

Homosexual Activism Forced on Freshman Health Class



“Portray gays as victims, not aggressive challengers.” — from “The Overhauling of Straight America,” by homosexual activists Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill, 1987

“Titling our report ‘Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth’ ... threw opponents onto the defensive....” — from “Winning the Culture War,” speech by Kevin Jennings, executive director of the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), 1995

“There is no wrong, only different” — “Respect Week” graffiti board, Monte Vista H.S., 1998

San Ramon Valley Unified School District officials say they’re not pushing “gay” issues — just tolerance (*SRV Times*, May 24, 2001). But “tolerance,” like “safety” and “diversity,” has become a smokescreen for homosexual activism. [More recently, in the 2020s, “tolerance” has become the excuse for depraved pornography in SRVUSD school libraries.]

San Ramon Valley High’s initial 1995-96 teacher “in-service” program, for example, presented vastly inflated incidence rates for homosexuality and teen-homosexual suicide. Other handouts asked: is heterosexuality “just a phase you might grow out of?”

“Safe schools” training for SRVUSD counselors by a dissident, rogue “Catholic Charities” group in 1999 urged “gender non-specific language (i.e. ‘partner’ instead of ‘husband’),” and favorable, all-grade discussions of “same sex marriage” and “gays in the military.”

Last spring, even as school-board members and administrators denied a “gay” agenda, two homosexual representatives from the same “Catholic Charities” outfit made a presentation to Monte Vista teacher Cindy Imbertson’s 9th grade Health class.

A concerned parent subsequently revealed what happened, and subsequent investigation found that Charles, a “gay” male, and Jaime, a lesbian, were apparently permitted to quiz 14 and 15-year-olds regarding perceptions of homosexuality, and to lecture on “homophobia.” Students answered questions by moving from their desks to room areas that designated responses: “Yes,” “No,” “Don’t know or don’t want to answer.”

Parents and students provided these facts. But school authorities then practiced duck and cover.

On June 13, Monte Vista principal Becky Smith was asked in person for a timely inquiry of Ms. Imbertson, since the school year would end two days later. A reminder note was left at Smith’s office June 14, and she was called several times afterward. Eventually, an answering machine recorded Smith’s June 18 and June 28 return messages: “I am still trying

to locate our teacher....” But a quick phone-book lookup and call then found Ms. Imbertson at home, June 29. She refused comment unless Ms. Smith were present.

Smith was notified that Ms. Imbertson was available at home, and please now to elicit and convey answers as requested. When there was no response, an administrative complaint. That drew Smith’s written reply, still missing most of the information requested. But Smith stated that she had in fact met with Imbertson — on June 14!

Smith was asked again for relevant details, and now to explain her contradictions. Among other things, a request was made for a copy of the parental waiver allegedly required. The context was California Education Code § 51554:

Unless a pupil's parent or guardian has been sent written notification..., a pupil shall not receive instruction on sexually transmitted diseases, AIDS, human sexuality, or family life... by an outside organization or guest speakers.... Notification... shall include the date of the instruction, the name of the organization or affiliation of each guest speaker, and information stating the parent's or guardian's right to request a copy of Sections 51201.5 and 51553, related to AIDS prevention instruction....

The district should also have required specific “opt-in” authority from parents for such presentations. But Smith felt it was enough to allow students to “pass” on questions. That Approach, an investigating community member answered, could stigmatize minor children in classmates’ eyes as seemingly repressed or “homophobic.”

Remarkably, SRVUSD cooperated at the time in levying \$211 fines against students caught smoking, and required offenders to attend “Tobacco Use Prevention Education” on Saturdays.

But the District implicitly endorsed a potentially far more unhealthy behavior, taking a pass itself when it came to educating kids about the changeability of homosexual inclinations or the grave dangers associated with homosexual behaviors. These risks include shortened “gay” male lifespans, elevated breast-cancer rates among lesbians, and increased likelihood that children of same-sex parenting arrangements will exhibit homosexual behaviors themselves.

Parents can and should withdraw their kids from intrusive and abusive SRVUSD programs whenever possible. In fact, if and when parental resources of time and money permit, they should withdraw their kids from SRVUSD, to undertake home education or private schools. SRVUSD schools systematically present an intellectual, moral, and spiritual hazard to children.