
New Version Worse: S.B. 304, Juvenile Prostitution Decriminalized, PLUS Prostitution Bill, highly influenced by U.N. Rights of the Child, Focus on Juvenile Justice

Question: Should Georgia pass a law that considers juvenile prostitution to be no more serious than the behavior of an "unruly child?"

The original version of S.B. 304 was unbelievably bad! It was introduced to do the unthinkable in this Bible Belt state – decriminalize prostitution for anyone under age 16. So no one under 16 could be charged for prostitution, even if caught soliciting for or *committing* the act. *That* was disastrous! But it, also, gave the okay for juveniles to collect money from johns.

The bottom line (no pun intended) of the original S.B. 304: juveniles could become sex workers and earn a salary in occupations outside the purview of law enforcement.

But, believe it or not, the revised S.B. 304 is worse! Just when I thought S.B. 304 couldn't be up-staged, it up-staged itself! After a ten-day delay, a new version was released to the bill's opponents. The old language was discarded and entirely new language, meant to disguise the true intent, was substituted. Though the approach is totally different, the end result is even more drastic than the first. Follow along as I outline the bill and insert editorial comments.

- **First**, it adds this new paragraph to Code Section 15-11-2 relating to juvenile proceedings: "Sexual exploitation" means allowing, permitting, encouraging, or requiring that a child engage in:
 - Prostitution, in violation of Code Section 16-6-9;
 - Masturbation for hire, in violation of Code Section 16-6-16; or
 - Sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing any visual or print medium depicting such conduct in violation of Code Section 16-12-100."

[This would accomplish even more changes than the original S.B. 304. Legal Counsel assured me that moving the above three sections of law into this section would release juveniles from the possibility of arrest, charges and penalties for working and receiving money for prostitution, masturbation for hire (massage parlor work), and pornography.]

- **Then**, the bill's focus shifts to Code Section 15-11-2 that defines an "unruly child." That shift was made in order to add the following to the list of behaviors now considered unruly: "is the person who has been subjected to sexual exploitation."

[That means prostitution would be no more serious than disobedience to parents or truancy.]

- **Next**, the bill moves into Code Section 17-15-2 to identify the minor – formerly known as a juvenile prostitute – as a "victim" who is eligible for victim compensation funds.
- **Then**, the bill changes Code Section 17-15-8 relating to a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council to establish "victim" status of the child. (continued on page 2)

- **Finally**, the Governor’s Office for Children and Families will develop a system of care for the newly defined unruly child, now a victim, whether or not the prostituting was voluntary.

ACTION – Oppose. Call Judiciary Committee Senators Smith, Ch., 404 656-0034; Harp, 463-3931; Hamrick, 656-0036; Adelman, 463-1376; Brown, 656-5035; Cowser, 651-7738; Crosby, 463-5258; Fort, 656-5091; Judson Hill, 656-0150; Ramsey, 463-2598; Seabaugh, 656-6446; and Wiles 657-0406.

Four-Decade Push for “Kiddie Lib” in the U.S.

Legal Age of Consent is 16; Parents Do Not Agree

S.B. 304 is another step toward the goal of youth liberators to strip decision making power from parents and establish government as the ultimate “parent” – the goal of youth liberators who believe parents have no right to intervene in behavior government decriminalizes or legalizes.

Point: Georgia law sets 16 as the legal age of consent for sexual contact. However, the vast majority of parents do *not* give their 16-year-olds permission to engage in sexual contact outside of marriage. Likewise, that same vast parental majority vehemently opposes the result of S.B. 304, that now normalizes and decriminalizes (a) juvenile prostitution, (b) masturbation for hire (though disguised as “massage”) and the (c) involvement of minors in pornography

Governmental focus on distancing parents from their children’s choices is documented by the heavy-handed introduction and use of explicit sex education curricula (over parental objections) and the distribution (confidential from parents) of how-to materials and “safe sex” devices (at tax-payer expense), under full authority of Georgia law and the State Board of Education.

Included in sex education designed for children in schools, churches and elsewhere are vivid instructions on various lifestyles. Unbelievable? Go to your local school or public library and ask to see CDC’s five-part sex ed curriculum. Within its pages is a statement that its curricula are not based on United States values, but on “international values,” *i.e.*, situation ethics.

The international connection is obvious in other publications. In 1979, Marian Wright Edelman, U.S. director of the Children’s Defense Fund (CDF), made an ominous statement. She explained that she would continue monitoring federal policies, research and investigations to locate situations where she could “sue on behalf of individuals or classes of children, [and] accomplish what we know ought to be done for children.” However, that wasn’t the first glimpse of international policy application into U.S. culture, practices, court decisions and law.

“A Child’s Bill of Rights,” published in *MS. Magazine* March 1974, was from Richard Farson’s *The Children’s Rights Movement*, recommended reading in the United Nations International Year of the Child (IYC) Report of 1977. Farson’s book, also, included an article from John Holt’s book, *Escape from Childhood*, also recommended at an official IYC meeting.

Within Farson’s book are eleven “rights” he wants for children, regardless of parental wishes – the “unhindered right to be heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual or transsexual” and “develop communication and solidarity with the young people of the world in our common struggle for freedom and peace.” He, also, wants children to have the right to vote; financial independence (at parents’ expense); to own, buy and sell property; borrow money; *i.e.*, to, generally, live and behave as adults without the responsibility. But there’s more. He wants government to empower children to create communal families (funded by parents) and make their own decisions about education and sex practices, regardless of family values.

Taxpayers foot the bill for these family-destroying trends. The National IYC Commission was given \$2 million in taxpayers' money to carry out the 1979 push to overturn U.S. cultural standards, destroy parental authority and implement the U.N. recommendations.

Atlanta's Jean Young and the U.N. IYC connection. The May 1979 *Conservative Digest* article, "International Year of the Child: Dangerous Tomfoolery," reported that *Commission Chairperson Jean Young (UN Ambassador Andrew Young's wife)* had asked the 50 governors to start IYC programs. That caused a ruckus in states where the citizens still believe parental authority should prevail until children grow up.

Last, but by no means least is the U.S. court's disdain for parental rights. Before the *Conservative Digest* published the 1979 article, Supreme Court Justice Harry A. Blackmun had already ruled that children have the right to abortion without parental consent and various jurisdictions had ruled in favor of runaway children's rights over the previously recognized rights of their anxious parents.

Current court decisions consistently reject parents' constitutional rights to direct the upbringing of children and some very recent judgments have profoundly illustrated that philosophy.

A Georgia judge ruled that a teenager could open her bedroom window in the middle of night and let her teenage boyfriend enter, so the two could have sex secretly, while her parents slept in the next room. Incredulously, the judge said the girl's action was no business of the parents.

Judges have forced parents to use psychotropic drugs on students. Judges have denied parental rights to excuse their children from offensive curricula. Judges have ruled that Muslim doctrine in public schools is nothing more than a course in social studies. Judges consistently rule against family-taught religious expression by students ... and the beat goes on.

S.B. 304 Influenced by U.N. Treaty on Rights of the Child

S.B. 304's author may not know the bill promotes the feminist agenda, which is the international agenda imbedded in the UN Human Rights Treaty. So, the global "it takes a village" philosophy is incrementally and systematically being applied to U.S. culture and law. S.B. 304 is a trumpet-call reminder of the increasing U.N. influence on life in the U.S. The United Nations adopted the Treaty on the Rights of the Child November 20, 1989. It was never ratified in the United States, though the Children's Defense Fund lobbied hard for ratification during an early 1990s push for a federal babysitting system for preschool children.

Hillary Clinton chaired CDF's board of directors from 1986 to 1991 and, as First Lady in 1995, announced that her husband signed the U.N. Rights of the Child Treaty and sent it to the Senate.

Although the U.S. Senate never ratified the treaty, by 1995 a total of 176 foreign countries had. Despite the U.S. Senate's rejection of that treaty, its philosophy has influenced many U.S. decisions, rules, regulations and laws, as well as proposed legislation such as S.B. 304.

Beware! Within its 54 Articles, the U.N. Treaty¹ (a) transfers parental responsibilities and rights to the state. It (b) provides children with various rights as individuals apart from the family, such as autonomy and freedom from parental guidance; (c) and establishes national and international agencies and institutions to investigate and prosecute parents who violate children's rights, as determined by the international community headed by the United Nations.

¹ See: UN Convention on the Rights of the Child; plus, "Hazards lurking in Treaty of the Child," by Phyllis Schlafly, 3-1-95. *Georgia Insight*

Committee Hearing Promised for H.B. 38, Microchip Consent Bill

Georgia must join other states that have outlawed mandatory microchip implants in humans.

May 30, 2006, Wisconsin Governor Jim Doyle signed a law prohibiting forcible microchip implants in humans. Violators will pay \$10,000 per day until the microchip is removed.

April 4, 2007, North Dakota Governor John Hoeven signed an Act against forced implants in humans. Violation is a class A misdemeanor.

October 12, 2007, California Governor Schwarzenegger signed a law criminalizing forced microchip implants. Violators would pay \$1,000 a day until the chip is removed, up to \$10,000.

May 23, 2008, Oklahoma Governor Brad Henry approved a bill to prohibit forced implanting of microchips or other permanent marks in humans. Violators would be fined.

Virginia has the right idea and, perhaps, the most comical regulation of all. It says, “[The] department will not comply with any federal law or regulation that would require the use of any type of computer chip or RFID tag or other similar device *on or in a driver.*”

Missouri lawmakers made it a crime for employers to order employees to be microchipped. The National Conference of State Legislatures reported that, during the first five months of 2008, at least 17 states had considered regulating or restricting RFID, compared to only 13 in the 12 months of 2007.

Ohio has within its state a video surveillance company that requires employees to submit to a chip implant to access a secure records room, as does the Mexican attorney general’s office.

Microchip implants are required in two European nightclubs to link patrons to prepaid accounts.

Legislators should listen when a renowned genetic physician says, “There’s no way in the world, having read this information, that I would have one of those chips implanted in my skin, or in one of my family members. Given the preliminary animal data, it looks to me that there’s definitely cause for concern.” He was reacting to research on laboratory animals that were implanted with radio frequency microchips. Among the animals’ serious problems were tumors, malignant cancers, and the migration of microchips into their brains and extremities.

“This is Where Fantasy Meets Reality”

Representative Loudermilk, very much against microchipping individuals without their consent, recognizes the “science fiction” aura surrounding the issue. He assures us it’s real with this statement, “This is where fantasy meets reality,” an apt description of the situation. In fact, former Senator Joe Biden, now Vice-President of the United States and very much aware of the constitutional problems swirling around the debate to-mandate or not-to-mandate microchips, asked the following question during the 2005 Supreme Court confirmation of John Roberts:

“Can a microscopic tag be implanted in a person’s body to track his every movement? There’s actual discussion about that.

You will rule on that – mark my words – before your tenure is over.”

ACTION – Support H.B. 38. Call members of the House Judiciary Subcommittee. They are Representatives Jacobs, Ch., 404 656-0152; Bruce, 656-0314; Crawford, 656-0265; Dobbs, 656-7859; Lindsey, 656-5024; Nix, 656-0177; O’Neal, 656-5103; Powell, 656-0177; and Weldon, 656-0152; plus, Ex-officio members: Willard, 656-5125 and Lane, 656-5087.

Georgia Insight is a conservative publication financed entirely by its recipients.