

Have you read the new Ontario Sex Ed curriculum? It discusses anal sex with 12-year-olds

250 upvotes | 25 February, 2015 | by SgtBrutalisk

The curriculum is comprised of two documents, one for grades 1-8 and another for grades 9-12 (links below). There is a *lot* of material in these two documents, roughly 500 pages. Much of it is quite innocent - how to properly dress for summer, how to do physical activity safely etc. However, scattered throughout are some parts that seem to be picked straight from a gender studies feminist manifesto. I've skimmed through the entire thing and took screenshots:

[Yes means yes.](#)

[Don't be heterosexist.](#)

[Don't be ableist.](#)

[Generate outrage through social media to achieve change in society.](#)

[Drunk person can't give consent & Anything other than enthusiastic consent means no.](#)

[Definition of "normal" is arbitrary & Introducing non-binary gender identity.](#)

[Children are shown pictures of genitalia, this is first grade material.](#)

[Fat acceptance & Challenging stereotypes \(heteronormative of course\).](#)

[Teaching non-binary gender identity & Talking about gays, lesbians and bisexuals.](#)

[Violence against boys does not exist.](#)

[Uneven balance of power makes a dangerous relationship.](#)

[Ask for consent at every stage of sex.](#)

And finally, so you don't think I was trolling you in the title:

[Discussing anal sex with students, this is 7th grade material.](#)

[Another lesson about the anal sex, again 7th grade.](#)

Since TRP is about sexual environment for men, I thought this was relevant enough to post here. Whole new generation of boys and girls will be taught material that was up until yesterday reserved for shock sites. What I noticed by reading the curriculum is fixation on consent and safety. Also, teachers are supposed to say that "normal" means nothing, but then turn around and say that feeling anxiety or having mental illness is normal. The idea is clear - it is about redefining what normal is. Instead of children being allowed to be pure and innocent, the school will teach them what sodomy is.

The curriculum also teaches children to challenge everyone who questions these feminist values. This is a very powerful tactic that prevents parents from reversing feminist indoctrination. For example, your daughter comes home from school, where she was just taught what masturbation is and what a penis and vulva look like. When you comment that someone is "nuts", she will interject and say that mental illness is not laughable and may report you to the teacher for discrimination (kids are advised to speak with a "trusted adult" when they experience such situations, which most likely means teacher or the police).

Just like in *1984*, kids will be the most powerful surveillance tool of the government.

The article says that this curriculum was stopped 5 years ago by a "vocal minority", probably a handful of sane people.

Yesterday, we laughed at "woodkin asexual fluidgender transdragon entity" tumblrina. Tomorrow, this

will be taught in schools. The future is here, gentlemen.

The link to the news article is [here](#). However, since the article contains embedded documents which may not display properly in an Archive Today link, here are direct download links to the curriculum: [Part 1](#) and [Part 2](#). Download them and see for yourself.

Bonus content for the observant: the reporter, Ashley Csanady, [put one picture as her profile picture but looks 50 pounds heavier in the video](#). It's like she wants to toe the feminist agenda but realizes that being skinny is more attractive and gives advantages.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

vandaalen • 29 points • 25 February, 2015 11:38 AM

Just like in 1984, kids will be the most powerful surveillance tool of the government.

An Iranian friend told me, that after the islamic revolution, teachers would bring an opium-pipe to school, show it to the children and ask: "Who knows something similar like this from home?"

The parents of the children who affirmed, would get visited by the revolutionary guards very soon afterwards.

RedPillJohnny • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 04:07 PM

The police visits to schools for "drug education" in North America achieve a similar purpose although I am sure that they are not looking for parents who use drugs...yet anyway.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 02:20 PM

I'm fairly certain that if questioning children without counsel present was used as probably cause for searching a parent's home, it would fail to stand up when challenged in court due to it being unconstitutional (not that that means a lot these days).

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

tyranus89 • 64 points • 25 February, 2015 04:38 AM

Agreed, most of the stuff highlighted, when in context, was okay. Mentioning that anal sex exists to 12-year olds (7th-graders) is NOTHING new to them. Explaining to them that anal sex is not risk-free is just smart, *because* they know what it is, but don't know much else besides what they see in porn. "Derp, porn stars do it and you can't get pregnant so that's what we should do!" Kids are dumb, and that's why sex ed exists.

However, as my other post explains, the brainwashing shit can stay the fuck out.

Brainwashing vs. education: the manipulation of opinion rather than enlightening of fact.

Example: "Anal sex still carries some risk." -- education "Anal sex is horrible and is rape." -- brainwashing

What pisses me off most is that the school board is forcing the teachers to get this response from the students before they move on with the lesson. **I'm not ripping on all teachers, as some of my friends are definitely some good, RP educators...** But I know a lot more BP educators that will follow this shit to a tee and wait until every kid in the room has this pounded into their subconscious. Furthermore, there are those teachers who may disagree with what's being taught but a) just teach for the pay check, or b) are afraid of speaking up -- and rightly so.

cock_pussy_up • 12 points • 25 February, 2015 11:26 AM

I agree with this. Any 12 year old with internet access can watch "the world's biggest no-condom anal creampie gangbang" online, and is probably already watching this or some video like it.

SgtBrutalisk[S] comment score below threshold • -21 points • 25 February, 2015 12:11 PM

Should the school be teaching them what the world's biggest non-condom creampie gangbang is?? You are boggling my mind. Education is the basis of success. Teach kids something wholesome.

WillyWehrmacht • 14 points • 25 February, 2015 01:37 PM

Should the school be teaching them what the world's biggest non-condom creampie gangbang is??

He never said that. His point was; if theres already kids out there who are watching those things it might be better to teach them that anal sex without a condom is risky.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:05 PM

My point eludes you. The school should teach children virtues that will set them for life. If the "wear condom during anal" is the best it can do, then that's really pathetic.

cock_pussy_up • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 04:07 PM

The point is, kids are already getting informal sex education through the porn or other faucets of the entertainment industry. Porn (and music, mainstream movies, TV, romance novels, etc.) depict risky sexual activities as enjoyable but doesn't provide any information about the real life risks.

Kids will find the porn on their own. The schools' job is to tell kids the truth, which is that anal sex (or vaginal and oral sex) can give them diseases. The porn isn't going to tell them that.

LaV-Man • 13 points • 25 February, 2015 02:55 PM

I love the line "anything other than enthusiastic consent means no". Conversation, guy - "Hey baby lets make love", girl - "OK", guy "Can you say it a little more enthusiastically?" girl - "You're into some weird shit aren't you?"

anonlmouse • 6 points • 25 February, 2015 07:58 AM

And the thing is, they might have 90% of the idea, but get something wrong, I think possibly because they're getting trolled. It's funny to tell someone the truth mostly and change one detail deliberately, have them do a cursory fact check and see it seems right and then go on believing something is wrong. *Good* sex ed could actually help that, but I've seen the results of *bad* sex ed as well. I had a 9th grader who thought "rape" and "fuck" were interchangeable, likely because of the feminist everything is rape mentality that gets taught now.

RPthrowaway123 • 10 points • 25 February, 2015 04:46 AM

Agreed. I think comprehensive and straightforward sex education is important and should be encouraged. I'm much more worried about the SJW BS that could be added.

1003rp • 32 points • 25 February, 2015 12:24 PM*

How in the fuck are transgender people supposed to be considered normal? No one on earth should think that having the delusion of being born in the wrong body is just a normal thing. We shouldn't discriminate against them because they are human beings but for fucks sake it's abnormal. Being gay isn't normal either. I don't understand why sjws think that not hating people who are abnormal should take the leap to everyone being normal. That defeat the entire fucking purpose and definition of what normal is.

singeblanc • 6 points • 25 February, 2015 01:41 PM

So should they also point out that left handed people are abnormal? Or ginger haired people - are they "normal"? Is the white kid at a predominantly black school normal? What if that school is in a predominantly white country?

1003rp • 13 points • 25 February, 2015 01:47 PM

Everyone knows being left handed isn't normal but that doesn't mean there is anything wrong with it. Saying something is wrong with it is another step. It is obnoxious to try and convince people something like transgender or obesity or otherkin or anything like that is normal when it clearly isn't. If you want to take the next step and say it's bad that's another discussion. This teaching is trying to force children to believe it's normal to be trans and that's bullshit. It's abnormal.

singblanccomment score below threshold • -6 points • 25 February, 2015 02:14 PM*

The problem is, who gets to be arbiter of what is normal? If you live in the US, the majority of people are deemed overweight. Does that make being fat normal?

The whole "abnormal" label is actually about differentiating, it's about making an "us" and "them" mentality. And if you've ever worked with kids, you'll know they don't need any help doing that. The reason we encourage them knowing that, for example, homosexuality is normal (1 in 10) is that, unlike hair or skin colour, you can't see it, and historically it's been taboo and hidden, to the detriment of everyone involved.

1003rp • 12 points • 25 February, 2015 02:56 PM

First of all: How is 10% normal? That's rare. Also homosexuality is insanely sensationalized that you think 1 in 10 when cdc states it to be less than 2 in 100.

singblanc • 1 point • 28 February, 2015 12:09 PM

"Normal" isn't a single entity: it's a spectrum. Take height: whilst there are diseases that cause abnormal heights (gigantism and dwarfism), you wouldn't say that someone who is 4'8" isn't a normal person. Unusually short, perhaps, but there is a massive amount of variation in the human species. Even if only 10% of the population are a certain height, it's still normal.

And so with sexuality. We still like to have this Victorian idea that we can pigeon-hole everything, classify the world into black and white, whereas the world is always shades of grey. There's a whole world of sexuality out there, and to state that a woman who likes both men and women is "abnormal", or a man who enjoys being penetrated in the ass - well.

Not the mean average position? Sure. Abnormal? No way.

omg_cats • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 03:47 PM **[recovered]**

Normal is what most people are. It is amoral. Normal things can be good and they can be bad.

singblanc • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 03:02 AM

So, just to be clear: given that over 50% of the US population are deemed to be "overweight", by your definition we should be telling kids that it's normal to be fat?

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 06:44 AM

what if we increase the scale to the whole world?

singblanc • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 01:15 PM

Precisely my point: the definition of "normal" depends a lot on the parameters you chose to set it.

The big thing being missed here is that "normal" isn't a single entity: it's a spectrum. Take height: whilst there are diseases that cause abnormal heights (gigantism and dwarfism), you wouldn't say that someone who is 4'8" isn't a normal person. Unusually short, perhaps, but there is a massive amount of variation in the human species.

And so with sexuality. We still like to have this Victorian idea that we can pigeon-hole everything, classify the world into black and white, whereas the world is always shades of grey. There's a whole world of sexuality out there, and to state that a woman who likes both men and women is "abnormal", or a man who enjoys being penetrated in the ass - well.

Not the mean average position? Sure. Abnormal? No way.

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:24 AM

[permanently deleted]

singeblanc • 4 points • 26 February, 2015 03:05 AM

If life's primary purpose is to procreate I wish you luck in your endeavour to have over a hundred children before you die! How else will you know that you've "won" at life, apart from fulfilling its primary purpose?

It's tiring running from woman to woman knocking them up, but someone's got to do it! Go you!

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

singeblanc • 3 points • 26 February, 2015 12:17 PM

Wow, it's been a while since I heard that old canard! Your idea may well be true... *if* humans weren't a social species. The society, and the related genes of your tribe, have their chances of success increased by non-parent members of that society.

At the extreme end of the spectrum are male bees, drones, that as you say have the sole purpose of procreating. All the other bees, who are responsible for everything else in the hive, don't have some "maladaptive mutation": the desired result is the success of the group.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

singeblanc • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 06:02 PM

Bees are obviously an extreme example, but if you look at other pack animals more closely related to humans you'll see time and again that a) we're not as special as we think we are, and b) the success of the group is more important than the individual. It would be very surprising if, as you say, the only measurement of success in humans is procreation.

Consider canines, from where we borrow our beloved "Alpha" metaphor. In African wild dogs (*Lycaon pictus*) only one female breeds, whilst the others get phantom pregnancies so they can suckle the young (if your domestic dog has ever

had one, now you know why).

For an even more bombastic refutation, I suggest Dawkins' *The Selfish Gene*, where he suggests that the phenotype (us) and our little dance is completely subordinate.

None of this should mean that we can't live well, can't enjoy our time on the planet, but it certainly refutes the idea that a successful life is nothing more than procreating. Hell, most of the biggest losers I know have loads of brats!

[deleted] 26 February, 2015 06:14 PM*

[deleted]

[deleted] 26 February, 2015 06:33 PM

[deleted]

singeblanc • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 06:45 PM

You seem to have accidentally proven my point: having lots of kids isn't a sign of success, if anything it's a marker of how *unsuccessful* you are at managing to raise offspring to adulthood.

By your rationale, the Somalian peasant with ten children is winning at life while the playboy millionaire bachelor in Manhattan is a pathetic loser. If you want to achieve the former, it is readily available to you, son!

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 01:33 PM

By your understanding, would someone in a wheelchair be considered normal or abnormal?

1003rp • 35 points • 25 February, 2015 01:49 PM

Clearly being physically disabled is abnormal. You don't treat people like shit for being abnormal but you don't force kids into believing being disabled is a normal thing just like we shouldn't teach them being obese is normal or thinking you're a cat born in a human body is normal. It's not normal. Teach tolerance of the abnormal all you want but don't try to change the definition of normal to include the abnormal.

TempusRerumImperator • 21 points • 25 February, 2015 02:57 PM

Teach tolerance of the abnormal all you want but don't try to change the definition of normal to include the abnormal.

You win this thread.

[deleted] • -1 points • 25 February, 2015 02:18 PM*

you don't force kids into believing being disabled is a normal thing

Yes and no. Disability is a fluid spectrum and it's normal and expected for most people to be at least temporarily disabled at a certain point in their lives - after accidents, at high age, etc. If you count things like not having 100% eyesight and having to wear glasses as a minor form of disability, then suddenly the majority of the population is more or less disabled and thus the norm in a more vague sense.

I agree with you on obesity and otherkin not being normal, but beyond that, things get more complicated. Think of homosexuality and transgender: It's a proven point that the majority of teenagers are confused about their sexuality during puberty and that most people are able to enjoy homosexual encounters up to a certain degree - read it up in the Kinsey reports from the fifties, way before modern feminism. Similarly it's statistically very common for teenage kids to have their first sexual experience with the same gender - think jacking off simultaneously, girls feeling each others breasts etc.

1003rp • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 03:04 PM

Thank you for this insightful comment. I hadn't really thought about it in this way but I agree normal is fluid and changing over time. Any disability is still abnormal whether or not most people have it because it deviates from what we know to be the normal human condition. I think the concept that no one is normal is important to think about too. Everyone has something about them that makes them abnormal, and knowing that can help you to be a better judge of other people's abnormalities. It doesn't mean I have to like other people's abnormalities and it definitely doesn't mean that we should convince people that any certain abnormality is normal. Being trans is not normal. I don't have to be okay with them being trans. I can even dislike that they are trans if I want. What I can't do is beat them up/kill them/discriminate against them for their abnormalities. I don't understand people who get all worked up about what other people do or think, but I don't want my child being taught trans people are normal because they just fucking aren't.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 03:42 PM

Being trans is not normal. I don't have to be okay with them being trans. I can even dislike that they are trans if I want.

Thanks for your comment. I understand your position and am not going to argue against it. You can teach your child that trans people are abnormal all you want, it's your child and it's your duty to teach them your values. --> Just keep in mind that there's *a tiny chance that your kid might be trans her-/himself* and how they might react to you when coming out sometime after puberty.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 04:13 PM

I get the idea, but there's just no way some SJWs could stand in the way of the pharmaceutical industry and their lobbyist armada. You're forgetting who has the real power in our society...

1003rp • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 04:48 PM

Great point also thank you for that. I know I may have a child who would be trans and that would be very difficult and I hope I am able to handle it accordingly, but I do not believe telling them they are normal is helpful whatsoever, nor is forcing other people to think they are normal. I will have to teach them to be a good person just like any other child, but their trans status will always make them abnormal and must be addressed to help them live with it. If my child had diabetes I wouldn't tell them

diabetes is normal, I would teach them about what normal is and how they are different and what they must do to function with their abnormality in society. I wouldn't tell them diabetes is normal nor would I try to force everyone else to think having diabetes is normal. I hope this example helps you to understand where I'm coming from.

p3ndulum • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 01:43 PM

Is it "normal" for a paraplegic to be in a wheel chair? Sure. Is it "normal" for an elderly woman to be in a wheel chair? Sure. Is it "normal" for your Everyman to be in a wheel chair? Uh, no.

KJL13 • 11 points • 25 February, 2015 01:42 PM

It's abnormal. Something interfered with normal development to put them in that situation or they had an accident.

vengefully_yourcomment score below threshold • -6 points • 25 February, 2015 08:56 PM

Why should you care what they do? My gay friends have been gay their entire lives, they didn't wake up one day and decide they loved the cock. My trans friends are similarly wired differently, they have never felt like they fit. Sure there are probably some attention whores who want to be special, but most just want to be themselves. What the fuck should it matter if 0.1% of the population wants to have the other plumbing installed? The only people who give a shit are religious nuts and closeted people just like those they hate.

The fact of the matter is, people like that exist. People of different races also exist. While it's not "normal" to see a black guy in Copper Harbor Michigan, they can be there. Teaching kids that those people exist, and that they won't make them gay, or want to chop off their dicks by simply existing is a good thing. The hysteria and bigotry against people who don't fit your narrow view is not.

Let go of the religion indoctrination already, those people shouldn't matter to you. Most of them are really good people.

1003rp • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 09:15 PM

I never said there was anything wrong with it. In fact I said we shouldn't discriminate them.

vengefully_yours • -2 points • 25 February, 2015 09:31 PM

Good, then we agree. The problem seems to be with what is "normal" and honestly, that's just your brain trying to make sense of the chaos around us, and alerting us to possible danger. Not much danger in a boy who wants to be a girl, or vice versa.

1003rp • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 09:36 PM

No they aren't dangerous. I know that. I would rather they be portrayed as abnormal to my children though because of how rare trans people actually are. People on the Internet these days likely think a huge portion of people are trans because it's talked about so much when in reality is not all that common at all. I hope that makes sense.

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 09:51 PM

Yeah it does. People get up in arms over it and we aren't even talking a million people worldwide. To say kids shouldn't know is akin to not telling them there are purple cars. Not a good analogy, but they should know people are different, and to just accept that they

are different. Only give a shit if they are dangerous.

Nespos • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 03:11 PM

I think OP suspects that the inclusion of anal sex in the discussion is related to the point about not being heterosexist. I.e., it's there not just because anal sex is an option for straight students, but because it is of particular interest to gay students for whom vaginal intercourse does not apply. The implication then would be that Canada is edging closer to including homosexual intercourse in its sex ed curriculum. Of course I could be misinterpreting OP's argument.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:39 PM

Actually, I put the anal sex in the title to draw more comments and views aka clickbait.

rpscrote • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 03:58 PM

Believe me when I say any 7th grade boy today already knows what anal is.

and if anyone needs proof, play any game w/ voice chat on Xbox Live and find out

monsieurhire2 • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 07:04 PM

Exactly. To pretend otherwise is to condescend. Kids aren't stupid. They have eyes and ears, and they talk to each other. All it takes is one or two kids, and they spread the info like samzidat.

TheIronViking • 44 points • 25 February, 2015 06:03 AM

So if you need to ask for consent at every stage, and sex begins with teasing and foreplay, do you need to ask permission to seduce a woman?

"M'lady, may I endeavor to seduce you?" *tips fedora*

dickholedoug • 45 points • 25 February, 2015 08:07 AM

"Can I kiss you?" "Want me to take your shirt off?" "Would you be OK naked?" "Can I finger you?" "Want to have sex?" "Want to continue to have sex?" "I'm almost done, still want to have sex?"

Saying that consent can't be implied, only verbally stated, is socially retarded.

Cyralea • 12 points • 25 February, 2015 02:32 PM

You haven't seen this video?

It's precisely what a virgin thinks sex must be like.

[deleted] • 9 points • 25 February, 2015 01:45 PM*

Pulls out legal sex contract to prevent rape accusation:

Do you agree to this instance of sexual intercourse?

Yes

thrusts

Do you agree to this instance of sexual intercourse?

Yes

thrusts

Do you agree to this instance of sexual intercourse?

Yes

thrusts

Do you agree to this instance of sexual intercourse?

Yes

thrusts

Do you agree to this instance of sexual intercourse?

Yes

thrusts

TheIronViking • 11 points • 25 February, 2015 02:09 PM

Does this need to be notarized as well?

PeteMullersKeyboard • 6 points • 25 February, 2015 11:52 PM

seducing increases

It's not very effective

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 12:09 PM

"M'lady may I masturbate while thinking about you?"

R_E_D_1 • 46 points • 25 February, 2015 04:30 AM

I can already see the '*Where Have All The Men Gone?*' Huffpo headlines coming 20 years from now.

[deleted] • 14 points • 25 February, 2015 11:45 AM

assuming there will be men willing to support keeping that site online in 20yrs. that's cute.

GayLubeOil • 41 points • 25 February, 2015 09:39 AM

This is exactly the kind of shit that they pulled on my grandparents in Soviet Russia to brainwash them to be Good Communist Youth.

He who controls education controls the future.

House_of_Suns • 0 points • 25 February, 2015 12:15 PM

Education has always been paramount to creating an maintaining the state. Participatory democracy exists because there is an informed electorate.

On a side note, voting should be mandatory, like the Australia - as long as 'none of the above' is one of the choices.

I fail to see the objections to the curriculum, however. What is wrong with teaching kids instead of having them grow up with a warped sense of things from the internet?

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 04:42 PM

Pro-sex bias born of the sexual revolution is crippling our society culturally and socially, that's why many people don't like teaching kids these things; activating children sexually which this sort of program can do leads to underage sex and tarnishes chastity needed for the youth, mostly girls, to maintain strong relationships and a healthy marriage.

Teaching hedonism is bad, erring on the side of asceticism is always better.

Think about why most guys need TRP as a subreddit and it's so revelatory to most; we haven't had male influences like we needed them because women drove them away, these broken families are a direct result of the pro-sex bias and the fault of women who feel entitled to marriage, divorce and children and have arranged the laws and new social mores in their favor.

Stand_Your_Ground_ • 0 points • 2 March, 2015 08:58 AM

Mandatory voting is some of the dumbest shit I have ever heard. Why should some idiot who doesn't give a fuck about the democratic system doesn't even know what each of the parties policies is, be forced to vote?

If you don't care enough to go and vote, you don't deserve a say in your country's future.

I can also guarantee that the useful idiots that otherwise would not have voted, would be more likely to ignorantly vote for more government control as well as communist agendas if they are disguised as free stuff from the government for the poor and underprivileged oppressed etc.

House_of_Suns • 1 point • 2 March, 2015 11:27 AM

Your analysis is absolutely wrong. Look up the Australian model.

Political engagement is much higher with mandatory voting. Doing it electronically would be the next logical step, as it would add convenience.

UsernameIWontRegret • 0 points • 25 February, 2015 02:31 PM

I'm glad I read that last sentence. For a minute I was like "but the Soviets despised sexualization" then I realized you were referring to this crap as a whole.

[deleted] • 25 points • 25 February, 2015 06:29 AM

This was in undoubtly written by a 28 year old "gender studies" or sociology major from some shit liberal arts degree factory.

Give her ramblings the seal of approval from the almighty state, and there you have it: a new curriculum of bullshit and brainwashing.

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 01:21 PM

Who probably never had any interactions with a 12 years old kid. But I feel like nowadays people in the administratif part of the educational system don't frequent kid.

[deleted] • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 02:02 PM

Who probably also never had sex.

TheRedderPill • 34 points • 25 February, 2015 03:03 AM

When I was in 7th grade, you were a god amongst men if you felt a pair of boobs. Now they're shooting for fifth base?????

R_E_D_1 • 43 points • 25 February, 2015 04:32 AM

Free porn, bro. Free porn. It's changed everything. A friend of mine is a principal and told me that it's getting harder and harder for the school nurse to find gag reflexes in junior high girls while examining sore throats. Junior. High.

TheRedderPill • 12 points • 25 February, 2015 04:37 AM

I've only been out of high school for a couple years. From what I was seeing on my way out, I can totally believe it.

curious97 • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 04:39 AM

Pagan sexual practices are coming back in full force, this is nothing surprising. Remember that Roman emperors used to fuck little children all the time and it wasn't seen as a big deal.

TheRedderPill • 11 points • 25 February, 2015 04:48 AM

Oh yeah. I was talking to my gym coach during one of our health exams. He said over 20 girls broke into the girls locker and were worshiping satan and stomping on small animals and making out and stuff.

curious97 • 5 points • 25 February, 2015 04:50 AM

lol i too have heard of this worrying trend of satan-worship in locker rooms

cuntbh • -4 points • 25 February, 2015 10:39 AM

The really worrying thing is that I can believe that this would happen in some areas of the US (I'm looking at you, Bible Belt!)

JajkoDizzy • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 07:57 PM

I'm from the Eastern Europe and what you guys say is so unbelievable. I'm still a young person(18) and when I was in 7th it was very similar. If you had a girlfriend or were hugged by a girl you were considered alpha. There were some "incidents" sure but that's just kids from pathological families. But not only that, almost everything you say about feminism is unthinkable. The gap between Western and Eastern Europe is indeed immense.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:45 PM

I am from EE too and feel blessed for having a basically normal childhood without this kind of femnazi bullshit.

Chewie316 • 12 points • 25 February, 2015 01:02 PM*

Wow you are reaching pretty hard with your link titles.

And if studies are showing that kids are having anal sex at 14 when do you think they should teach them about it 17, 18 or 19 maybe?

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 01:41 PM

Is he really?

Only 10% of grade 7 (12-13 year olds)students will have had anal sex. Clearly, kids should learn about it before 16, but most reasonable people can understand a parents reaction regarding discussing anal sex if 90% of the student body hasnt tried it.

Personally, I think age 12 is about right, but thats just me. Maybe if they boosted it to age 13/14, it would reduce some of the controversy.

Chewie316 • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 09:53 PM

Yes if you read the title of the link OP has created and then read what is stated in the text book to me it is a huge reach!

I get the age thing as well but if 10% are doing it at 12 then I believe that is a good age to start. The entire point is to have the talk before they reach the age where they will have to make the decision. Kind of pointless to warn them after they have done it.

singeblanc • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 02:57 AM

I'm sorry, what percentage of a group should *already be actively engaging* in an activity before you deem it responsible to teach them how to do said activity safely? 30%? 90%? o_O

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 04:46 AM*

I dont have an answer for you really - depends on the act. Personally as I stated above, 12 is about right in regards to anal sex even though its only 10%.

edit also Toronto has a HUGE gay pop, so probably more appropriate here then elsewhere

The issue is what I or what you feel is appropriate, the issue is what the majority of parents feel is appropriate. 5 years ago, the exact same bill was killed as parents rose up against it. This time around the government is forcing it in with no consultation from the public (with the exception of a few handpicked groups that were earlier vetted).

singeblanc • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 12:09 PM

The issue is what I or what you feel is appropriate, the issue is what the majority of parents feel is appropriate.

I respectfully disagree: our policies are already lead far too much by how people "feel" about how the world should be. We live in the information age, where we can use data to our advantage.

With an issue like this you can do trials in various areas, teach some at 10, some at 15, and look at the results. What we feel is irrelevant: what results in increased safety for our children is the only important factor.

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 09:16 PM

You're right about trial balloons and yes about how people feel is taken too much now.

The thing is, we live in a democracy, and a stupid persons vote is worth as much as the smart ones. Also, there are more stupid people than smart people in Canada, so politicians will always be aiming to please the lowest common denominator. Now you know why canada perennially has a brain drain, and why men are leaving the province in particular.

RS73 • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 10:16 PM

I don't know where the fuck 10% of twelve-year-old kids have had anal sex. Maybe in some weird cult commune where kids are told to start fucking at age three. Ten percent seems very high for that age group.

yummyluckycharms • -1 points • 25 February, 2015 11:11 PM

kinsey and other sexologists (basically anyone who studies sex)

RS73 • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 11:16 PM

Kinsey and "anyone who studies sex" has determined that 1 in 10 twelve-year-olds are railing each other in the ass? I don't think so.

yummyluckycharms • -1 points • 26 February, 2015 12:16 AM

Hmmm....cause yes, why would people who study sex care about when people lose their virginity, condom usage, and other behaviour related to sex. You make an excellent point.

RS73 • 2 points • 1 March, 2015 10:21 PM

First of all, if you've got links to multiple valid studies showing that one in ten 12-year-olds are dropping their PS3 controllers and having anal sex, I'd be happy to take a look at them. Secondly, if you're so naive that you believe every study by "people who study sex" then you're going to go through life getting conned quite a bit. Kinsey's methodology was poor and a lot of what he was alleged to have "proved" came from his own oddball personal life and has been debunked.

David35207 • 22 points • 25 February, 2015 06:15 AM

What a crock of shit. It's all "open-minded" until you hit the point where "gender based violence often refers to violence against women and girls." and then it doesn't say anything that women can be the violent party towards males.

FLFTW16 • 9 points • 25 February, 2015 10:47 AM

Yeah, and 40% of the time! Jesus!

liveyourselfhappy • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 01:38 PM

Statistics in Australia show that 30% of all domestic violence is against men. I'm glad the feminists (the equality warriors) have recognised this issue.

David35207 • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 04:56 PM

Leading us into a better future! </3

tyranus89 • 30 points • 25 February, 2015 04:23 AM

It seems like all of the quotes under the "Student:" sections are what the students are "supposed" to say.

And people say that schools don't try to brainwash kids.

I just read an introductory to reactionism that claims our society is Orwellian; I'd never considered that until then, and reading this has now confirmed it.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 12 points • 25 February, 2015 12:08 PM

The teacher is supposed to prolong the lesson until the desired response is achieved. Brainwashing 101.

[deleted] • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 07:35 AM

Kids in 1st grade would be better off having 1984 pushed onto them to read rather than this garbage

rebuildingMyself • 23 points • 25 February, 2015 04:00 AM

Jesus. That's some scary reprogramming.

Zackcid • 19 points • 25 February, 2015 05:52 AM

:(

I shed a tear to the upcoming generation. And *I thought* we had it tough growing up. I wonder if they'll still

allow these kids to read 1984 in English class or if it will be forbidden.

rebuildingMyself • 16 points • 25 February, 2015 06:17 AM

1984 is fine. It's the interpretation that will be hamsterized. If the patriarchy rises again this is what will happen!

[deleted] • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 01:55 PM

1984 is too extreme. It will be more like Fahrenheit 151, where people become willingly stupid and obedient.

RS73 • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 10:01 PM

It will be more like Fahrenheit 151, where people become willingly stupid and obedient.

We're already there. "Question Authority" used to be a popular hippy bumper sticker in the US. To the degree that national politics and culture are now "progressive", the new attitude is "Conform, obey, submit to PC doctrine and don't stand out from the crowd. Get approval from the PC group authority." It's really pretty sad how pussified the culture and men have become.

ECoast_Man • 3 points • 26 February, 2015 03:27 AM

And in addition to this flagrant instance of feminist fucking hogwash - what about the other shit man? Like everything else.

If it was this easy to insert this shit into the curriculum, in how many more subtle ways have feminists succeeded in *completely* feminizing the school system? There are books written on this very topic that the school system is completely feminized, young boys are unable to adapt and end up just getting prescribed X mood stabilizer. I was somewhat skeptical, but I'm buying it now. Christ.

TheRedderPill • 56 points • 25 February, 2015 03:00 AM

OP, I nominate you to receive this months award in Red Pill Investigative Journalism.

The fact it's getting down voted so quick only means you struck a chord with our Smurf skinned friends

Crushric • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 04:35 AM

I second the notion. All in favor say "aye".

[deleted] • 23 points • 25 February, 2015 10:39 AM*

Jews deserve death.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 12:33 PM

Thanks. I am surprised how many blue pillers there are in TRP right now. It seems we will have to migrate off Reddit soon.

trumpill • 11 points • 25 February, 2015 01:50 PM

I would argue that it's pretty blue-pill to be so fucking concerned about what the feminist masses are propagating. They don't apply to you. Being RP means you are living outside of the system, it's why we call it THE RED PILL. The reference is that you are not a part of the matrix anymore, and this does not apply to you.

If you have kids and you are worried about them, it is your job as a father to keep your values in your family. There was never a guarantee in life that your kids will not be exposed to things you don't approve of, and what is being taught in this school is no worse than what they will find on the internet daily.

rp_aware • 16 points • 25 February, 2015 04:13 PM

You can *think* you live outside the system all you want until a need surfaces for you to integrate. Like having kids. And sending them to school.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:47 PM

Yep and the police comes knocking to your door because you don't want to put your kids in elementary school. Oh, that's right, it is mandatory (where I live). Have fun having your kids taken away and forced into school anyway.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:00 PM

Neo came back into the Matrix, didn't he? He could have stayed in the Zion and partied but he went back. Why? Because the danger is much greater than what we think it is. Today it's Ontario, tomorrow it's my local school teaching this bullshit.

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 04:43 PM

[deleted]

SgtBrutalisk[S] • -1 points • 26 February, 2015 11:50 AM

School is de facto parent of children when they are within the school premises (it's called in loco parentis). If teenage girls are getting pregnant while in school, whose fault is it?

[deleted] • 17 points • 25 February, 2015 10:38 AM

Academia is now officially aboard the cultural marxism bandwagon and there are no brakes! Bad title, cause this is far more important than just sexual overexposure of children.

If this goes on quietly for a couple of years, I urge you all to provoke the collapse of the western world. It might be the only way to save us, by burning this shit to the ground before it gets any more pussyfied. At least we will be kings of the ashes.

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 06:11 AM

[deleted]

[deleted] • 6 points • 25 February, 2015 06:41 AM

Hitler or Tony Montana's speech bastardized? lol

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 07:07 AM

[deleted]

SpongeCroft • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 11:32 AM

just used that word yesterday to describe the fuck-up's today's generation lives through. kinda like you're an observer to that huge opera when the next act is going to begin...

yummyluckycharms • 14 points • 25 February, 2015 07:35 AM

Again, further evidence that Toronto is hell for men. The entire curriculum, especially in regards to consent and violence is geared towards, making men and even little boys, appear to be rapists.

That said, I dont think teaching children at age 12 about fudge packing is wrong, as there are tons of gays in ontario, and chances are the kids have 2 daddies already.

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 02:51 PM

[deleted]

yummyluckycharms • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 08:55 PM

LOL - you can keep them. The best girls in the GTA are in the burbs, which tend to be wealthier, less infected by feminism, and club culture. They also tend not to work in the public sector (meaning they have real jobs), and dont try to hang out in financial district bars looking to pick up bay street bi's

[deleted] 26 February, 2015 08:47 AM

[deleted]

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 11:55 AM

U of T is close to bay street, and also close to the church street. Because of the close proximity of all three to each other, its not uncommon to see college girls hanging out in bars looks for bay streeters to buy them drinks. However, this tends to create a humourous situation where these girls will be lingering around the bar, not realizing that their intended target is gay and doesnt give a shit.

To be fair, I wouldn't know that they were gay either if it wasnt for the fact that I'm a regular at some of these joints. That said, its always good for cheap laugh to see the gold diggers strike out.

[deleted] 26 February, 2015 02:12 PM

[deleted]

yummyluckycharms • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 08:52 PM

There are a lot of diversity in Toronto for sure - but each ethnicity as its own enclave, whether that be indians live in Browntown, singhdale, and mississauga, or Chinese and Jews live in Markham.

That said, toronto has an overall veneer of politeness, but underneath that is a strict hierarchy of class and clique society that is exceptionally hard to break into. In LA - you're invited to strangers parties rather easily, and in New york ONS are incredibly easy. Americans are incredibly opening and welcoming people. In Toronto, meeting people is like going for an insane job interview where everyone passes the first round, but then you have to jump through hoops of fire and speak like a politician for even the most casual interaction. In regards to datng, its far worse than that. Mind you, being born here, I've learned the rules the hard way, but there is a reason why toronto was the birthplace of pua

cuntbh • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 10:36 AM

If you do not have sex, you do not have to worry about getting an STI.

Bullshit. Chlamydia can be transferred by skin contact with another person's genitalia- I was told this by a professional nurse, as well as seeing the front page post on /r/TIFU a while ago about a dude who got it from a

stripper.

It would be nice if they didn't have complete bullshit in their curriculum.

[deleted] • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 01:54 PM

Bullshit. Chlamydia can be transferred by skin contact with another person's genitalia

"Skin contact with another person's genitalia" is pretty close to the SJW-approved definition of sex.

[deleted] • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 12:08 PM*

We have basically the exact same thing right now in Germany. Difference is, ours is a guidebook and how much is actually implemented depends on schools & teachers, so it's non-obligatory.

The idea behind it is to educate children about stuff they're talking about, things they hear on tv, things they find on the internet. Most kids hear and use phrases like "deepthroat", "facial", "assrape", "buttplug", "bisexual", "gay faggot" etc. long before they understand them fully. This does only lead to sexual confusion, and some education about this will actually help them understand what's going on, not hurt.

As an example, keep in mind that people like "Conchita Wurst" have reached popstar-fame in Europe and are present within mainstream-media and on daytime-tv. So questions about transgender identity WILL arise and as in other education aspects, parents are often ill equipped to answer them.

Using "gay" as a swearword is obviously hurtful to gay kids - suicide rates amongst homosexual teenagers are much higher than amongst hetero teenagers. School will not stop kids from hurting each other, but it makes some sense to make them understand 1.) what the words mean they're using anyways and 2.) why this can be hurtful to some people.

And yeah, this is about teaching what is normal: But not in a normative way, as in: you're not normal if you don't do xyz; but in a permissive way: It's normal that anyone can do whatever he wants - anal, gay sex, BDSM etc., as long as two people consent in it. This is about not discriminating against those who have other sexual desires and fantasies than you have and about understanding what's going on in your neighborhood.

Compare it with religious education: Even if you *don't* want your kid to grow up as a Christian, it makes a lot of sense to have an institution (at best an unbiased one) teach your kids the contents of Christianity and the meaning of Christian symbols, as they are literally confronted with them everywhere, from video games over movies and mangas and the news up to politics and everyday life.

Edit: Clarity

singeblanc • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 01:59 PM

Thank you for being a voice of reason!

No matter how you *feel* about kids being taught about these things, you can research the results of teaching them or not, and it's pretty striking: teen pregnancy goes down, STIs go down, bullying goes down... One thing we now know doesn't work: sweeping it under the carpet and hoping it'll all work itself out.

Sunlight is the best disinfectant!

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 12:29 PM

Good comment. I think you bring up fair points, but then explain this to me:

We know that female fertility has a limited window, why doesn't this curriculum teach girls about that? How about discussing the realities of marriage, divorce and child custody? None of that happens without sex. This curriculum makes it seem the worst part about sex is getting an STI.

We know that's not true at all. Having consensual, protected sex with someone can absolutely destroy your life further down the line.

Now you can't really say that "children are too young for that!" since we've already gone off the deep end with anal sex.

There is so much more to sex than simply "wrap latex around it, ask for consent and stick it in".

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 08:15 AM

Oh and one more thing: This education program is not fucked up, but what's fucked up is something in our society that created the need that we teach kids about anal before most of them even had their first kiss...

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 06:50 PM

I agree with you that those things should be taught, perhaps not to 12 year olds, as these social dynamics seem a little bit too complicated, but they surely should be discussed with teenagers and undergrads.

Having consensual, protected sex with someone can absolutely destroy your life further down the line.

Yep. I don't have any ideas how you could teach this to 12 year old kids though. Unfortunately there is no definite screening method to detect crazy chicks.

thredditsowaway • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 01:16 PM

You may be interested to know (unless you already do) that the premier of Ontario is a short-haired, openly lesbian woman: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kathleen_Wynne

I've only ever been there a few times, but Toronto is a hotbed of retarded feminist thinking. It makes Sweden look like a pretty normal place. This is another example of a total failure of democracy: just because (a very misled) 50% +1 of the population say they like it, the (sane) rest of the province is going to have to put up with it.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:18 PM

Saw her pic in the associated video. It figures.

omarelbass • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 03:57 AM

First of all, thank you so much OP for reading through and highlighting these important parts. Second of all, I think kids will grow up to be more mature and they won't feel as shy when learning about this as opposed to having to go ask friends to understand (which as well know can be misleading at first).

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 5 points • 25 February, 2015 12:18 PM

You are welcome. It took me around 4 hours to read the material and write the post. I think that this is a desperate attempt by Ontario school system to stay relevant. My issue is that I grew in a school system that taught me things that were completely irrelevant and impractical. I would teach my kid a new thing every day - something that can be actually used.

Hitlers_Boss • 15 points • 25 February, 2015 04:29 AM

Holy crap you cant make this shit up. I guess we can thank the blessed third wave feminism for reminding men that we should commit sepuke on a daily basis or kneel at the feet of women for our "crimes."

[deleted] • 13 points • 25 February, 2015 06:40 AM

no no those aren't *real* feminists though! The real ones don't want that at all! They want equality! --
->Pointing out the insanity of feminism's usual response.

My question is where are these lovely equality-only-seeking crusaders? I don't see them any time some horse-shit law passes.

mykonos_rm • 12 points • 25 February, 2015 04:31 AM

I'm going to chuck this into my "fuck em" box.

Fuck em.

IllimitableMan • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 01:00 PM*

School is a bunch of brainwashing bullshit. If my kid brought this shit home I'd take them out of that school immediately. Home schooling, or get rich enough to go private, lest you sacrifice your child's mind to the SJW neoliberalist brainwashing hivemind.

Edit, relevant: <http://therationalmale.com/2014/12/05/teach-your-children-well/>

RedPillJohnny • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 04:05 PM

Fucking rights. Public school is brainwashing bullshit and only growing more so. Parents have to have some serious balls to raise their kids properly in North America. My hope is that this bullshit will grow to such ridiculousness that it will topple over and crumble to the ground, but we know that that is not going to happen anytime soon.

IllimitableMan • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 06:46 PM

It's not much better in England. The state wants your kid's mind under its influence.

Murgie • 3 points • 26 February, 2015 08:29 PM

First time poster here. Largely just looking around to determine how much of the stereotypical depiction of this sub elsewhere on Reddit is based in reality, how much is grossly exaggerated nonsense, and how much is outright bullshit.

I'm probably not aware of things which would go without saying to a regular, so try and go easy on me, mates. I don't intend to do much more than ask some questions regarding the rational behind given stances, but you know, just point out if I do something wrong, eh?

Children are shown pictures of genitalia, this is first grade material.

Is this really a problem? I mean, I can understand objections to exposing a child of that age to examples of sex and sexuality which are *intended* to be erotic or whatever, but a medical cross section of reproductive organs doesn't seem to carry much in the way of implicit negatives, does it?

I mean, hell, they're going to have one of them attached to them anyway, eh? It's not really much of a secret to them.

Yes means yes.

Errr... Is this one, specifically the highlighted text, *really* something worth objecting to?

Like, I understand if it was only included to help illustrate the overall tone you're getting from the curriculum texts, sometimes I do the same thing when I'm trying to illustrate a point to someone. So if that's the case, just say the word and it's settled.

But if that's *not* the case, what kinds of potential scenarios and situations do you believe this concept comes into play?

Definition of "normal" is arbitrary & Introducing non-binary gender identity.

Is there really anything that's really untrue here, though?

At the end of the day, after all, the inevitable fact of the matter is that social and societal norms just aren't universal concepts. That's what makes different cultures and different time periods, well, *different*.

It's the reason why we don't hold ritualistic Ōllamaliztli games, sacrificing the losing team to Huitzilopochtli and adding their heads to the tzompantli rack beside the court.

Ask anyone on the street, and they'll tell you that's radically abnormal. With good reason, at that.

Ask someone in pre-Columbian Tenochtitlan, and they'll tell you the very opposite.

With that in mind, we can't really conclude that normal means the same thing to everyone, everywhere, all the time, can we?

Don't be ableist.

Eh, it's not really *wrong* here, either. I mean, you're just not going to see your average movie or sitcom or whatever start focusing on the intimate relationships of amputees, or paraplegics, or schizophrenics, or the deaf, etc.

They just would have been *waaay* farther ahead by explicitly stating that just because the love life of such individuals is not commonly portrayed in popular media, doesn't mean such individuals can't *have* a love life in reality.

That's ultimately what it's trying to convey, it'd just be a lot more effective and significantly less scattered if it went out and *said* it, instead of trying to ignore the fact that half the reason psychical and mental disabilities aren't the subject of popular entertainment is simply because nobody actively *wants* to be faced with those kinds of challenges during their leisure time.

Teaching non-binary gender identity & Talking about gays, lesbians and bisexuals.

Really just speaking out of pure curiosity here, but why did you specifically highlight "two-spirited" on this one?

I'm not sure if you're Canadian or how much you might know about Ontario's regional native tribes, but just to clarify; two-spirited is pretty much just the Aboriginal name for transgender.

They came up with it centuries ago, presumably because whatever biological predisposition or occurrence which leads to the feelings transgenders experience existed back then, and their societal take on religion lead them to believe the cause of it was two different spirits inhabiting the same body.

I know it certainly *sounds* a hell of a lot like a term for the whole "I have the spirit of an iguana and sexually identify as an attack helicopter" way of thinking, but it's pretty much just the Ontario government acknowledging the Aboriginal's culture in the public school system, because it's the public school system.

But hey, maybe you already knew all that, I don't know. I'm just making a guess based on what I thought it

meant when I first heard the term.

Violence against boys does not exist.

Yeah, fuck, I personally take issue to that one, too.

It's not that they shouldn't have mentioned that females are more frequently targeted/affected by such, it's that they should have explicitly stated that it's ultimately still just as valid when a male is the target of such behavior. Maybe even pointed out some of the issues which affect men differently, like the fact that law enforcement seem just as likely to laugh and hang up then they are to provide much in the way of assistance.

Another lesson about the anal sex, again 7th grade.

I don't have much in the way of questions on this one, either.

I'm pretty confident that I understand the reasons why some might object to it, I just don't particularly agree, feeling that any adherence to the rules which normally dictate socially acceptable conversation topics should be tossed out the window the moment they conflict with imparting knowledge of topics as important as disease vectors and the like.

Fuck knows what they were thinking when they decided to include the bracketed text, though.

It's not like using protection is a matter of probability or something, the kids know damn well whether or not they're using a condom, statistics be damned.

Cyralea • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 02:24 PM

I'll humour you.

Is this really a problem?

No, this one isn't objectionable. Not sure why OP included it.

Errr... Is this one, specifically the highlighted text, really something worth objecting to?

Yes, because it creates a literally unfollowable law. Consent needs to be ongoing...what does that mean? Every 5 minutes? What if I got consent 3 times, but she changed her mind after without telling me? It literally does nothing to prevent rape, and only opens up avenues in which males can be falsely accused of rape as she can always use it as a trump card down the road. Further, there are *lots* of cases where silence means yes, which is something anyone who has had sex would know. If you start making out with a girl and she violently jumps you and grabs your dick, her body language is signalling her consent. This isn't even a remotely realistic law to follow.

Is there really anything that's really untrue here, though?

Yes, because it completely ignores the idea that we have a defined idea of normalcy in any given society, and teaching kids otherwise is setting them up for unhappiness. You could choose to not to bathe or wear clean clothes -- after all, who's to say that's normal? -- but it defies the basic notion that actions have consequences. Terrible idea to teach children. Further, there's the nonsense about being two-spirited otherkin, which is outright kooky.

Eh, it's not really wrong here, either.

Again, it's ignoring a real world concept -- attractiveness is largely objective. The majority of people want to

be with the standard definition of beauty (thin, fit, muscular, etc). Telling kids otherwise doesn't help them. Telling them their disabilities are just as sexy as the norm is malicious.

I'm not sure if you're Canadian or how much you might know about Ontario's regional native tribes, but just to clarify; two-spirited is pretty much just the Aboriginal name for transgender

I'm Canadian and I had no idea. Maybe they ought to use terms that are widely accepted rather than make up oddball sounding ones.

I don't have much in the way of questions on this one, either.

Same. Teaching children STI risk isn't a bad thing.

Does that make it more clear?

[deleted] • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 08:05 AM

By not educating our kids, we leave the state to "rescue" our "poor children."

jacks1000 • 10 points • 25 February, 2015 05:09 AM

Generate outrage through social media to achieve change in society.

Whatever happened to "be the change you wish to see in the world?" Can't these leftist nutjobs be consistent? Besides, why should "society" change because some Transgendered Otherkin of Color has their gender-non-specific underpants in a bunch due to "microaggressions" or whatever?

Subtleorious • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 05:02 AM

You're spot-on with the SJW activism concerns. Since when did lobbying of media companies become part of sex Ed?

However, your concerns about anal sex are a tad paranoid. Butt sex happens. I would call a sex Ed curriculum that didn't mention it to be incomplete.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 12:06 PM

I put it on bottom of the post for a reason. I am more concerned with how teachers encourage kids to shsr absolutely everything.

[deleted] • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 05:30 AM

We're just at the beginning of this feminist/sjw rabbit hole. believe that

[deleted] • 0 points • 25 February, 2015 06:43 AM

well if it's a good sign, you see a lot more rational reactions to feminist bullshit, so a lot more people are waking up to it.

[deleted] • 7 points • 25 February, 2015 06:52 AM

it only seems that way to you because you probably go on TRP everyday. Our society overall is getting more and more heavily indoctrinated passively.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 07:56 AM

Oh well you might be right. My fucking teacher constantly chooses the "wage gap" as his go-to discrimination, when it used to be racism, an actual problem.

rp_aware • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 04:04 PM

Normalcy is just a set of definitions that we use to make sense of large groups. Same with stereotypes and archetypes. I think everyone knows deep down that stereotypes and normative categories capture truths in a fuzzy way. You can focus on the fuzziness, or you can focus on the utility.

The fight starts when you have a culture full of individualistic ingrates who don't look at society through a macro lens ... which is what we have. If you see yourself as a fierce individual and see every person you meet as a fierce individual, then "normal" is going to piss you off to no end. Stereotypes are going to piss you off. You will campaign against any way of thinking that is anti-individualistic.

At the end of the day, exceptions aside, humans are very fickle and conforming. In a word, *herdlike*. Normal will always exist, stereotypes will always have utility, and archetypes will be amply represented.

A quick word on archetypes: an archetype is an exaggerated form (like a Platonic form) that large numbers of people tend to be like: for example, the rebellious teenager who starts getting tattoos, weird hair, etc. You think 'so typical'. Typical = archetypal: in this case, the archetype of the rebellious teenager. The great irony is that the typical rebellious teenager is exactly *the type* who would think of themselves as fiercely individualistic.

The punch line: thinking of yourself as fiercely individualistic is highly typical and normal. Herd behavior.

Normative thinking is useful as fuck when analyzing groups of humans, so hang on to it. *Quietly*.

[deleted] • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 12:59 PM

Wasn't the feminist movement created to break up the nuclear family and get kids going to state run schools for proper brainwashing?

I heard that somewhere.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:20 PM

I didn't hear that one, but it sounds right. The end goal is the government as the parent and you know, parenting licenses etc.

The_Turbinator • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 01:23 PM

This is what happens when we vote in a fucking hardcore feminist woman for our Premiere.

If I ever do have kids the only province they will be doing any growing up in is Quebec.

zyk0s • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 02:57 PM

Quebec is not all fine and dandy either, and the public system is getting shittier with every revision they bring. That being said, private schools are partly subsidized, especially francophone ones, so if you ever do have kids, that is really the best option.

Ausfall • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 01:47 PM*

It should be noted that this is only possible because Kathleen Wynne, the Premier of Ontario (think State Governor for you Americans), now has a majority government in the provincial legislature. The Liberal Party was able to push this through because other parties do not have enough seats to overturn their decisions. In essence it's a dictatorship unless the politicians vote against their own party (hint: they never do). She also never mentioned this overhaul of the education system during the election because the idea was torn to pieces during her previous government by the opposition to the point they had to withdraw the bill.

While I think kids should be armed with knowledge, there's a persistent trend in education in Canada to stamp an agenda onto kids. Instead of giving kids the tools they need to come up with their own conclusions and make

their own decisions, they are told what to believe and leave school as a Progressive, Well-Rounded Member of Society™

This kind of education teaches kids (especially male kids) that they are intolerant, racist, homophobic or oppressive. The sex education part says that trying to be a regular kid and trying to fit in means that they are somehow wrong. It's the next step of the "there are no losers" education, but in reality there aren't any losers because there aren't any winners either.

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 03:33 PM

| She is the first female premier of Ontario, and the first openly gay head of government in Canada.

No hidden agendas there.

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 10:07 AM

is this what Russians talk about when they complain about Western Homosexual propaganda?

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 04:33 PM

Indoctrinating young children with this curriculum? My thought is a resounding YES.

nzgs • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 02:29 PM

Of all the things wrong with state schools, sex education is the last thing to worry about. I'd be far more concerned with the humanities being hijacked by cultural marxists.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:16 PM

Think about this: how the education system changed in the last 20 years to this point and how is it going to change 20 years from now.

curious97 • 5 points • 25 February, 2015 04:43 AM

Question: How is the Catholic schoolboard reacting to this? Will they implement it? I am not familiar with that organization but if they're a neutered Catholic organization I wouldn't be surprised if they decided to "modernize" (puke)

I can't imagine what they will be teaching our children's children. Practical Sex Ed labs in grammar school? I bet it's coming some time or another.

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 08:09 AM

What does ISIL have to say about it: <http://finance.yahoo.com/news/isis-burns-8000-rare-books-030900856.html>

Cyralea • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 02:36 PM

More evidence that Toronto is hell on earth. Feminazi programming like this doesn't even cause people to bat an eyelash here.

I think the greater message here is that for any aspiring parent to be heavily involved in their children's schooling, particularly once they get to this age. Questions like "What did you learn today?" would go far to giving you an angle to stamping out this kind of nonsense.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 11:59 AM

I think parents need to simply be vigilant and learn children proper values. I don't think anal sex is per se wrong or "sinful", but I do think that a girl should really reserve it for someone special. I mean, that probably sounds sappy, but anal is very romantic when you think about it.

oldredder • 4 points • 25 February, 2015 03:08 AM

Considering the number of guys here who for no reason I can fathom seek anal with their women - I am surprised you'd even complain.

No thanks for me. I know which holes are the right ones and that's not it

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 04:07 AM

[deleted]

RedPillProphet • -2 points • 25 February, 2015 04:24 AM*

I like the idea of it but back out the last second when she offers it. Like I'd bring it up during foreplay but when during sex they ask me to insert a finger or something, I am like "no thanks you nasty bitch".

oldredder • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 06:11 AM

I know. Many women think so too. Even if a girl's willing to take it in the bung hole she's going to question if a man who does this really wants to do this to men and is afraid to just go do it, so he does it with women.

No one will look down on the woman for letting it happen so she's not losing anything by going for it but passing judgment silently, or not so silently when she shares these suspicions with other women, or men who don't know that man.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

BlaiseDB • 0 points • 25 February, 2015 11:48 AM

Without going into the merits of the Hershey Highway, I think it's safe to say that it is not conventional, qualitatively different than coitus, and rather traumatic by comparison. I don't think it's appropriate to go into it in any particular detail.

Realistically, out of a class of two dozen 12 year olds, how many would be seriously considering giving or receiving? Of the rest, how many would have anything more than a puerile, prurient curiosity?

oldredder • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 03:09 AM

I think it's safe to say that it is **not conventional, qualitatively different** than coitus

what?????

It's completely different. It won't feel the same, smell the same, different tightness of the hole, everything is different!

This is nutso.

Are you sure you phrased that right?

BlaiseDB • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 03:25 AM

Not conventional but is qualitatively different. You distributed my "not" ;-)

oldredder • -1 points • 26 February, 2015 03:26 AM

"distributed" ? Maybe your writing style is just bad.

I'm only about 40% sure I understood ANY version of what your sentence could mean.

BlaiseDB • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 03:36 AM

The words were "not conventional" and "qualitatively different". You interpreted that as "not conventional" and "not qualitatively different".

oldredder • -1 points • 26 February, 2015 03:48 AM

That's how language works.

Try writing better.

BlaiseDB • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 04:00 AM

I don't know where you learned to read, my friend. Probably from an Ontario school, ha ha.

squirtmasterd • 3 points • 25 February, 2015 11:29 AM

Sex education has proven to reduce teenage single mums. It's a different time and a different generation to be holding them to your antiquated standards. Red pill is for discussion on how best to navigate this new world.

SpongeCroft • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 11:33 AM

Isn't there a South Park episode about this? Those sex ed teachers need to get laid...

elysius • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 01:08 PM

If this kind of thing grinds your gears, look up the Dark Enlightenment and Neoreaction and join the fight.

TempusRerumImperator • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 02:41 PM

"trusted adult" when they experience such situations, which most likely means teacher or the police).

I was born in a communist country where this tactic was VERY popular and happened a lot. It made everyone paranoid and scared of the state. They had a very long arm indeed.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 11:57 AM

Yes. This is repeated over and over in the curriculum. Teacher must at all times make children feel safe and encourage them to share every little personal detail about themselves.

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 02:54 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 04:53 PM

I had a girl on OkCupid message me last night. Her profile listed "feminism" 3 times (can't live without) and her favourite activities included Tumblr.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 11:31 PM

let me guess, you not only nexted her but blocked her as well?

sevenStarsFall • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 06:50 PM

A 12 year old girl who learns what anal is today is an 18 year old girl letting me plow her in the ass 6 years from now.

What's the beef?

ECoast_Man • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 03:18 AM

Oh sweet Jesus.

I found the anal sex parts the *least* offensive of what you identified. This is just sick. The domestic violence one is shocking - why exactly must it add the point that 'it's primarily about women... Now give me examples'.

This was *definitely* written by a full *team* of rabid fucking feminists. Fucking Toronto - The Capital of Ontario and North American Feminism.

Cypher211 • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 11:43 AM

This is a fucking horror show. I live in the UK but I guarantee it'll just be a matter of time before we start seeing this over here as well...

singeblanc • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 03:01 AM

We should be so lucky!

More likely we'll have Faith Schools pushing a curriculum of pretending sex doesn't exist, to the extent that when Father John tells Little Timmy that it's "normal" behaviour for little boys to suck old men off, the poor innocent won't know any better.

Kelly_Gruber • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 11:38 AM*

The is made by the same liberal party that had a high ranking member get charged as a pedophile. He was also in charge of overseeing this new curriculum.

Edit: strange be must be some pedophiles in here since I'm getting downvoted for speaking the truth

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 02:48 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 04:33 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] 25 February, 2015 11:29 PM

[deleted]

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 11:56 AM

My belief is that this kind of propaganda is aimed at encouraging pedophilia. It will become legal very quickly in Western countries because it's going to be the new "normal".

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 05:33 AM

there's no need for third graders (8 year olds) to know about homosexuality and transgenderism, save that for middle school.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 11:34 PM

I hated heath class in school because it was always the same shit and always took time away from gym class. I feel sorry for these poor kids.

• points • 1 January, 1970 12:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 08:12 PM

What a steaming pile of shit you've posted. I upvoted your comment after that 1984 reference, but quickly turned it upside-down.

Also... Most of the things in this plan aren't bad. Teaching kids about consent is... Really good. Smart. Consent should not be assumed. Ongoing consent is rather silly but.... Unless you hear a proper "Yes" don't. Rape is fucked up you sick cunts.

No human being needs to be "taught" that a transaction must be agreed upon before it's finalized. Like sex. Both parties must agree. Giving this crap about "consent" only helps to further the feminist agenda to make anything qualify as rape.

Heterosexism might also sound a bit silly, but in a school setting kids do very much so look to their peers for what's "right" and if a kid feels like he's doing something wrong it can fuck with the kid.

More garbage. Heteronormativity is good. If you are the anomaly (a homosexual or some other demigodfaggotkin), then *you* must assimilate to *our* standards, not the other way around, snowflake. Got a problem with how our society makes you *feeeeeel*? Band together a bunch of your allies and start your own colony somewhere.

Not being ableist is well.... Okay, this is starting to look like you've taken a completely different context here. This idea of ableism here is... Not some tumblr shit. It's just proper equality. So, do we just pretend disabled people don't have lives? They don't have feelings and desires? Nah, fuck off.

"It's just proper equality..." You've really swallowed the ProgPill. Can they take care of themselves? No? Then they get tossed into nature's discard pile. Sorry to ruin your rainbows and unicorns fantasy. It's not *my* job to take care of them. Especially if they won't be productive to society.

Getting your message online is not a bad thing. Granted it depends on the person who has the message and how they spread it but... Pushing for change for some serious issues really isn't a bad thing, and honestly nor is what they talk about in that excerpt.

"Change" is not inherently virtuous.

A drunk person cannot give consent. Certainly not legal consent. And... An unconscious person. Do people need to be told someone who isn't sapient can't even fucking speak? Do... Do we need to have a quick refresher course on what being unconscious means? Please tell me we don't. 'Cause I mean... Like I said, rape is pretty fucking disgusting you sick cunts.

Petty insults.

This ties in with the shit about heterosexism. It's not that bad. Mind, I don't entirely care for the whole "No one can lose, everyone is a winner" attitude. But for something as... Inherent as gender and sexuality? Something that people can't change no matter how hard they try? **Teaching an open idea of gender and sexuality is not a bad thing.** And normal isn't a fixed idea. **If you went to a country where the majority of the populace were transwomen, you-as a man at least- would be abnormal.** It's really not that hard to understand.

Yes, it is a bad idea. We should teach homosexuals to have an "open idea" of heteronormativity. They are visitors to our society; we are the majority and should not be obligated to conform to a minority.

Find me one such society. Because it wouldn't last past a few generations. Heteronormative couples produce

offspring and thus the next generation. Seems like "normal" is the default state... funny, isn't it?

This is really good. Considering the piss poor shape of sex ed in most places and the shitty puritanical ideals a lot of people preach, knowing at least proper body parts is very important. Also if taught properly could at least maybe prevent some fucking child sexual abuse.

In *first grade*?! This is when they still call their plumbing their "peepee." All this does is subjugate the children to sexuality at an age that is way too young. It's perverse.

I'm still surprised at how you're taking issue with these things. And how hard you're skewing the point of the excerpts to put them in a negative light. Fat acceptance isn't that bad. Coddling a child to believe being fat is healthy is terrible. Believing that fat is healthy is bad. Teaching that you should count someone out of something because you think they're incapable? That's not unhealthy behavior. It's just not being an asshole.

Almost had me. We agree mostly, except for I think it's perfectly fine for fat losers to be bullied into getting on the treadmill and putting down the fork. Or are you saying I should be "taught" that a 5'4" 300lb 7th grader is as capable of running a mile as the 5'9" 120lb 7th grader?

Yes. It does. An uneven balance of power is not exactly a healthy relationship.

Wrong. Who's your idol? Your father (if you have one)? Is there an imbalance of power in your relationship with him, despite it being ultimately healthy and functional? Puke up that ProgPill, son. You're deluded. This transcends to an intimate relationship in which a woman prefers the security provided by a dominant authority (man).

What the fuck does the reporter have to do with the curriculum proposed? What.... Just fuck off... Please.

Your speech pattern has very weak undertones.

[deleted] • 1 points • 25 February, 2015 11:15 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 5 points • 25 February, 2015 11:51 PM

I have an over-inflated ego. Let's take a look...

lol lookit this sweetie pie trying to demoralize me and misrepresent my arguments like he's the real sooper stronk alpha menz yes I'm feeling so subordinate to u, gimme ur dik hotstuff ur SUV is through the fucking roof.

Quite an emotional response. The kind that serves to protect one's ego.

Everything in your post is cherry-picked and absurdly misrepresented or misunderstood. Further, you look like a fool trying to put on a loud display for the audience. Put your ego aside, respond civilly (as you recognize you should have), and we can discuss matters more in-depth. You did not give anything of substance.

SgtBrutalisk[S] comment score below threshold • -7 points • 25 February, 2015 12:02 PM

Great reply. You must have exerted your intellect a lot to simply go through my post and say that I am wrong.

Numeromancer • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 01:25 PM

School is all about the 4 Rs: Readin' , 'Ritin', 'Rithmetic, and Rectal-tears.

singeblanc • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 02:02 PM

Although ironically this education *prevents* the latter...

LaV-Man • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 02:49 PM

Heard it somewhere else but found it really interesting. If a drunk girl cannot give consent, why can I be convicted of a crime while I am drunk? Am I able to make rational decisions while intoxicated and therefore responsible (legally) for them? Then why is she not? Just pointing out the hypocrisy/double standard.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 11:55 AM

Because according to feminists, erection are conscious. If she had drunk sex with unconscious you, you automatically consent due to having an erect penis. If you drunk had sex with unconscious her, you were aware because you had an erection. As I said, you can't win, simply because you have a penis.

swordfish1985 • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 03:29 PM

This is bad, they imprinting feminism propaganda right from childhood so that kids believe them as facts and cannot question it when grown.

rp_aware • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 04:16 PM

This gem:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVHYvUpeqKI>

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 11:51 AM

Can I reply to your post? Can I write "wow" two times in a sentence?

Wow, just wow.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 04:50 PM

Is it okay that I reply to your post?

Sesa_Refum • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 05:54 PM

Fucking degeneracy. All I can say on this.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 February, 2015 02:50 PM

Do you not want kids to be sex-educated? Why is getting shown pictures of penises and getting talking to's of sex bad?

Sorry this isn't abstinence only, OP. You seem like an enraged soccermom with this post. "THINK OF THE CHILDREN!"

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 11:52 AM

This isn't something I saw discussed in TRP, so I posted. Calm your tits down.

BuckStricklandx • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 05:36 AM

Kids should never have to read the phrase "sexual being" in a health class lol

Requi3m • 0 points • 25 February, 2015 08:59 PM*

Children are shown pictures of genitalia, this is first grade material.

Oh no we wouldn't want children seeing a part of the human body! Don't be such a prude.

And finally, so you don't think I was trolling you in the title

Well thanks for confirming you were trolling us. We wouldn't want middle schoolers to hear the word "anal" which I'm sure they've never heard before.

A lot of what you highlighted is feminist bullshit but some of it isn't.

SgtBrutalisk[S] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 11:48 AM

I think you will agree that showing genitalia depends on the context. In this case, the context is just dreadful.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -6 points • 25 February, 2015 10:52 AM

If you put your children in school you are unfit to be a parent.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -10 points • 25 February, 2015 04:08 AM

Honestly everyone should learn sex-ed before they are 12.

Should be working by 14 and around 16 starting a family.

People don't get smarter after 14, they just learn how stupid they are.

[deleted] • 8 points • 25 February, 2015 11:58 AM

The prefrontal cortex, that is your part of the brain with which you make complicated rational decisions, isn't fully developed before the age of 25...

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 February, 2015 12:08 PM

Great factoid, literally means nothing in regards to this topic.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 February, 2015 01:24 PM

You're right. However there is a big difference between sex-ed and ultra leftiste propaganda

MadBum • -1 points • 25 February, 2015 05:40 PM

Hahaha really fun to watch you go from

Whole new generation of boys and girls will be taught material that was up until yesterday reserved for shock sites.

to

Just like in 1984, kids will be the most powerful surveillance tool of the government.

Everyone who subscribes to the kind of shit you guys on this sub do must be pretty stupid, but I can't imagine they're all as stupid as you.