder.

In 1972, Father McHugh was elevated to the rank of Monsignor and appointed a Papal Chamberlain by Pope Paul VI. That same year, his duties at the NCCB/USCC were expanded to include overlapping responsibilities as both Family Life Director (1967-75) and the Director of the new Bishops' Office of Pro-Life Activities (1972-1978).

It might be comforting to think that Msgr. McHugh's departure for Rome in 1978 to pursue advanced studies in moral theology and ethics, signaled the end of the AASEC-SIECUS-Planned Parenthood Axis's stranglehold on the NCCB/USCC. It did not! McHugh's responsibilities as the "American Church's" point man in pushing sexual catechetics in Catholic schools was simply transferred (albeit temporarily) to another NCCB/USCC veteran bureaucrat with anti-life credentials, as good, if not better, than his predecessor!

The Dolesh Debacle

Dr. Daniel Dolesh, like McHugh, was a member of AASEC. He also belonged to several other pro-abortion, pro-homosexual groups including the National Forum for Sex Education and the Metropolitan Sex Education Coalition, a Planned Parenthood front organization based in Washington, DC. (90) In the late 1970s, Dolesh had been instrumental in formulating important Family Life policies and projects for the U.S. Catholic Conference. With McHugh away in Rome, the mantle of leadership fell to Dolesh who was selected to Chair the USCC Department of Education's new National Committee for Human Sexuality.

In 1981, Dolesh's National Committee for Human Sexuality issued a revised set of USCC "sex education guidelines" for Catholic schools titled, *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians*. Never formally debated or approved by the American bishops or the NCCB-USCC's Administrative Committee, the document was released under the auspices of the USCC's Department of Education with only a few cosmetic changes.

For example, Dolesh's Committee was forced to add a footnote on original sin to the document! (91) This awkwardly positioned and obvious last minute addition to the original text had been a small concession to orthodoxy demanded by a few concerned bishops, who nevertheless permitted these horrendous "guidelines" to pass relatively unmolested, which is more than can be said for the young children exposed to them.

The Dolesh "guidelines" charge teachers in Catholic schools to provide a complete and systematic education in sex for all their students, including formal instruction on all major aberrations of sexual development: "... psycho-sexual changes, psycho-sexual deviations such as homosexuality, transvestism, pedophilia, incest, natural and artificial family planning... myths of masturbation... different sexual lifestyles... and physical and emotional responses in intercourse." (92)

Planned Parenthood-World Population (PP-WP) was thrilled with the *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians*, especially the document's admonition that Catholics should make no attempt to block public school sex instruction, nor should Catholics attempt to establish alternative programs which might risk isolating the Catholic community. So thrilled in fact, that PP-WP even provided their readers with the USCC's Washington address from which the guidelines could be ordered. (93) Soon after these highly controversial "guidelines" were issued, Dolesh, the USCC's expert on Family Life, became embroiled in a domestic battle of his own, separated from his family, and moved to Cleveland to begin life anew as a sex therapist.

In February 6, 1986, *The Plain Dealer* ran an article by Diane Carmen entitled, "The Love Doctors; Sex Therapy in Cleveland," featuring Dolesh, and his new business partner, Sheryl Lynn Lehman, described as "Jewish, divorced, and has two children." (94) The two co-hosted a radio call-in-show called "Sexline," where on a least one occasion Dolesh had justified bestiality. Mercifully, the talk show has been discontinued. Naturally, the Carmen interview included a reference to Dolesh, as a former U.S. Catholic Conference employee who had "helped in the development of guidelines for sex education programs in Catholic schools across the country," i.e. *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians*. (95)

In typical bureaucratic fashion, the United States Catholic Conference, which being a civic corporation has no Catholic conscience *per se*, managed to ride out the Dolesh scandal. The USCC, incredible as it may seem, also managed to keep Dolesh's *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians* on the market for ten years until it was replaced by yet another set of "sex education guidelines," titled *Human Sexuality: A Catholic Perspective and Lifelong Learning*. These most current USCC "guidelines" were developed by still another stacked NCCB/USCC Sex Education Committee and were released in November 1990. The USCC unsuccessfully tried to keep its Sex Education Committee's membership secret! However, it was a foregone conclusion that Bishop James T. McHugh was a member of this "secret" group of lay and clerical "sexperts," as indeed proved to be the case. (96)

McHugh Influences Vatican Documents

While on sabbatical in Rome, Msgr. McHugh served as a special assistant at the World Synod of Bishops on "The Christian Family in the Contemporary World" (1980). In 1983, he was invited by the Vatican to help formulate Pope John Paul II's "Charter on the Rights of the Family." He also participated in the drafting of "Educational Orientations on Human Love," (poorly translated by the USCC's Office of Publications as "Educational Guidance in Human Love"), a mischievous document on sexual instruction for

Catholics, including school children, released by the Vatican's Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education on December 1, 1983. (97)

Bishop McHugh continues to be the American bishops' and the Vatican's expert on "sex education." In January 1996, Bishop McHugh was among the specially invited guests to an important meeting on the issue held by the Vatican's Pontifical Council for the Family in Rome. This meeting was held for the purpose of putting a correct public relations spin to the Council's recent disastrous document: "The Truth and Meaning of Human Sexuality: Guidelines for Education Within the Family." In an interview with Catholic News Service (CNS) following this Rome meeting, Bishop McHugh, said that despite claims to the contrary, the new document is not meant to remove sex education from the classroom. "The Cardinal (Alfonso Cardinal Lopez Trujillo, President of the Council) went out of his way to say that the document does not say there is no role for sex education in schools," Bishop McHugh insisted. (98) Cardinal Trujillo did not publicly contradict McHugh's interpretation of the Pontifical Council for the Family's document.

Clearly, after thirty years of advocating and promoting universal "sex education," which the former President of Planned Parenthood, Dr. Alan Guttmacher, had identified on the eve of the Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* decision, as the cornerstone of abortion rights, (99) Bishop McHugh has not changed his mind on the matter. The destruction of souls of Catholic children exposed to systematic sexual conditioning in parochial and public schools and CCD classes will continue unabated, Bishop McHugh, the high priest of "sex education" assures us. A fact that appears to matter not one whit to the Holy See.

References

1. Charlotte Wolff, *Mangus Hirschfeld*, Quartet Books, London, 1986, pp. 263-270.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 270.
3. Pope Pius XI, *Encyclical Letter on Christian Education of Youth*, December 31, 1929, Daughters of St. Paul, Boston, MA, p. 36.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
5. "Decree of the Holy Office on Sex Education," *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 22-49, March 21, 1931.
6. *Ibid.*
7. James Thurber, E.B. White, *Is Sex Necessary?*, Harper and Row, NY, 1929.
8. Barbara Morris, "None Shall Escape It -- Sex Education for the World," *The Barbara M. Morris Report*, May 1973, Vol. 4, No. 3., p. 2.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
10. Melvin Anchell, "Sex Education - a Tragi-comedy," *HJI Reports*, Vol. 10, No. 7, July 1992, p. 1.
11. Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
12. "Pastoral Letter to the Laity, October 17, 1829," *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, Vol. I, 1792-1940, Hugh J. Nolan, Editor, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Conference, Washington, DC, 1984, pp. 38-40.
13. *Ibid.*, "Pastoral Letter, 1843," p. 145.
14. *Ibid.*, "Pastoral Letter, September 26, 1919," p. 310.
15. *Ibid.*, "Pastoral Letter, April 25, 1993," page 384.
16. "The Essentials of a Good Peace," November 11, 1943, *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, Vol. II, 1941-1961, Hugh J. Nolan, Editor, National Conference of Catholic Bishops, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, DC, 1984, p. 47.
17. *Ibid.*, "The Child, Citizen of Two Worlds," November 17, 1950, pp. 101-102.
18. *Ibid.*, "Explosion or Backfire," November 19, 1959, p. 222.
19. The National Catholic Welfare Conference with an Administrative Board was formed in 1919, by America's liberal bishops to increase the Church's influence in the nation's secular social action policies and programs. After the Second Vatican Council it became known as the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. The United States Catholic Conference is a civil entity of the American bishops, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, ostensibly organized to insure "coordination, cooperation, and assistance in the public, educational, and social concerns of the Church at the national and inter-diocesan level." See Publication No. 870, USCC, *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, Vol. III, 1962-1974, for a history of the NCCB/USCC.
20. Claire Chambers [pseudonym], *The SIECUS Circle - A Humanist Revolution*, Western Islands Press, Belmont, MA, 1977, pp. 307, 363.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 379.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 354.
23. Father James T. McHugh, "Dioceses Accepting Sex Education Idea," USCC Family Life Division, Washington, DC, 1970.
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Proceedings (Edited) of The Creighton Conference on Sex Education, Family Planning, and Family Life Counseling in the Medical School Curriculum*, July 17-18, 1968. Supported by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, pp. 99, 112.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 83.
27. "No Fault Divorce," *Christian Political Action Newsletter*, May-June 1973, Christian Political Action Movement, Omaha, NE, p. 2.
28. According to Dr. Herbert Ratner, famed editor of *Child and Family*, the flourishing Cana Movement of the 1940s and early 1950s contained, from the beginning, the seeds of its own destruction. There is an old saying that "a small error in the begin-

- ning becomes a big error in the end." This "small error" Dr. Ratner states was "the dissociation of conjugal love from the sense in which procreation and education of children was central (and essential) to the natural institution of marriage. What resulted was inevitable. The engaged couples picked up the error, which served their secular desires though not their needs, errors which seemed to have the Church's stamp of approval of secular attitudes and values." (Personal correspondence with author.)
29. See James Likoudis, *Fashioning Persons for a New Age*, Catholics United for the Faith, New Rochelle, NY, 1971.
 30. See *A Catholic Analysis of Benziger's Family Life Program on Sex Education*, Human Life International, MD, 1993. (Note: Carl Rogers' seminal text on sensitivity training and subjective morality, published in 1961, was titled *On Becoming a Person*.)
 31. Chambers, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
 32. Personal correspondence of Herbert Ratner, M.D., to author.
 33. *Ibid.*
 34. John L. Thomas, "The Family in a Pluralistic Society," *Respect Life Program 1978-1979*, Committee for Pro-Life Activities, NCCB, Washington, DC, p. 6.
 35. Chambers, *op. cit.*, pp. 383-388.
 36. *Ibid.*, p. 362.
 37. See U.S. Coalition for Life, *Who Will Defend Michael?* (1976) and *A March of Dimes Primer--The A to Z of Eugenic Killing* (1983) available from the USCL, Box 315, Export, PA 15632.
 38. Chambers, *op. cit.* p. 225.
 39. *Ibid.*, p. 263.
 40. Father George Hagmaier, C.S.P., "Sexual Mores Changing," *National Catholic Reporter*, Feb. 25, 1970, p. 1.
 41. For a detailed report on the "Interfaith Statement on Sex Education," see Randy Engel, *A Critique of the UCC Sex Education Guidelines*, The Wanderer Press, St. Paul, MN, 1981, pp. 21-23.
 42. Chambers, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 108, 239, 260.
 43. *Ibid.*, p. 260.
 44. U.S. Catholic Conference, National Council of Churches, the Synagogue Council of America, "Interfaith Statement on Sex Education," Washington, DC and NY, June 1968.
 45. *Ibid.*
 46. National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Human Life in Our Day*, November 15, 1968, *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, Vol. III, 1962-1974, Hugh J. Nolan, Editor, NCCB/USCC, Washington, DC, 1984, p. 175.
 47. *Ibid.*
 48. *Ibid.*
 49. For an in-depth commentary on *Declaration on Christian Education* promulgated by Pope Paul VI on October 28, 1965, see Randy Engel, *Sex Education: The Final Plague*, Tan Publishers, Rockford, IL, 1991, pp. 75-79.
 50. McHugh, *op. cit.*, 1970.
 51. L. Varnado, "Too Many 'Sex Experts' Teaching the Subject," *National Catholic Register*, December 7, 1981, p. 1.
 52. William Zeller, M.D., "Sex Education of Children and Adults," *Sex Education - A Guide for Teachers*, Rev. James T. McHugh, Editor, USCC Family Life Division, Washington, DC, 1969, p. 16.
 53. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
 54. *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.
 55. *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.
 56. Rev. John A. Meyer, "Sex Education and Psychological Readiness," *Sex Education: A Guide for Teachers*, Rev. James T. McHugh, Editor, USCC Family Life Division, Washington, DC, 1969, p. 30.
 57. Rev. James T. McHugh, "Conscience Formation and Moral Values," *Sex Education--A Guide for Teachers*, USCC Family Life Division, Washington, DC, 1969, pp. 57-58.
 58. Chambers, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 221.
60. USCC Family Life Division, *Sex Education - A Guide for Parents and Educators*, USCC/NCEA, Washington, DC, 1969, p. 22.
61. *Ibid.*
62. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
63. *Ibid.* p. 24.
64. James Renton, "Priests Suspension Arouses Sex Ed Opponents in Newark," *The Wanderer*, St. Paul, MN, April 14, 1983, p. 1.
65. Dr. Melvin Anchell, "Sex Education - a Tragi-comedy," *HLI Reports*, Vol. 10, No.7, July 1992, p. 1.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
68. Msgr. Eugene Kevane, "Catechesis and Sexuality: What the Church Teaches," *Human Sexuality in Our Time*, Daughters of St. Paul, Boston, MA, 1979, p. 207.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 207.
70. James Lieberman, M.D., "Informed Consent for Parenthood," *Abortion and the Unwanted Child*, Carl Reiterman, Editor, Springer Publishers, NY, 1971, pp. 77-93.
71. Engel, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
72. For a complete list of signatories to the SIECUS advertisement published in *The New York Times* see Chambers, *op. cit.*, pp. 430- 433.
73. For a complete set of the Hugh Moore ads see Lawrence Lader, *Breeding Ourselves to Death*, Ballantine Books, Inc., NY, 1971.
74. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-91.
75. John J. Mulloy, "Sex and Scientific Manipulation - Fr. McHugh's Conception of the New Man," *The Wanderer*, February 5, 1970, p. 4.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
77. *Ibid.*
78. U.S. Coalition for Life, *Human Embryo Research Packet*, Export, PA, 1994.
79. See Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, *Family Planning Services Hearings*, August 3, 4, and 7, 1970.
80. See "Cardinal Cody and the Beasley Scandal," Chapter V.
81. William B. Ball, "Population Control: Civil and Constitutional Concerns," *Religion and the Public Order*, editor, Donald A. Grannella, Cornell University Press, NY, 1968, p. 13.
82. Hearings, *op. cit.*, p. 361.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 361.
84. "Birth Control Laws," November 20, 1970, *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, Vol. III, 1962-1974, Hugh J. Noland, Editor, 1983, Washington, DC, p. 272.
85. Randy Engel, *A Pro-Life Report on Population Growth and the American Future*, Pennsylvanians for Human Life, Pittsburgh, PA, 1972, p. iii.
86. *Commission on Population Growth and the American Future*, Transcript of Proceedings - Public Hearing, April 14, 1971, Washington, DC, p. 145.
87. *Ibid.*, p. 146.
88. *Ibid.*, p. 149-150.
89. *Ibid.*, p. 152-153.
90. Engel, *op. cit.*, *The Final Plague*, p. 75.
91. USCC Department of Education, *Education in Human Sexuality for Christians*, Washington, DC, 1981, p. 10.
92. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-87.
93. "Catholic Bishops Publish Sex Education Guidelines," *Planned Parenthood Washington Memo*, July 17, 1981, p. 4.
94. Engel, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-106.
95. *Ibid.*
96. Letter from Bishop William C. Newman, Chairman of the Task Force for the Revision of the Guidelines on Human Sexuality, to author, dated April 17, 1989. Bishop William revealed the names of the bishops serving on the Task Force after one year of calls into his Baltimore Catholic Center Office. However, he refused to give a complete list of all members of the Task Force stating: "Since this document on the human sexuality guidelines will be approved by the bishops and be their document,

we do not think it appropriate to publish the names of the laity, religious and clergy who were a resource to the Task Force." The author later obtained a complete list of members of the Task Force from a private source.

97. See Engel, *Sex Education-The Final Plague*, Chapter III, for a detailed explanation of *Educational Guidance in*

Human Love and the role played by Msgr. McHugh in drafting the document.

98. CNS Release, "Sex Education Is The Focus of Vatican Text," *The Catholic Light*, Diocese of Scranton, PA, Feb. 15, 1996, p. 2.

99. Alan Guttmacher, "Abortion Battle," *Washington Star-News*, May 3, 1973, p. 14.

Purchase

The McHugh Chronicles

\$15.00 + S&H

Web:

<http://uscl.info/index.php?pr=Publications>

By Mail:

New Engel Publishing

Box 356

Export, PA 15632

Phone: 724-327-7379