

Submission

on

Sex and Relationship Education Delivery

**To the Department for
Children, Schools and Families**

The Maranatha Community

September 2008

The Maranatha Community is a nationwide movement and network of Christians in all denominations. Comprising thousands of active members of churches of all traditions, it is committed to healing, unity and renewal of faith. Formed 27 years ago, its members have been very deeply involved in care and relief work, especially among children, and it has also taken the initiative in broad areas of national concern both in Parliament and throughout the country. It works in association with The Council for Health and Wholeness.

The Maranatha Community UK Office,
102 Irlam Road, Flixton,
Manchester, M41 6JT.

Tel: 0161 748 4858. Fax: 0161 747 7379.

E-mail: info@maranathacommunity.org.uk. Website: www.maranathacommunity.org.uk.

The Leader and co-founder of the Community is Dennis Wrigley. The coordinator for this project is Captain Peter De Bourcier BSc (Eng) MRAs

Contents.....	1
1. Introduction	2
2. The Social and Biological Context	2
3. The Roles of Parents and of Schools	3
4. Principles and Implementation	4
5. Concluding Comment	4
6. References	5 - 34

I. Introduction

1.1 The Government's *Sex and Relationship Education Guidance*¹ states that sex and relationship education (SRE) *"is lifelong learning about physical, moral and emotional development. It is about understanding the importance of marriage for family life, stable and loving relationships, respect, love and care. It is also about the teaching of sex, sexuality, and sexual health. It is not about the promotion of sexual orientation or sexual activity – this would be inappropriate teaching."*

1.2 We fully support this statement of purpose. Unfortunately, the effect of the secular humanist agenda which has largely driven social matters in the UK since the 1960s has been to separate personal conduct from considerations of morality, family life and social consequence.

1.3 This has contributed, through the diminished recognition of the marriage-based family as the fundamental unit of a healthy society, to:

1.3.1 Lowered outcomes of health, longevity, productivity and social responsibility among many adults,²⁻⁶ which in turn have contributed to:

1.3.2 Lowered outcomes of educational achievement, emotional and social development, moral awareness and sense of responsibility among many children and young people.⁷⁻¹² These in turn have contributed to:

1.3.3 An increase in indications of fundamental disorder such as the gang culture, anti-social behaviour and youth violence (amongst both boys and girls), and soaring rates of teenage pregnancy, abortions and sexually transmitted disease.¹³⁻¹⁶

1.4 Therefore, whilst good SRE could help to achieve targets such as reducing the rate of teenage pregnancy, it will be most effective only if it is clearly set in the context of moral responsibility and recognition of the importance of sound family and social structures.¹⁷⁻²⁴

1.5 It is important to note that recognition of the crucial nature of sound family and moral structures is not limited to people of any one particular religious persuasion, such as Christians. It is shared by many of our immigrant and indigenous population of other persuasions, such as Muslims, and by many people of no specific religious faith. Although some may deny it, it is intrinsic to human nature.

2. The Social and Biological Context

2.1 Over the past 40 years our culture has embraced post-modernism, which rejects absolute values and standards of truth and promotes the objective of self-gratification. Society cannot function on a basis of rights without responsibilities. Moreover, it is beyond doubt or denial that activists and interest groups, collectively, want to use SRE as an instrument of social engineering.²⁵⁻³²

2.2 Within this culture, children and young people can experience daily exposure, and have ready access, to media portrayals of "free and easy" sexual relationships

devoid of unwanted consequences, “soft” pornography on the shelves of high street shops and petrol stations, and pornography of all types on the internet.

2.3 Good SRE alone cannot combat the effects of this culture, exposure and access, but the principles and delivery of SRE should take account of them. It should seek to enable pupils to evaluate them soundly, and should aim to combat their destructive physical, emotional, spiritual and social effects.³³⁻³⁴ SRE delivered without a strong moral and sociological background amounts to giving children and young people ‘lessons in depravity’.³⁵⁻³⁸

2.4 SRE should also be designed and delivered to take account of the natural stages of children’s biological, psychological and emotional development. It should especially take account of the latency period between about 6 and 10 years of age of neutral gender identity.³⁹ Children in that stage of life have a natural reluctance to become involved in sexual matters, and it is essential that our SRE safeguards them from being invasively forced to consider them, or pressurised into sexual exploration when their natural and healthy inbuilt protective instincts require otherwise.⁴⁰⁻⁴² SRE having contrary intent or content amounts, in a psychological sense, to child molestation.⁴³

2.5 Advocates of giving children SRE at an early age, and doing so irrespective of parents’ wishes, often cite experience in the Netherlands as indicating a causative correlation between early SRE and low rates of teenage pregnancy. This is a false proposition: other factors, especially a generally strong family structure, are the primary causes of the better Dutch teenage pregnancy rate.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁷

2.6 All this sets those who design and deliver SRE a major, uphill task. Nevertheless, it is a task that must be faced if SRE is to fulfil the role set out for it in Reference 1. Anything less would be likely to leave SRE as little more than a superficial palliative, and would fail both our children and our wider society.⁴⁸

3. The Roles of Parents and of Schools

3.1 Many people recognise that, in an ideal world, the home and family is the proper and best environment for children to learn about sex and relationships. Nevertheless, especially as we are now getting generations of adult parents, and increasing numbers of single child-parents, who have not themselves had the benefit of this quality of upbringing, or are otherwise not able to provide it, it is appropriate for Government and schools to play a part in the SRE process.

3.2 However, any contribution by schools, under Government guidance, should be supportive rather than interventionist. The right of parents to ensure that their children have education with which they, the parents, are comfortable is enshrined in law.⁴⁹⁻⁵⁰

3.3 This right of parents to involvement in and the determination, monitoring and limitation of what is taught to their children must therefore be fully respected at all stages of SRE in schools. It already forms part of Government policy, and should remain so.⁵¹

4. Principles and Implementation

4.1 The Moral Background. The future design and delivery of SRE should recognise the fact that it involves moral issues which go far beyond mere personal preference and individual choice.

4.2 The Primacy of Sound Family Structure. A majority of young people aspire to sound marriage and family life.⁵² SRE should reflect the fact that the marriage-based family is normative in most cultures around the world. We support what has already been set out in this respect in Section 1 of the Government's Guidance document.⁵³

4.3 The Reduction of Teenage Pregnancy. The most effective way to achieve the Government's objective of reducing the rate of teenage pregnancy is to minimize teenage sexual activity.⁵⁴ Whilst the 'technical' (biological and practical) side of SRE is valuable, it should only form a secondary component of SRE as a whole:

4.3.1 SRE should emphasize the place of self-discipline and consideration for the other person in managing all human relationships.

4.3.2 It should recognise and uphold the family-based structure of human society, and acknowledge the existence of a moral framework which transcends individual preference, as the basis for young people's whole-life approach to SRE.

4.3.3 It should commend abstinence from sexual activity until marriage as the healthiest and most satisfying way of managing our natural and proper human instincts; and the family environment as that which, overall, produces the best outcomes for the individual, for society and for following generations.

4.3.4 It should take note of best practice, including the work of the Romance Academy, the content of the PURE Course, the Ugandan experience and similar resources.⁵⁵ These will provide valuable guidance to those preparing future SRE guidelines and materials.

5. Concluding Comment

5.1 There are some examples of very good practice in current SRE, but in general the outcome of SRE as it has been delivered in recent years has been disastrous. It has led to soaring numbers of child pregnancies and abortions, and the proliferation of sexually transmitted infections.

5.2 It has also led to the growth of an adult generation many of whom have had no experience of a sound home and family environment, who are therefore generally poorly equipped to bring up their own children well. It has led to a generation of child-parents who are commonly similarly ill-equipped to raise children and train them in social responsibility, with sound concepts of parenting and family life. It is likely that future generations will judge that much recent SRE amounts to a form of child abuse.

5.3 There is therefore a need radically to revise our approach to SRE. Done effectively, following the recommendations above, this would contribute significantly to achieving the Government's target of reducing the rate of teenage pregnancy.

6. References:

1. *Sex and Relationship Education Guidance*, DfEE, July 2000.
2. *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People Are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially*. Linda Waite and Maggie Gallagher.
3. *Marriage-Lite: The Rise of Cohabitation and its Consequences*. Patricia Morgan, Civitas.
4. *The Facts Behind Cohabitation*. Civitas Factsheet.
5. *Are Married People Happier Than Unmarried People?* American Psychological Association Factsheet, 16 Mar 03.
6. *Marriage and Family in the United Kingdom – an Overview*. The Maranatha Community, October 2006, p12:

3.2.10 The years of decline in marriage and healthy family life have coincided with a substantial growth in suffering and unhappiness amongst adults and children.

- According to the BMA's report, 'Child and Adolescent Mental Health', reveals that 9.6% of children aged between 5 and 16 experience some kind of mental health disorder. In the 11-16 age group, 12.6% of boys and 10% of girls suffer from a mental disorder. Professor Skuse, professor of behavioural and brain science at the Institute of Child Health, Great Ormond Street, London, said at the launch of the report: "There does appear to have been a real increase over time which isn't due to increased recognition. There was around a 50% increase between the early 70s and mid 80s, and another 50% since the mid-80s in conduct disorders in boys." The BMA board called for adequate backing for child and adolescent mental health teams and improved services for children in care. Sir Charles George, chair of the board, said that only about a third of children excluded from school were referred to mental health specialists. (BMA, June 2006, 'Child & Adolescent Mental Health'; Guardian, 21.6.2006)
- Unmarried men & women occupy an astonishing 90% of all beds in hospital & care homes – up from an average of 70% during 1921-1971. That's 7 & 16 times respectively more than married men & women. (Prior & Hayes, 2003)
- According to a spokeswoman from the Department of Health, the number of child mental health cases seen increased by more than 40% between 2002 and 2005 (Guardian, 21.6.2006)
- Divorced fathers are far more likely to engage in risky behaviour, including drugs, alcohol and unsafe sex (Umberson, 1987; Wellings & al, 1994) Divorce makes young men & women twice as likely to increase their drinking. (Power & al, 1999)
- A psychological study by Dr. Richard Williams states that 40% of the nation's children now have mental health disorders, including psychosis, eating problems and suicidal tendencies. Leading psychologists say that the breakdown of the family has created a new generation of 'latchkey kids', many of whom suffer neglect and abuse. The British Psychological Society says one child in four suffered mental disorders, especially those who live in inner cities. (Sunday Telegraph 1.12.96)
- In the UK, divorced men aged 20-60 have 70%-100% higher mortality rates. Divorced women over the age of 25 have 35%-58% higher mortality rates (ONS, 2001 -Mortality). Mortality rates amongst cohabitantes is no different that that of singles. (Lillard & Waite, 1995)

3.2.11...

3.3 For centuries the concept of marriage has been a publicly-affirmed permanent and life-long union between one man and one woman. Those who seek to cohabit outside

marriage decide to enter into a sexual relationship without necessarily accepting mutual responsibility and long-term duties. Whereas some cohabit for many years, cohabitation is increasingly a temporary relationship without commitment. When one of the partners tires of the relationship they are free to walk out and establish further relationships. This often causes immense emotional and financial distress. Although some cohabitation situations continue for many years, sexual faithfulness is not generally a characteristic of cohabitation.

3.3.1...

3.3.2 Cohabiting women are disadvantaged as opposed to married women in terms of sexual disease.

- Women who are cohabiting are six times more likely to attend a clinic for sexually transmitted disease than married women. Cohabiting women are four times more likely to have an abortion than married women. (Jonson AM, Wadsworth J, Wellings K & Field J, 'Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles', Blackwell Scientific Publications, London, 1994)

3.3.3 Cohabitation is inevitably linked to unstable relationships.

- A major Home Office study found that unmarried men & women – single, cohabiting, separated or divorced – were more than twice as likely to experience domestic violence compared to married people. (Mirrlees-Black, Domestic violence: Findings from a new British crime survey self-completion questionnaire. London: Home Office, 1999)
- There are a number of differences between marriages and non-married partnerships. The level of commitment may be different. Cohabitors seem more likely to have lower quality and unstable relationships, and are more likely to have lower socio-economic status. (Brown SL "The Effect of Union Type on Psychological Wellbeing: Depression Cohabitants Versus Marrieds" Journal of Health and Social Behaviour 2000, pp 241-255)

3.3.4 Cohabitors are more likely to have drink problems.

- Cohabitors are shown to be the group with the highest alcohol abuse. Compared to married people, cohabiters reported 25% more alcohol problems, which was in turn insignificantly different from the figure for the unmarried. This was especially strong for males. Cohabiting men had significantly the highest levels of alcohol problems. Cohabiting provided no benefits in terms of depression or alcohol abuse, which suggests that the benefits from marriage do not originate solely from having someone with whom to live. (Chris M Wilson and Andrew J Oswald: How Does Marriage Affect Physical and Psychological Health? A Survey of the Longitudinal Evidence, January 2002)

7. Supporting Families. Government Green Paper, 1998.

"Marriage is the surest foundation for raising children and remains the choice of the majority of people in Britain."

8. Marriage and Family in the United Kingdom – an Overview. The Maranatha Community, October 2006, p6:

"At least one in three children will experience parental separation before the age of 16. Most of these children go through a period of unhappiness; many experience low self-esteem, behaviour problems, and loss of contact with part of the extended family. 'Foundations', Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2004, ref 314."

9. Ibid, p7:

"According to research by Professor C Lewis & Dr J Warin, fathers are just as important as mothers in a child's upbringing. The involvement of a father with their children aged 7-11 predicts exam success in exams at 16. Where fathers are involved before the age of 11, children are less

likely to have a criminal record by the age of 21. What good are Dads? Lewis & Warin, Fathers Direct Factsheet 2001.”

10. *Ibid*, pp 8-14:

3.2 The evidence of the damage inflicted upon children by dysfunctional families is now incontrovertible and it would be irresponsible to ignore it.

3.2.1 Children from broken families are poorer and more likely to be homeless.

- Children living in lone-parent households are twice as likely to be in the bottom 40% of household income distribution compared with children living in two-parent households (75% versus 40%). (*Households Below Average Income 1994/95-2000/01*, Department for Work and Pensions (2002), p50)
- Young adults from disrupted families are 1.7 times more likely to have experienced homelessness (6.2% compared with 3.6%). (Kiernan, 1997, 'The legacy of parental divorce: social, economic and family experiences in adulthood', London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics p21)
- Over 60,000 children live in care; 98% are admitted due to family breakdown. (Department of Health, 2002 Ref: 2002/0193)

3.2.2 Children from broken families have more ill health and higher mortality.

- 'Sudden Infant Death Syndrome' is 3 times more common amongst unmarried mothers and 7 times more common amongst single mothers, compared to married mothers (*Mortality Statistics Series DH3 33*, ONS, 2002)
- It has been estimated that parental divorce increases children's risk of developing health problems by 50%. (Mauldon, J (1990), 'The effects of marital disruption on children's health', *Demography* 27, pp 431-46)
- Children living in lone-parent households were 1.8 times as likely to have psychosomatic health symptoms and illness such as pains, headaches, stomach aches, and feeling sick. (Cockett and Tripp (1994), *The Exeter Family Study: Family Breakdown and Its Impact on Children*, p21)
- A Swedish study found that children of single parent families were 30% more likely to die over the 16-year study period. After controlling for poverty, children from single-parent families were: 56% more likely to show signs of mental illness, and 26% more likely to rate their health as poor. (Lundbert, O (1993), 'The impact of childhood living conditions on illness and mortality in adulthood', *Social Science and Medicine* 36, pp 1047-52)

3.2.4 Children from broken families are more likely to have emotional or mental problems.

- Among children aged five to fifteen years in Great Britain, those from lone-parent families were twice as likely to have a mental health problem as those from intact two-parent families (16% versus 8%). (Meltzer, H, et al (2000), *Mental Health of Children and Adolescents in Great Britain*, London: The Stationery Office)
- A major longitudinal study of 1,400 American families found that 20%–25% of children of divorce showed lasting signs of depression, impulsivity (risk-taking), irresponsibility, or antisocial behaviour compared with 10% of children in intact two-parent families. (Hetherington, M. (2002), *For Better or Worse: Divorce Reconsidered*, New York: WW Norton)
- One study, which followed 100 children of divorce through 25 years, found that, while the divorced parents may have felt liberated, many of their children suffered emotionally. (Wallerstein, J et al (2002), *The Unexpected Legacy of Divorce: A 25 Year Landmark Study*, London: Fusion Press)

- *After controlling for other demographic factors, children in lone-parent households are 2.5 times as likely to be sometimes or often unhappy. (Cockett and Tripp (1994), The Exeter Family Study: Family Breakdown and Its Impact on Children, p19)*

3.2.5 Children from broken families have more problems at school, including increased risk of truancy, being excluded from school and are more likely to leave school with no qualifications.

- *Children from lone-parent families are more likely to score poorly on tests of reading, mathematics, and thinking skills. (Elliott, J and Richards, M (1985), 'Parental divorce and the life chances of children', Family Law, 1991, pp 481–484; and Wadsworth, J, Burnell, I, Taylor, B, and Butler, N (1985), 'The influence of family type on children's behaviour and development at five years', Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 26, pp 245–254)*
- *After controlling for social class, level of parental supervision, attachment to family, whether peers and siblings were in trouble with the police and standard of work at school, boys in lone-parent households were still 2.7 times more likely to truant than those from two-natural-parent households. (Graham, J and Bowling, B (1995), Young People and Crime, London: Home Office, p120)*
- *Children living with a lone mother are three times more likely than those in two-parent families to be excluded from school (15.6% versus 4.8%). (Youth Survey 2001: Research Study Conducted for the Youth Justice Board (January–March 2001))*
- *Sixteen-year-olds from lone-parent households are twice as likely to leave school with no qualifications as those from intact families. Most studies have found that most or all of this increased risk occurs because lone-parent families generally are poorer, which in itself has a strong association with poor educational outcomes. (Ely, West, Sweeting and Richards (2000), 'Teenage Family Life, Life chances, lifestyles and health', pp 1–30)*

3.2.6 Children from broken families are at greater risk of suffering physical, emotional, or sexual abuse and to run away from home.

- *Data from the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) show that young people are five times more likely to have experienced physical abuse and emotional maltreatment if they grew up in a lone-parent family, compared with children in two-birth-parent families. (Cawson, P (2002), Child Maltreatment in the Family, London: NSPCC)*
- *All studies of child-abuse victims which look at family type identify the step-family as representing the highest risk to children – with the risk of fatal abuse being 100 times higher than in two biological-parent families according to international experts Daly and Wilson, drawing on US data from 1976. (Daly, M and Wilson, M (1988), Homicide, New York: Aldine de Gruyter)*
- *Analysis of 35 cases of fatal abuse which were the subject of public inquiries between 1968 and 1987 showed a risk for children living with their mother and an unrelated man which was over 70 times higher than it would have been for a child with two married biological parents. (Whelan, R (1994), Broken Homes and Battered Children, Oxford: Family Education Trust)*
- *Children from lone-parent families are twice as likely to run away from home as those from two-birth-parent families (14% compared to 7%). (Rees, G and Rutherford, C (2001), Home Run: Families and Young Runaways, London: The Children's Society)*
- *100,000 children run away from home every year. (Children's Society 2001)*

3.2.7 Children from broken families have more problems with sexual health, including earlier intercourse, increased risk of contracting STIs, and increased chances of becoming teenage parents.

- *Children from lone-parent households were more likely to have had intercourse before the age of 16 when compared with children from two-natural-parent households. Boys were 1.8*

times as likely and girls were 1.5 times as likely. After controlling for socio-economic status, level of communication with parents, educational levels and age at menarche for girls, the comparative odds of underage sex actually increased to 2.29 for boys and 1.65 for girls. Girls from lone-parent households were 1.6 times as likely to become mothers before the age of 18. (Wellings, K, Nanchahal, K, MacDowall, W, et al (2001), 'Sexual behaviour in Britain: Early heterosexual experience', *The Lancet* 358, pp 1843–50)

- In a sample of young women who had had intercourse before age 18, those from lone-parent households were 1.4 times as likely to have had a sexually transmitted infection by age 24 (14.3% versus 10.2%). Controlling for other factors slightly increased the comparative odds to 1.53. (Wellings, K, et al (2001), 'Sexual behaviour in Britain: Early heterosexual experience', pp 1843–50)
- Analysis of data from the National Child Development Study (NCDS) indicated that women whose parents had divorced were twice as likely to become teenage mothers as those from intact families (25% versus 14%). After controlling for childhood poverty and behavioural and educational problems, the odds for teenage motherhood and early fatherhood were reduced to 1.4. This means that children of divorce were still 40% more likely to become parents early, even after considering other family background factors. (Kiernan, K (September 1997), 'The legacy of parental divorce: Social, economic and family experiences in adulthood', London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics, pp 26–27)
- 17% of 15 year olds and 6% of 13-14 year olds in England attended NHS Family Planning Clinics in 2003/4. (NHS Contraceptive Services, Statistical Bulletin, 29/9/2004)

3.2.8 Children from broken families are more likely to smoke, to drink and to take drugs.

- In a sample of teenagers living in the West of Scotland, 15-year-olds from lone-parent households were twice as likely to be smokers as those from two-birth-parent homes (29% compared to 15%). After controlling for poverty, they were still 50% more likely to smoke. (Sweeting, H, et al (1998), 'Teenage family life, lifestyles and life chances. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family* 12, pp 15–46)
- In the West of Scotland, 18-year-old girls from lone-parent households were twice as likely to drink heavily as those from intact two-birthparent homes (17.6% compared to 9.2%). (Sweeting, et al (1998), 'Teenage Family life, lifestyles and life chances', pp 15–46)
- Parental divorce during childhood increased the odds of young adults engaging in heavy and/or problem drinking. The link was weak when measured at age 23, but was strong by age 33. (Hope, S, et al (1998), 'The relationship between parental separation in childhood and problem drinking in adulthood', *Addiction*; 93: pp 505–514)
- At age 15, boys from lone-parent households were twice as likely as those from intact two-birthparent households to have taken any drugs (22.4% compared with 10.8%). Girls from lone-parent homes were 25% more likely to have taken drugs by the age of 15 (8.2% compared with 6.5%) and 70% more likely to have taken drugs by age 18 (33.3% compared with 19.6%). After controlling for poverty, teenagers from lone-parent homes were still 50% more likely to take drugs. (Sweeting, et al (1998), 'Teenage Family life, lifestyles and life chances', pp 15–46)
- Approximately 800,000 children now have parents with alcohol addiction problems; 500,000 have parents with drug addiction problems. (Institute for Alcohol Studies, 2004; ACMD, 2003)
- Research suggests that 60% of drug-addicted mothers and 85% of fathers no longer look after their children. (Drug Misuse Research Project, Glasgow University 2004)

3.2.9 Children from broken families are more likely to be involved in criminal activity and more likely to be incarcerated.

- *Children from broken homes are 9 times more likely to become young offenders, accounting for 70% of all young offenders. (Youth Justice Board, 2002, Review 2001/02: Building on success. London: HMSO)*
- *39% of all male prisoners under 21 years old were in care. 70% of all prostitutes were in care. (Project Caleb Report, 2004)*
- *Those in care are 50 times more likely to be imprisoned, and 60 times more likely to be homeless. 75% have no educational qualification, and are 66 times more likely to have a child which will be institutionalized. (Project Caleb Report, 2004)*
- *Children aged 11 to 16 years were 25% more likely to have offended in the last year if they lived in lone-parent families. (Youth Survey 2001: Research Study Conducted for the Youth Justice Board (January–March 2001))*
- *Although 20% of all dependent children live in lone-parent families, 70% of young offenders identified by Youth Offending Teams come from lone-parent families. (Review 2001/2002: Building on Success, Youth Justice Board, London: The Stationery Office (July 2002))*
- *American studies have shown that boys from one-parent homes were twice as likely as those from two-birth-parent families to be incarcerated by the time they reached their early 30s. (Harper, C and McLanahan, S (August 1998), 'Father absence and youth incarceration', San Francisco: paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association)*

3.2.10 ...

3.2.11 *Clinical experience leaves us in no doubt that children need to be nurtured within a loving, stable and moral family environment in which their mother and father play their rightful roles, within a happy, married relationship.*

3.2.12 *A child constantly living under the shadow of the possibility of mother or father leaving the family home invariably suffers emotional stress, feelings of insecurity and often guilt. The collapse of their parents' relationship causes long-lasting emotional damage to the majority of the children involved.*

3.2.13 *Children of broken families experience rejection, confusion and fear. Many believe that they are to blame and such feelings of guilt are often carried into adulthood. Even when an arrangement is made by separated or divorced parents for access to the children, there is often a problem of divided loyalty and interrupted relationships which cause extreme confusion and instability to many children. They are left with no model of family for their future lives.*

3.2.14 *Children who do not have the security of living with a married mother and father face many obstacles in life.*

3.2.15 *The institution of marriage is designed to be a real safeguard for children, ensuring a natural continuity of affection, care, support and guidance.*

3.3...

3.3.1 *Children of cohabiters as opposed to children of married couples undoubtedly are disadvantaged.*

- *Children of cohabiting parents are 20 times more likely to be abused than children living with their married natural parents. Children living with a mother and a cohabitee who is not the child's father are 40 times more likely to be abused and the risk of fatal child abuse is 15 times more likely among cohabiting parents than among married natural parents.*

(Family Court Reporters Survey cited from 'Broken Homes and Battered Children, Family Education Trust 1994)

3.3.2...

3.4 ***If marriage is abandoned to other forms of living together such as cohabitation and same-sex partnerships, our entire society and especially our children will suffer.***

The adverse effects of family breakdown are devastating for the individuals concerned, especially children and society as a whole.

3.5 ***It has been argued that children do not suffer when their parents split up. However, the experience of vast numbers disproves this.***

- *In the United States, over 1 million children experience parental divorce annually. Approximately 20% to 25% develop mental health or adjustment problems twice the rate experienced by children from continuously married families. Meta-analyses of studies conducted between 1950 and 1999 indicated that children from divorced homes function more poorly than children from continuously married parents across a variety of domains, including academic achievement, social relations and conduct problems. They continue to be at risk for clinically significant mental health difficulties into adulthood, are more likely to receive mental health services, and have a shorter life expectancy, than those who grew up in two-parent families. (Winslow, E, B, Wolchik, S, A, & Sander, I, 2004, 'Preventative Interventions for Children of Divorce', Psychiatric Times, Vol. XXI Issue 2)*
- *A report entitled 'Friction within Families' from the Family Policy Studies Centre, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, discovered that two-thirds of the homeless teenagers they encountered were from broken homes. The report states "one of the major causes of youth homelessness is the change in family circumstances many young people experience because of the re-marriage or re-partnering of their own parents". (Daily Mail 16.3.98)*
- *Children of divorced parents frequently experience crisis in future relationships. A report by Kathleen Kiernan of the London School of Economics based on the lives of 11,400 children born in 1958 states, "by the age of 33, more than four out of ten children of divorced parents had seen their own live-in relationship or marriage break up". "Parental divorce may be directly implicated in that children of these unions carry a legacy of doubt and vulnerability... Undoubtedly children benefit from being raised in an emotionally and economically secure two-parent family". (Daily Mail 30.9.97)*
- *A psychological study by Dr. Richard Williams states that 40% of the nation's children now have mental health disorders, including psychosis, eating problems and suicidal tendencies. Leading psychologists say that the breakdown of the family has created a new generation of 'latchkey kids', many of whom suffer neglect and abuse. The British Psychological Society says one child in four suffered mental disorders, especially those who live in inner cities. (Sunday Telegraph 1.12.96)*

11. *Ibid, p27:*

- **Importance of two-parent families**

According to research sponsored by the Economic and Social Research Council and led by Professor Sarah Curtis of London University, children are happier and have better chances in life if they are brought up in two-parent families. Research focused on 2,790 children aged 11-14 from East London and researchers discovered that children suffered more mental distress if they came from broken homes. (Daily Mail 12.1.05)

12. *Ibid, p30:*

- **Generational effects of broken homes**

Children from broken homes face far greater risks in all major areas of life. They are more likely to experience hardships – whether low income, unemployment, poverty, or homelessness. They are more likely to experience problems – whether to well-being, health or crime. They are

more likely to be unsuccessful – whether at school, at work or in relationships They are more likely to avoid marriage and more likely to divorce if they do marry (O'Neill, 2002, *The Fatherless Family*, London. CIVITAS)

13. *Ibid*, p4:

“A major UK study found that parental divorce before age 10 was a major predictor of later adolescent delinquency and adult criminality. Implications of Criminal Career Research for the Prevention of Offending, Farrington, *Journal of Adolescence* 13, 1990”

14. *Sex Education and Sex Practice*. LFW Eickhoff, *Child and Family*, Vol 13 No 1, undated reprint pp 2, 3:

“This study among juvenile delinquents notes that where instruction was given that induced full sexual awareness, or imparted an understanding of the full significance of the genital parts, in advance of the natural order, ie before the individual could manage his own living independent of parent figures or like other adults, instead of after, as is the rule throughout the living world, then without exception sex education preceded sex practice that itself preceded the ability to live independently. Thus the offenders were performing as adults before they had outgrown childhood.”

15. *What's wrong with Sex Education?* Melvin Anchell MD, Central Bureau of the Catholic Central Verein of America and Human Life International, ISBN 0 9626257 4 4, p2:

“Many acts of gangsterism, prostitution or criminality in young girls are the consequence of a violent interruption of early puberty with its harmless girl-girl relationships by heterosexual acts for which they are not yet really ready... Premature heterosexual experiences produce disturbances in the development of a girl's whole personality.” (From *The Psychology of Women*, Helen Deutsch MD, cited in above.)

16. *Marriage and Family in the United Kingdom – an Overview*. The Maranatha Community, October 2006, p35:

• **Broken homes fuel rising crime says judge**

Judge John Curran addressing an all-Wales High Sheriffs' Seminar in Cardiff said that the broken home was at the root of much of the crime he saw. The absence of a responsible male role model and the failure to stamp out disruptive behaviour was setting too many children on a course of under achievement and crime. The Judge, who has 40 years experience in criminal law said “Society had to recognise that single teenage mothers often made bad parents because they were too young to raise children properly”. He predicated that unless more was done to encourage parents to stay together and teach them how to bring up a happy, well-adjusted child, the problem would only get worse. He said “A depressingly common theme of the early lives of offenders, as revealed by my own long experience and in the reports I read, is the separation of the parents at a very early stage of the child's life”. He said the vast majority of separate parents did raise their children successfully – “the fact is, however, that all too many of those who end up in the criminal justice system do so against a background of an absent parent – usually the father”. He said “If there is one thing a boy needs in life, it is the interest and good example of a concerned and responsible father. So many offenders have not had that advantage and it cannot be a coincidence”. Judge Curran also condemned sex education which sometimes merely amounted to “an instruction manual in how to have intercourse”, drug taking and binge drinking. He said that cracking down on drug abuse and binge drinking were vital – “the children swigging lager from a can in the park or outside the local shop are prime candidates for the drift into crime. (Daily Mail 8.11.05)

17. *Submission to the School Curriculum & Assessment Authority in connection with the National Forum for Values in Education and the Community*, The Maranatha Community, December 1996:

(1) The institution of marriage is fundamental to the stability and well-being of our society. The state and therefore the educational system, inevitably has a direct interest in this institution.

(2) *Our national culture is based upon it being considered normal and healthy for children to live in families, cared for by loving, responsible mothers and fathers and other relatives, safeguarded by the security of the marriage commitment.*

(3) *Marriage is a means of establishing through personal commitment and agreement a life-long, secure and loving environment for children.*

(4) *Marriage cannot be seen as one of several equally valid lifestyles. It is a legally recognised means of protecting children's interests, quite distinct from co-habitation. It helps to ensure healthy male and female influences upon children in their formative years, particularly when they need role models.*

(5) *During recent years large numbers of children have experienced insecurity, rejection, confusion and fear through the increasing breakdown of marriages. Marriage failure undoubtedly causes many children an immense amount of suffering and children who are casualties often carry a burden of pain and guilt into their adulthood. Even when an arrangement is made after a divorce for access to the children by both parents there is often a problem of divided loyalty and interrupted relationships which can cause extreme confusion and instability to children.*

(6) *It needs to be recognised that the destruction of healthy long-term relationships in marriage and family has immense social consequences. As a nation we have the responsibility to ensure that our educational system upholds marriage and the family, and prepares children and young people for it in every possible way.*

(7) *It is both essential and now a matter of extreme urgency that the school curriculum includes clear moral and spiritual instruction and preparation for married life. The concept of family should be positively promoted.*

(8) *A child is a human being with rights. Children have the right to be prepared for married relationship, particularly at a time when there are so many destructive influences being brought to bear upon them which damage and often destroy their understanding of healthy human relationships.*

(9) *The overwhelming majority of people in the United Kingdom wish to have their children properly prepared for marriage in school. They have stated in recent public opinion polls that they believe moral teaching in schools should focus on marriage and the traditional family. It is important that the views of those minorities which dismiss the value of family and life-long marriage should not be imposed against the will of the majority.*

(10) *The crucial relationships in life which will be experienced by our children will be those within the context of marriage and family. The nation has a heavy responsibility to make a positive contribution to pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development in this respect. If we fail to do this we will be under the judgment of future generations.*

(11) *Children develop healthy human relationships and a moral framework for life within the context of marriage and the family. Children who are deprived of this context are vulnerable to many of the destructive influences in contemporary society, including violence and crime, drug abuse and promiscuity. If marriage continues to be neglected there will inevitably be an enormous increase in human suffering.*

Evidential Notes:

The Crisis

The number of divorces has doubled since 1971. (Office of Populations Censuses & Surveys)

In 1990 a record of 192,000 divorce petitions were filed in England and Wales. (OPCS)

The United Kingdom has the second highest divorce rate in Europe. (Statistical Office of European Communities)

10% of divorces occurred within two years of marriage in 1990. (OPCS/GROS)

24.9% of divorces in 1990 involved people divorced in a previous marriage. (OPCS)

750,000 British children have no contact with their fathers following the breakdown of marital relationships. (Family Policies Study Centre Survey of Lone Parents)

1,300,000 lone parents are bringing up children in Britain. (Social Security Minister in the Daily Mail 14.9.94)

There has been a 600% increase in marriage breakdown since 1961. (Movement for Christian Democracy)

The Wish of the People

A Gallup poll has revealed that 75% of the public believe that schools should teach that marriage is a good thing. (Sunday Telegraph 3rd November 1996)

An Audience Selection poll in the 'People' newspaper has revealed that 73% believed that moral teaching in schools should focus on marriage and the traditional family.

The State's Interest

The Lord Chancellor, Lord Mackay, in an interview, stated 'marriage is a relationship in which the state has an interest'. There is a 'need for stability as a background to the development of children'. He declared 'It's a human relationship in which children look for stability. If they've got two people today Mummy and Daddy, and tomorrow Daddy and another person; this introduces an insecurity, a confusion in the children's understanding. Research shows this to impede very seriously their development.' (Children in Focus, 1994)

The Consequences of Broken Marriage

Antony Clare, Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, states studies in Britain and the United States strongly suggest that divorce has an impact on children which lasts into adulthood and affects their personal relationships later on. He adds 'society is directly affected by the human debris of broken families.'

In her book 'Farewell to the Family?', Patricia Morgan, spells out how the traditional family has been systematically undermined and warns of the dire social consequences. She reveals how marriage is ceasing to be recognised by the legal and fiscal systems and she warns of the emergence of a new 'warrior class' of men without family and domestic responsibility and for whom 'status is defined by predatory sexual behaviour and violent seizure of other peoples' property'. (The Institute of Economic Affairs - January 1995)

'Studies show that illegitimate children tend to be disadvantaged in every way.' (Norman Dennis Reader in Social Studies - Daily Mail 19.9.94)

'Crime and the Family' (Family Policy Studies Centre 1994) points to the growing numbers of people who have lost the skills of bringing up children, resulting in increasing anti-social behaviour by young people. Referring to parents the report says 'they have lost their ability to sustain long-lasting monitoring and correction of their children's behaviour' and 'parents' control over teenagers in a society where adolescents have more autonomy than ever before, is increasingly difficult'.

10,000 children telephone 'Childline' for help every day. (Times 7.1.95)

343,000 children and young people have been counselled by 'Childline' since its formation in October 1986. (Childline December 1993.)

64,000 children and young people are in Local Authority care in Great Britain. (The Children's Society: Spotlight on leaving care.)

Nearly 100,000 young people go missing in Britain each year. ('Young runaways' - Children's Society 1989.)

18. Teenage Parenthood – Response, The Maranatha Community, 12.11.98:

(1) Why do you think the rate of teenage pregnancy is higher in the UK than in the rest of Western Europe?

...The teaching of responsible parenthood has been grossly neglected in our schools. The presentation of sex in purely biological terms has been a failure. The teaching of responsible parenthood has been totally neglected. In addition to this teenagers are currently being presented with abortion as a legitimate form of family planning. The cumulative effect of all this has been a widespread rejection of moral standards and an increase in sexual activity at an unnaturally early age. This, in turn, has led to enormous increases in the rate of teenage pregnancy. A large proportion of teenagers who are pregnant, are searching for the love which they have been deprived of at home and are vulnerable to exploitation.

(2) By how much do you think it is realistic to aim to reduce rates of teenage and underage parenthood and over what period? Why? On what does it depend?

...The sweeping away of morality in the decades since 1960, together with more readily available contraception, coincided with an astronomical rise in the rate of illegitimacy. The provision of contraception does not deal with the fundamental problem of teenage parenthood. If we are to reverse the trend towards still higher rates of teenage parenthood and the real suffering and depravation associated with it, we must admit that society has got it wrong and that the tolerance of promiscuity has led to huge suffering, both in terms of children and young parents.

(3) In your view, what unintended effects do we need to be wary of in developing a strategy on this issue?

There is a very real danger that sex education, divorced from morality will concentrate interest in the physical sex act, sometimes to a grossly abnormal degree. We have much evidence of children under the age of 10 being severely emotionally disturbed by the crude presentation of sexual matters within the context of the educational system. The unintended side effects of much sex education can be a debasing of human relationships and the forcing upon children of practices which they would rarely otherwise encounter.

(4) Why have previous attempts to tackle this issue not succeeded?

The idea that information divorced from value judgement or moral guidance can reduce teenage pregnancy has proved fallacious. All the efforts to reduce teenage parenthood through the active promotion of contraception and abortion have failed...

(5) What approaches do you think would be most successful?

Closer collaboration between parents, teachers, doctors and the churches in the context of a commonly agreed framework would be helpful. Experience shows that parents can and do influence their children if they have readily available and suitable material.

Teenagers need to be helped to understand that inclinations do not have to be followed up. A healthy approach to sexuality will protect young people from the enormous pressures to give in to their own quite natural sexual promptings.

There are two issues which urgently need to be faced. Firstly, it needs to be taught that self-control is the fundamental element of adult civilised society. Secondly, we must all face up to the fact that children are now cruelly targeted for purely commercial gain in terms of encouraging their sexual activity. Huge profits are made by children's and young persons magazines that exploit sex. In a number of these magazines published this year the majority of the articles dealt with sex. Deliberate efforts are made to heighten an interest in sex to a level of obsession. In addition to this, the manufacturers of condoms unscrupulously target the youth market.

A co-ordinated national policy could help young people to understand the nature of mature relationships and protect them from the very powerful and readily accessible commercial influences around them. Teaching on responsible sexual behaviour will have little effect if it is constantly denied by a manipulated teenage culture, which endorses and encourages promiscuity.

(7) If, for example, you work with some of these groups, can you give us unpublished data or other information that would throw more light on the extent and nature of some of these connections?...

...In our experience there is no evidence to show that the presenting of factual information in sex classes has done anything to reduce risk-taking in sexual encounters. Quite the reverse. Many young people are encouraged to have an unhealthy attitude towards sexual relations and are often deliberately introduced to practices which would be generally regarded as abnormal and deviant. The biggest single danger introduced in contemporary sex education is divorcing the sex act from a married relationship. If we continue to deny our children teaching about stable married relationship we will directly contribute to the collapse of marriage and family life in coming generations. Marriage is a fundamental building block of Western civilisation and if we allow it to be destroyed the disintegration of society is inevitable. If sex is dissociated from love it will inevitably still further increase the number of emotionally and physically damaged young people, many of whom we currently counsel...

(8) How do you think sex and relationship education in schools could be improved?

There needs to be a greater emphasis upon loving, caring and stable relationships. The issue of marriage should no longer be dodged. The value of life-long committed relationships between husband and wife should be underscored. Our children should be taught the tremendous responsibility which they carry in any human relationship. In particular, they need to be taught that when entering into a physical sexual relationship they are involved in the potential creation of a life which will be lived by someone for decades, unless ended in abortion. Children need to be taught that there are very real physical and emotional dangers in having sex too early. This is a factor which has been totally ignored by agencies such as the Family Planning Association and the Brook Clinics who have freely provided contraception to young girls without warning them that early sex can lead to cervical cancer. Similarly, children need to be taught that the various methods of birth control do not completely protect them from sexually transmitted diseases or unplanned pregnancy. Children have been presented with the lie that there is 'safe sex'. Fortunately, reference is now being made to 'safer' sex. If we are going to present to children the thesis that 'risky' sex is acceptable we will inevitably leading to a debasement in the way in which our young people value life.

To our knowledge many teenagers themselves are saying that they are in an educational moral vacuum. They frequently tells us that they would welcome direction and guidance. This guidance can remove the enormous peer pressure under which young people feel coerced to conform to perceived and unacceptable standards of moral behaviour and sexual experimentation.

(9) How early in a child's schooling should it start and with what?

To present sexual activity to immature children can be extremely damaging and even traumatic. There are many instances of children under the age of 10 who have been presented with sex education who have had nightmares concerning whether they are 'homosexual' or whether they are 'abnormal' because they have not experimented sexually. To subject children to inappropriate sex education can be tantamount to child abuse.

Basic sex education in school should in our opinion commence at 10 because of the early maturation of boys and girls. Comprehensive sex education should in our view commence at 13.

The presentation of factual information should be carefully balanced with modesty and self-respect and always within the context of a moral framework.

(10) Who do you think can best conduct sex and relationship education in schools?

The first requirement of anyone giving sex education must surely be to have a sound understanding of relationships and the moral framework of society. He or she ought to be a person of integrity and seen as a reliable role model.

(12) What topics should be covered in classes? What do you think should not be covered?

Sex education must always be in the context of the security of marriage. This must be taught as the ideal. It is important for children to understand that marriage and family have been the foundation of civilised society for centuries.

Abnormal or deviant sexual activity should not be dealt with other than in the context of warning about the serious consequences.

(15) How can parents and carers best be involved?

Parents and carers should be informed at every stage in advance of any teaching and they should be consulted constantly in terms of the content of lessons.

(17) Should sex and relationship education be part of the national curriculum?

Sex and relationship education should be part of the national curriculum conditional upon children being taught that marriage is the normal and ideal relationship.

(18) Should parents continue to have the right to remove their children from sex education classes?

The state has no right to teach sexual standards to children against the will of their parents. Every parent should have the right to withdraw their child from any form of sex or relationship education which conflicts with their moral standards or religious beliefs. To do otherwise would be to move dangerously close to a totalitarian approach to education.

(19) How can classroom based sex and relationships education be linked to other sources of information in or outside school?

Children should be taught the truth about sexually transmitted disease. This could be presented in conjunction with local General Practitioners or Health Authorities. Much polemical information concerning AIDS such as material distributed by the Terrence Higgins Trust is potentially extremely damaging to children because of a rejection of morality, the use of foul language and illustrations which most people regard as pornographic. Notwithstanding this older children should be given basic clinical information about risks in sexual behaviour. In particular, boys should be warned that anal intercourse is physically damaging and extremely dangerous in terms of receiving and passing on disease. The fact that condoms do not provide a fail-safe resistance to either disease or conception should be made clear to all teenagers. In the entire process of sexual education, care should be taken to protect children from the influence of those seeking to inflict propaganda on them.

They should also learn that those who maintain traditional standards of morality are less likely to experience marriage breakdown, than those who do not.

Children should be fully aware that the divorce rates for couples living together before marriage are extremely high, whereas the divorce rate for couples who are virgins when they marry is extremely low.

(20) Are those who teach sex and relationships education routinely kept in touch with wider local cross agency strategies into which their work fits?

Sex education should always be in the context of responsible behaviour in the wider community. At present there is a breakdown of a coherent strategy due to different and conflicting value systems and beliefs. The AIDS crisis has caused widespread confusion among the young and has also led to a situation in which fundamental factual information has not been readily available. For example, many teenagers still believe the fiction that the use of a condom gives total protection against AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. Similarly, many young people are totally

unaware of the physical and emotional consequences of abortion and, therefore, treat it lightly. Invariably those who had abortions as teenagers deeply regret this in later life.

19. *Sex under Sixteen*. Clifford Hill, Family Education Trust. ISBN 0 906229 15 4, p 59:

"In summary, our research indicates that the incidence of early sex and teenage pregnancy could be reduced by:

1) Strengthening marriage relationships so that more young people are living in a protective home environment with the benefit of two parents as role models.

2) Increased communication between parents and children so that sexual matters and relationships become a natural part of family life before young people reach their teenage years.

3) Parents taking greater care concerning the teenage magazines, TV programmes, videos and other media which exert an influence upon their children's lives.

4) Young people, especially girls, being made fully aware of the difficulties faced by young mothers with babies and the problems of child-rearing.

5) Young people being taught the dangers to health of early sexual activity, especially where multiple partners are involved.

6) Young people being made more aware of the dangers of alcohol and drugs in lowering their resistance to sexual activity."

20. *The Safe Sex Hoax*, Dr Margaret White, Family Welfare Project, ISBN 0 9533454 0 8.

21. *An inquiry into the relationship between the state and the family in the upbringing of children – Submission to the Commission on Families and the Wellbeing of Children established by the National Family and Parenting Institute and NCH, the children's charity; The Maranatha Community in association with the Council for Health and Wholeness, p 4:*

"Marriage is a public, covenanted commitment which generates stability in families, communities and nations. Most families are marriage based and there is overwhelming evidence that the majority of children and young people consider marriage to be the ideal form of living together...It is accepted that during the last thirty years there has been a sustained campaign by secular humanists and others to get rid of the basic concept of marriage. This has led to multiple partnerships or at least many sequential partnerships, which has directly contributed to an unprecedented level of family breakdown."

22. *Ibid*, p 8

*"Much of the guidance for teachers of sex and relationship education (SRE) in schools emphasises the importance of a 'value-free' approach to relationships. **This is despite [] a huge body of evidence, including the recent OFSTED report, that shows SRE must be moral-based.** As part of SRE, different family constellations should be discussed as being equally valid and acceptable. In a sex education pack intended for primary schools, beginning with key stage one, the teacher is encouraged to discuss different family arrangements, for example children living with married or unmarried parents, single parents, lesbian, gay and bisexual parents, grandparents etc. Teachers are instructed that 'it is important not to try to 'promote' a particular type of home life as the norm or superior' (Julian Cohen, *Primary School Sex and Relationships Education Pack, Healthwise 2001 p 22*), despite the overwhelming majority of families still being marriage-based. Thus, children are not being taught that marriage is the most beneficial family structure, to be discarded at our peril. **This is in direct contradiction with the Government's so-called evidence-based approach.** Serious questions are being asked by parents all over the UK as to why such a minority, and clearly detrimental, ideology is being imposed on so many children."*

23. *The National Strategy for Sexual Health and HIV – Submission to the Health Committee at the House of Commons, The Maranatha Community, June 2002:*

1.15 It is beyond dispute that the marriage-based family is a public institution and is the basic building block of a civilised society. Its erosion and destruction [have] immense consequences

which no politician dare ignore. It is equally beyond dispute that the marriage-based family not only saves huge financial resources which would otherwise be spent on supporting other, largely dysfunctional family structures, but also makes a major contribution to the diminution of sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancies.

4.1 Educational material should be produced warning of the huge dangers of promiscuity and should be intensively promoted throughout the country particularly amongst young people.

24. *A Five Year Sexual Health Promotion strategy and action plan – Submission by the Maranatha Community, Northern Ireland, March 2004 pp 2, 7, 9, 10:*

2.8 Pervading cultural influences, powerful commercial interests and enormous peer pressure, particularly on the young have sought to normalise and even promote promiscuity. The influence of the media, with its resolute mocking of monogamy, and a now obsessive emphasis on sexual matters has undoubtedly been formative. The erosion of the marriage-based family has clearly led to a situation in which a growing number of people have a range of sexual partners, with all the attendant, but avoidable, social, emotional and medical problems.

2.9 In this situation public policy has, in the main, been reactive rather than pro-active. In a changing culture, government has been drawn into so-called educational processes which often do little other than introduce participants to new and often dangerous sexual practices.

2.11 There appears to be a fear of giving factual information about real risks and a refusal to actively promote anything remotely related to the formation of mature, stable and adult human relationships in which restraint, mutual respect and love are major constituents.

2.15 It is beyond dispute that the marriage-based family is a public institution and is the basic building block of a civilised society. Yet the marriage-based family is under severe threat, not least from the policies of recent governments. Its erosion and destruction has immense consequences which no politician dare ignore. It is equally beyond dispute that the marriage-based family not only saves huge financial resources which would otherwise be spent on supporting other, largely dysfunctional family structures, but also makes a major contribution to the diminution of sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancies.

2.16 It would therefore seem sensible for government to put far greater emphasis upon the support of the marriage-based family, rather than pursuing the policies of recent years in which married couples have been increasingly penalised and all other forms of co-habitation are presented as equally acceptable.

6.2 There is a very real danger that sex education, divorced from morality, will concentrate interest in the physical sex act. The unintended side effects of much sex education can be a debasing of human relationships and the forcing upon children of ideas and practices which they would rarely otherwise encounter.

6.3 Through the process of 'values clarification', pupils are encouraged to develop their own values and reject the values of their parents and the inherited Christian values of society. They are also encouraged to reject the concept of absolute 'right' or 'wrong'. This then inevitably leads to adoption of so-called 'situational ethics' where what is right or wrong is totally dependent on the situation. For example there may be a feeling that it is right to engage in homosexual sex, sex with animals, sex with children or dead people. This feeling would be presented as 'right' under those circumstances which are 'right for the person concerned'. It is often suggested that the presentation of basic standards should be rejected as 'moralising' or 'preaching'. The rejection of moral absolutes and standards is clearly expressed in the frequently used term 'informed choices', which the consultation document also uses.

8.1 At a time when Government, the National Health Service and Educational Establishments are working to reduce health risks by addressing life-style factors such as smoking, excess alcohol consumption and drug abuse it is of very grave concern that people are being encouraged to regard unnatural and deviant practices such as anal intercourse, as normal. Sadly they are not being clearly informed of the fact that this is an extremely unhealthy and high-risk activity.

8.2 A substantial volume of medical information exists warning of the consequences and risks of alternative sexual practices and a group of medical professionals has spelt these out in a statement published by 'The Council for Health and Wholeness'.

8.3 Rarely in sexual educational material in current use do we see warnings about the serious consequences of anal intercourse.

9.2 There is increasing evidence on the positive impact that abstinence-based sex education programmes are having in the US, leading to a reduction of teenage pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases.

9.3 One of the most dramatic examples of sexual health policy based on abstinence until marriage comes from Uganda, a country that unlike the UK, has dramatically reduced STIs, in particular HIV. Among some groups, the reduction of HIV was up to 80%. The main reason for the success in Uganda was the reduction in casual sex/promiscuity rather than the promotion of condoms.

9.4 In Uganda, HIV rates fell nationally from 21% to 9.8% between 1991–1998, continuing to fall to 6.4% among pregnant women. The most important factor in this decline is a decrease in non-regular partners by two-thirds. While condom use increased somewhat, the unique factor in Uganda was the steep decline in multiple sexual relationships. Uganda promotes 'ABC' as the basis of sex and relationship education: ABC stands for 'Abstinence (no sex before marriage), Be faithful, or use Condoms', in that order of emphasis. It is not 'abstinence only' or 'condoms only'. Condoms are needed if 'A' or 'B' fails! Research has shown that the most important factor of ABC is B – be faithful.

25. *Sex and Social Engineering – How the Sex Education Lobby is undermining society*, Valerie Riches, The Family Education Trust, ISBN 0 9062290 4 9, p8:

"For nearly two thousand years in the Western world, there has been a basic commitment to the ideal, if not always the practice, of associating sex with love and faithfulness in the context of monogamous marriage. However, towards the [middle of the 20th] century great changes took place, quite different in nature from previous periods of permissive sexual behaviour."

26. *Our Christian Identity*, The Maranatha Community, July 2008, pp 33-37, 66-67:

9. The Abandonment of Christian Sexual Morality

9.1 The Sexualisation of Society

There has been an explosion of sexualisation of society, with sex increasingly being presented on television, in magazines, in newspapers and, especially, on the Internet. There has been a huge increase in the availability of pornography. The United Kingdom now has a daily pornographic newspaper available from most newsagents. There is a string of sex shops across the land selling pornographic films.

By the mid-90's around 80% of internet traffic was pornographic and by 2003, there were over 260 million pornographic websites. The sex trade in the United Kingdom is now a multi-million-pound business.

The sexual revolution, with the provision of the pill to unmarried women and girls and condoms to children, has been part of the huge attack on marriage and the family. The rejection of basic Christian standards of sexual morality has led to a spawning of child abuse and child pornography. Sex clinics are now overcrowded and it is freely admitted that sexually transmitted diseases in the UK are out of control, with an epidemic of chlamydia, gonorrhoea and syphilis and the highest number of HIV cases ever diagnosed.

This has been the very high price paid for turning away from Biblical standards of sexual behaviour. The Bible speaks of righteousness, ie, right relationships. When wrong relationships

are fostered and practised great harm results. The absence of Christian values has led to moral confusion and great human misery.

9.2 The Sexualising of Children

There has been a calculated effort to rob our children of the proper freedoms of childhood and the constructive guidelines of Christian morality.

- **Kinsey**

Alfred Kinsey, a fierce opponent of Christian sexual morality, was the author of reports which are now largely discredited, and even considered fraudulent. A paedophile, he regarded extra-marital sexual intercourse as desirable.

- **SIECUS**

The Sex Information and Educational Council of the USA (SIECUS) has had a profound influence on sex education in Britain over the past 40 years. In their guide "Sex, Science and Values", they stated, "The strict Judaeo-Christian codes inherited from the past in which chastity is prescribed are being challenged. Rational inquiry is replacing blind faith... a so-called new morality is being ushered in". They freely admitted that they "do not see right and wrong as eternal entities", rather they "distinguish between what is wise and foolish in actions that vary according to time, place and circumstance".

- **Mace**

A founder member of SIECUS, David Mace, who has strongly influenced British sex education, pressed very hard for children to be opened up to their sexuality. He said, "On reaching puberty, boys and girls would freely gratify their sexual urges as they arose and will be free to do so throughout the rest of their lives... it would be entirely proper to invite any other person of either sex or age group to participate in any kind of sexual experience – on a couple or group basis".

- **Cole**

Dr Martin Cole, a genetics lecturer at Aston University and a strong antagonist towards the Christian faith, produced sex educational material which is widely used. He promoted youth camps where young people could be promiscuous provided they used contraception. He wrote, "I think teenagers should be promiscuous – it can be a very vital and important part of growing up". His philosophy followed the teachings of Havelock Ellis, who defined progress as "a gradual emancipation from morals".

- **Brook**

When Brook Clinic produced their document "Safe Sex for Teenagers" in 1978, they said, "We must be prepared to challenge established attitudes that sexual activity in young people is dangerous... there are still too many workers in birth control clinics who believe consciously and unconsciously that sex before 16 is sinful". Brook deliberately avoided giving any moral guidance to children and simply stated their job to be that of helping young people to "make informed choices".

- **Secularists**

The National Secular Society, a campaigning anti-Christian group, produced a booklet, "The Erroneous Zone", which strongly opposed what was called "moralistic approaches" to teenage sexual behaviour. It was included in the FPA booklist and said, "We have to remove the anti-sex attitudes of a traditional moral code and particularly the influence of the churches".

- **Humanists**

The Student Humanist Federation produced a booklet, "Sexual Morals", which accepted the principle of multi-partnering and which totally rejected the Christian ethic.

- **Family Planning Association**

The campaign "Sexualise Children" was intensified by the Family Planning Association (FPA), whose former press officer, Wendy Smith, wrote in a teenage magazine, "There is no reason

why a girl shouldn't carry a sheath around with her all the time so that if the situation arises when she wants to sleep with a boy, she can ensure that he wears one".

- **Health Education Council**

A sex education manual entitled "Make It Happy" (Virago Press) was endorsed by the FPA and promoted by the Health Education Council, even though the book, commenting on incest, said, "When this is between sisters and brothers it can be a loving sexual relationship". Referring to group masturbation, the book said, "If that's how you enjoy it, there is nothing wrong in sharing sex in this way".

- **Paedophiles**

The de-Christianising process was further developed in the sex manual, "Boy, Girl, Man, Woman", by Bent Glaesson, in which paedophiles are described as being generally "kindly people who treat the children tenderly and affectionately".

- **Health Education Authority**

The publicly funded Health Education Authority published a sex education booklet, "Your Pocket Guide to Sex". Written by the Agony Aunt of a teenage magazine, "Just Seventeen", it contained information on the use of vibrators, oral sex and masturbation and stated that "the number of people who you have sex with is much less important than how you have sex".

Children are no longer taught the sanctity and advantages of the marriage-based family. There are no references to husband and wife, and the teaching of chastity is banned. The Health Education Authority said in 1999 that children should be taught "that there are strong and mutually supported relationships outside marriage". (Love Life – Sexual Health for Young People, HEA; Your Pocket Guide to Sex, HEA)

The concepts of fidelity and modesty, and the need for respect for others and self-restraint, together with most other Christian virtues, are dismissed by many people in the sex education business, who do not believe anything is intrinsically right or wrong.

- **FPA**

The FPA, in their booklet "4 Boys", boldly state "your body is yours to share with whom ever you choose".

- **Stopes**

Marie Stopes International, in their publication "Our Passport to Sexual Health", actively promote sexual activity amongst the young, telling young people, "A foreign holiday still holds promise of sun, sea and sex". It urges young holidaymakers always to take condoms with them in order that they should fully enjoy the holiday.

- **Healthwise**

Sex education promoters such as Healthwise sweep aside Christian moral standards, and in their pack "The Primary Schools Sex and Relationship" (1999 edition) say, "In the past some people have suggested narrow moralistic aims for sex education. This has included suggestions such as promoting marriage and family, dissuading children from having sex before marriage, telling children what is right and wrong, etc, in a manner which has more to do with propaganda than with education".

- **LDA**

In the book "Knowing Me, Knowing You", published by LDA Learning, teachers are advised that to teach about the traditional family "might well be downright offensive to some".

Sexual relationships are thus being presented to children as a recreational activity with no further significance, debasing the fundamentals of human relationship. The truth is, of course, that the humanist sex education campaigners are themselves engaged in fierce propaganda to influence children.

Christians have always put great importance on providing children with teaching about stable life-long family environments. Many of the sex educationists are deliberately preparing children for a

life of promiscuous sex. Rarely, if ever, do they warn of the immense physical, emotional and social consequences of this. Immature children are now bombarded with images of sex on all sides. There appears to be an unholy alliance between libertarianism and consumerism, with innocent children inevitably being the victims, freely exploited regardless of the consequences.

There is a high price to pay for the rejection of basic Christian teaching. Christ himself warned that “whoever harms the least of these little ones, it would be better for him to be thrown into the water with a millstone around his neck”.

Children are having children, and children are having abortions – in many cases without the knowledge or approval of their parents or their doctors. The de-Christianising of our nation is more evident among children and the young than anywhere else. Promiscuity is promoted, teaching about chastity is banned.

- **Educationists promoted corruption of children**

A Scottish Executive approved reading list includes a teaching guide, “Taking Sex Seriously”, which recommends teachers to encourage children as young as 11 to think about “all the different sexual activities that two people can do together”. The booklet suggests sado-masochism, group sex and unnatural sexual practices as suitable subjects for discussion. The National Executive Officer of the NASUWT Teaching Union said, “This is encouraging deviancy among our children and is morally bankrupt.” The Scotsman commented, “We believe the vast majority of parents – who have not, of course, been consulted in the matter – will find [this] utterly unacceptable, and will be outraged that the proposals have got as far as they have.” (The Scotsman 29/03/01)

- **Human-animal sex presented to children**

Upbury Arts College in Medway, Kent has withdrawn a school worksheet in which pupils were asked to debate the merits of sex with animals and dead people, after parents complained. Rebecca Linnell, 13, said, “We shouldn’t be taught things like that.” (The Times 17/01/03)

- **Primary school children corrupted**

Mothers who were shown just the first 15 minutes of a sex education series entitled “Living and Growing” by Channel 4 were horrified and condemned it as “virtually pornographic”. They begged teachers not to use it, saying that it would encourage sexual experimentation.

Officials want to use it in primary schools by September. Five-year-olds would be shown illustrations of a naked man and woman and asked to label parts of their bodies. A film for slightly older children shows an animation of a couple having sex. It then discusses masturbation, gay and lesbian relationships and the purpose of condoms. Thousands of packs of this course have been sold.

Julie Anne Luisis, whose five-year-old daughter Charlotte attends the Cambell Infant School in Dagenham, said it would encourage younger children to experiment. She said, “Some parents were virtually in tears.” Michelle Heggarty, a mother of three, said, “They should not be taught sex education at that age.” Another mother said, “I have seen the video and it is virtually pornographic. Whoever said it was OK to educate children needs their head examined.” (Daily Mail 19/07/03)

- **Celibacy group banned**

Sex-education advisers in East Sussex have told head teachers who invited a Youth Theatre Company to promote a message of sexual abstinence not to repeat the invitation because the message is “unsuitable for the pupils”. Abstinence teaching is growing in popularity in America but is opposed by the UK Government’s Teenage Pregnancy Unit and the Sex Education Forum, part of the National Children’s Bureau. The Sex Education Forum has issued a report entitled “Just Say No – To Abstinence Education”. The East Sussex area has a high rate of teenage pregnancies.

Also, the PSHE team in East Sussex has issued a leaflet for teenagers called “Dare to Be Different”, about being homosexual and “coming out” to friends. (Daily Telegraph 03/04/02)

- **Teachers told not to encourage chastity among children**

Teachers have been told not to suggest to ten-year-olds that sex before marriage is wrong. The Family Planning Association has said that such an attitude is “judgmental” and primary school teachers should “respect the diversity” of society when teaching about sex and relationships.

The FPA brochure “How Much? How Soon?”, aimed at teachers of children aged nine to ten, says, “To say that sex outside marriage is always wrong will inevitably contradict the experience of some pupils with regard to their own parents/carers’ lifestyles.” Teachers should take into account the lifestyles of some parents “regardless of the position adopted by the school”, and teachers should feel free to discuss gay relationships with under-tens: “talking about homosexuality does not constitute ‘promoting’ it.”

The advice comes as the rates of STDs among teenagers soar. MP Ann Widdecombe said that children should be taught to save sex until they are married. “I think the FPA are being profoundly irresponsible,” she said. “They are saying sex before marriage is acceptable. Organisations like the FPA shouldn’t be giving information to schools.” (Daily Mail 17/04/04)

- **Sex propaganda imposed upon children**

A pilot scheme involving 14 schools in the North East, the South-West, London and the Midlands is introducing books dealing with gay issues to children from the ages of four to eleven. It is being argued that the books, one of which is a fairy-tale featuring a prince who turns down three princesses before falling in love with and marrying a man, are necessary to make homosexuality seem normal to children. The “No Outsiders” project has received nearly £600,000 in funding from the Economic and Social Research Council, and backing from the National Union of Teachers and the General Teaching Council. A spokesman for the Christian Institute said, “The predictions of those who said the repeal of Section 28 would result in the active promotion of homosexuality in schools are coming true.” (Observer 11/03/07)

- **Young children invited to act as homosexuals**

Children as young as four are being taught about same-sex relationships using puppets, plays and fairy tales in a Government-funded scheme. Pupils are being invited to act the parts of gay characters during after-school arts clubs as well as in some literacy and drama lessons. A spokesman for the National Confederation of Parent-Teacher Associations said, “We are putting issues on young shoulders that actually don’t need to be there. This may be OK in the later years of secondary school but to try and deal with this in primary is really not on.” (Daily Mail 22/05/07)

- **Union opposed teaching of marriage**

The University and College Union has urged that schools should be banned from promoting traditional marriage and sex education lessons, for fear of discriminating against gay and lesbian children. The Union criticised teachers who champion heterosexual wedlock for instilling “negative images” of same-sex relationships. The University and College Union says schools should prohibit any lessons which “negatively characterise” the identity and lifestyle of homosexual or bisexual teenagers. The Government’s existing sex education guidelines published in 2000 highlight “the importance of marriage for family life”. Last year Vincent Nicholls, Archbishop of Birmingham, said the classroom must not be a “morally neutral zone”. (Daily Telegraph 31/05/07)

- **Minister proposed banning of teaching that gay sex is wrong**

The Education Minister, Alan Johnson, said on BBC Radio 4’s “Today” programme that faith schools should not be allowed to teach that gay sex is wrong. (BBC “Today” programme 01/06/07)

- **Government guidelines told teachers not to use “Mum” and “Dad”**

New Government guidelines for schools launched by Ed Balls, the Children, Schools and Families Secretary, instruct teachers not to use terms like “mum” and “dad” when referring to pupils’ parents. They recommend that “Schools should make efforts to talk inclusively about same-sex parents”.

The guidance was produced by the homosexual lobby groups Stonewall and Educational Action Challenging Homophobia. It suggests that “relevant issues” should be considered in the

context of a range of subjects including English, Geography, History, Art, Music, Drama and PE.

It has no statutory force, and has been issued despite the fact that a recent High Court judgement ruled that the Sexual Orientation Regulations do not extend to the school curriculum or lessons. (LifeSiteNews.com 30/01/08; The Christian Institute 30/01/08)

Our age will go down in history as a time when we sexualised the young. Children and young people have been opened up to the destructive influence of pornography and a cultural message which degrades human relationships and mocks marriage. Our schools are being used as instruments of social engineering; children are being taught the physical facts of sexual relationships without any moral guidance; they are being given condoms; they are becoming sexually active prematurely and in a moral and social vacuum; they are becoming parents and having abortions; and they are contracting sexually transmitted diseases. The teaching of Christian morality has been abandoned and the chief casualties have been our children...

15.2 Social Engineering – Manipulating Human Relationships

The founders of the movements pressing for a sexual revolution and the demolition of marriage and family were quite clear in their motives, and the sources of the ideology currently being imposed upon our children are easy to identify.

- **Christianity targeted**

Marie Stopes, most widely known as the proponent of contraception, declared, “I am out to smash the tradition of organised Christianity...”.

- **Christian morality rejected**

The most powerful pressure group worldwide is the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), based in London. It is heavily funded by Government and a formative influence on our children. Its founder was Margaret Sanger, a passionate critic of Christian belief and an admirer of Nietzsche for his attack on Christian morality. A supporter of eugenics and of Hitler, she unashamedly stood for “unlimited sexual gratification”. The IPPF has had a dominant influence on sex education in the UK in the past 40 years.

- **The family attacked**

Another powerful influence has been Wilhelm Reich. He was antagonistic to Christian morality and condemned the family as “the foremost breeding ground of traditional morality”, and was passionately committed to the undermining of marriage. He rejected the constraints of morality and clearly stated, “Any kind of moralism is life-negative” (The Sexual Revolution, 1969). He was in favour of children having sex and predicted that “in a few more years it will be as much a matter of course as is today the right of the unmarried woman to have a sexual partner”. Dr E S Williams says in his book Lessons in Depravity, “this prediction, which seemed ridiculous at the time, has now become reality”.

By these means, a policy of social engineering has been introduced into our schools. Words such as “husband”, “wife” and “marriage” are airbrushed out of the new sexual manuals by zealots committed not merely to their preferred form of political correctness but to a radical re-ordering of our society. Teaching about marriage and stable, life-long family environments has been deliberately excluded, and children are now being conditioned at school age for a life of promiscuous sex.

We have now reached the stage where condoms are freely distributed to children in schools without the knowledge or approval of their own parents, ostensibly to reduce teenage pregnancies. Whatever they might feel individually, the adults who do this are almost certain to be seen by the children as giving their approval to their use. Rarely, if ever, are children warned of the immense physical, emotional and social consequences of premature and non-marital sexual activity. Likewise, children are provided with abortion facilities without the knowledge or approval of their parents or even their family doctor. Rarely, if ever, are they warned of the dire consequences of the abortions which they are offered.

Thus what used to be recognised as abnormal is being normalised. It is increasingly being regarded as acceptable for children to have sexual intercourse with children. Indeed, it is commonly promoted as part of the educational process. Children are encouraged to have casual sex, and promiscuity is no longer discouraged.

This has led to extreme confusion among children and young people, and chaos in terms of relationships in society. Children are having children. Children are aborting children. Inevitably, there has been an explosion of sexually transmitted diseases among children and young people. This is a hitherto unknown situation.

The responsibility for this rests firmly on the shoulders of those who have overthrown Christian values and virtues and systematically and deliberately undermined the marriage-based family and directly encouraged casual sex.

We see, then, how sex education became a vehicle for the corruption of children and young people. Moreover, it is apparent that many of those devising sex-education programmes were aggressively committed to the de-Christianising of the educational process, and thereby the de-Christianising of the generations now growing up.

- **Leading headmaster condemned social engineering in schools**

Mr Rod MacKinnon, the head of the prestigious Bexley Grammar School in London, said, "There are those who wish to use children and schools as social engineers with a view to creating a different society but we should not even be trying to do such things: children need to be nurtured, educated and cared for not thrown into the front line of social reform. Muddled thinking is guaranteeing failure for the noble aspirations we all hold for the education of the young." He said schools were being forced to shun traditional lessons as ministers manipulated the education system for the purpose of "social engineering". (*Daily Telegraph 07.07.08*)

27. *Sex and the Education of our Children, William I Bennett (former US Secretary of Education), reproduced by The Medical Education Trust, pp 3, 9, 10:*

"Sex Education is therefore about character and the formation of character. A sex education course in which issues of right and wrong do not occupy centre stage is an irresponsibility.
[Author's underlining]

For to suggest to our children that really the only things that matter about sexual activity are pleasure, or "comfort", or getting pregnant ,or getting a sexually transmitted disease – to suggest that the act of sexual intimacy is not significant in other ways – is to offer them still another very bad lesson. Why? Because it is false. It's false because, as every adult knows, sex is inextricably connected to the psyche, to the soul, - or if you don't like that term – to personality at its deepest levels. Rarely is it a mere riot of the glands that occurs and then is over and meaningless thereafter. Sexual intimacy changes things – it affects feelings, attitudes, one's self image, one's view of another. Sexual intimacy changes things – it affects feelings, attitudes, one's self-image, one's view of another. Sexual activity never takes lace outside the wider context of what is brought to it or left out of by the persons who engage in it. It involves men and women in all their complexity; it involves their emotions, desires, and the often contradictory intentions that they bring with them, whether they mean to or not. It is, in other words, a quintessentially moral activity.

We should speak of the fidelity, commitment and maturity of successful marriages as something for which our students should strive."

28. *Marriage and Family in the United Kingdom – an Overview. The Maranatha Community, October 2006, p15:*

- *"The family based on marriage has always been recognised as the mechanism for socialising the next generation...with the decline of marriage the social network which sets and maintains standards of acceptable behaviour within a community fragments."* (Patricia Morgan, author of *Farewell to the Family?*)
- *Dr. Brock-Chisholm was the first director of the World Health Organisation. As early as 1946 Chisholm said, "The concept of right and wrong is a barrier to developing a civilised way of life.*

This concept of right and wrong should be eradicated. Children have to be freed from....prejudices forced upon them by religious authorities...Parents are dictators and suppressors of the child's best nature.....Sex education should be introduced....eliminating 'the ways of the elders', by force if necessary." ('Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress' – Psychiatry, Volume 9, 1946)

29. *Ibid, p20:*

- *Teachers are instructed that 'it is important not to try to 'promote' a particular type of home life as the norm or superior'. (Julian Cohen, 2001, Primary School Sex and Relationships Education Pack, Healthwise, p22)*

30. *Ibid, p26:*

- *FPA say parents not the best people to advise a child. Parents are "no longer necessarily the best people to advise a child" about contraception, sexually transmitted infections and abortion, the high court heard this week reports the Guardian. Sexual health charity the Family Planning Association (FPA) told a judicial review into the confidentiality of doctors' advice on these matters to underage children that the traditional belief that "parents know what is best for a child" is out of date. Nathalie Lieven, appearing for the FPA, said parents had no right to know if under-16s were seeking treatment for sexually transmitted infections or unplanned pregnancy and the traditional "paternalistic approach" of informing parents was contrary to social changes over the past 20 years in western Europe. (The Guardian - 10/11/2005)*

31. *Ibid, p32:*

- **Parents have "no right to know"**
Pro-life groups have unanimously condemned this week's High Court ruling denying parents the right to know if their daughters under 16 are being advised on having an abortion. Doctors or health workers treating young girls for sexually transmitted diseases or contraception, will also not need to inform parents. LIFE said it has "deep unease" about the verdict, calling it "yet another defeat for the family" and a victory for those seeking to drive a "wedge between parents and children". Spokeswoman Michaela O'Sullivan added: "For years now an arrogant elite of self-appointed reproductive health experts have been steadily undermining the family, despite the wealth of evidence demonstrating that married families are the best arena for bringing up children. This out of touch attitude was perfectly demonstrated by Nathalie Lieven of the FPA earlier in the hearing when she described as "out-dated" the idea that parents usually know what is best for their own children". (Catholic Times - 29/01/2006)

32. *Ibid, p34:*

- **Teachers 'should not tell pupils that sex outside marriage is wrong'**
Teachers have been warned not to suggest to ten-year-olds that sex before marriage is wrong. The Family Planning Association has said that such an attitude is 'judgmental' and primary school teachers should 'respect the diversity' of society when teaching about sex and relationships. The advice comes as the rates of STDs soar among teenagers. In a guidance leaflet aimed at teachers of children aged nine to ten, the charity said: 'To say that sex outside marriage is always wrong will inevitably contradict the experience of some pupils with regard to their own parents/carers' lifestyles.' Teachers should bear in mind that the lifestyles of some parents have to be taken into account 'regardless of the position adopted by the school'. MP Ann Widdecombe has said that children should be taught to save sex until they are married. 'I think the FPA are being profoundly irresponsible,' she said. 'They are saying sex before marriage is acceptable. Organisations like the FPA shouldn't be giving information to schools'. The FPA brochure called How Much? How Soon?, also tells teachers they should feel free to discuss gay relationships with under-tens, saying: 'talking about homosexuality does not constitute as "promoting" it.' (Daily Mail 17.4.04)

33. Leaflet, *No-one's invented a contraceptive against getting hurt*, US Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Office of Population Affairs 10/07.

This leaflet highlights the emotional damage that can result from sexual activity that takes place without any sound and lasting relational framework.

34. *What's wrong with Sex Education? Melvin Anchell MD, Central Bureau of the Catholic Central Verein of America and Human Life International, ISBN 0 9626257 4 4, p53:*

"For the survival of a civilisation based on families composed of individuals living by consciences instead of barbarians living by instincts only, it is essential that sexual decency be maintained, not only in our homes, but also in the schools to which we send out children."

35. *Lessons in Depravity. ES Williams, Belmont House Publishing, ISBN 0 9529939 5 3.*

36. *Children and contraception – time to change, Dr Margaret White, Order of Christian Unity, ISBN 0852 44 2904:*

"In 1990 a paper by Dr Richard, Has sex education failed our children? – a review of 33 sex education programmes found that in the USA contraceptive education resulted in gains in sexual knowledge with appreciable shifts towards promiscuity."

37. *The Family Way – The Case for Abstinence Education, Fred Naylor, Campaign for Real Education. ISBN 1 872953 28 X.*

38. *Marriage and Family in the United Kingdom – an Overview. The Maranatha Community, October 2006, pp 32-34:*

- **Children to be taught about oral and anal sex**

Children as young as 13 are being advised on oral sex, anal sex, orgasms and being good in bed in a booklet published by the Family Planning Association (FPA). Entitled 'Love, Sex and Relationships' the booklet is aimed at 13-16 year olds although the legal age of consent is 16. It is being distributed to schools and youth groups. Anne Wayman, the FPA's Chief Executive said the booklet gave clear "impartial" advice to young people who wanted more information about emotions, sexuality and relationships. The booklet advises teenagers how they can tell when they are ready to have sex and contains cartoon characters saying "I like to touch myself" or "I like to dress up as a girl" and "Does my crotch look bigger than this". In the section on oral sex it says "Many people enjoy it; others are not interested. Often called a 'blow job' when done to a man and 'going down' when done to a woman". Another section on anal sex says "many gay men never have anal sex. You can be straight, gay or bisexual. Some people enjoy it; others aren't interested". Another part of the booklet poses the question "How can I be good at sex?" it says "no one is born sexually experienced and most of the fun is in learning. Talk to your partner. Ask what they like". Miss Wayman said "Young people are getting a huge amount of information about sex all the time. They need accurate information before they become sexually active. Regarding the problem of teenage pregnancy, Beverley Hughes who is the Children's Minister said she was virtually powerless in trying to solve the problem. (Daily Telegraph 10/06/2005)

- **Sex education normalises sexual activity in young people**

A newly released sex education manual for children aged 13 to 16, put out by the UK's FPA (Family Planning Association), is being harshly criticized by pro-family groups as being very inappropriate for children. The booklet includes information on how to perform various sexual acts including anal and oral sex, and includes a chapter titled, "How can I be good at sex?" One example found in the chapter explains, "No-one is born sexually experienced, and most of the fun is learning. Talk to your partner. Ask what they like. Be aware of their feelings as well as your own pleasure." The booklet encourages children to explore their homosexual attractions, and contains details on masturbation. The manual also details where a child could get abortifacients like the morning-after and birth control pills without their parents knowledge or consent. (Lifesite.net News, 10/6/2005 see <<http://www.lifesite.net/ldn/2005/jun/05061004.html>>)

- **Children's sex guide urges them to 'talk dirty'**

Coordination Group Publications have published a 64-page booklet for use in school classrooms to give pupils detailed descriptions of sex acts in a chatty dialogue. It reads "There

is not accounting for taste. Not everyone likes oral sex. Not everyone likes ham and cheese sarnies either". It recommends "sexual touching, talking dirty face to face or on the phone, even sexy emails and text messages as a 'warm up' to having sex". It also goes into detail about penis size while in other sections provides graphic details about gay sex. The publication is used in numerous secondary schools for Personal, Social and health Education class (PHSE). (Daily Mail 13.2.06)

- **An example of Sex Education**

In an open letter to John Clare of the Education section of the Daily Telegraph, an English secondary school teacher wrote the following:

"If you think what follows is awkward for a family newspaper, consider what it's like for me, a middle-aged English teacher, who is required to teach "personal, social and health education" to 12-year-olds at a secondary school in Sussex. I'm instructed to base one lesson on a list of 10 statements that the pupils have to rate on a scale of one to 10 "with 10 being really serious". The statements include: "My friend has given her boyfriend a blow-job; my friend has snogged her female friend; my friend snogged his male friend; my friend has had unprotected oral sex; my friend has had unprotected anal sex; my friend had her friend's older brother come on to her and force her into having sex." The approved materials for another lesson require the pupils to match a list of words and phrases with the correct definition. Among these are: "Mutual masturbation – people use their hands to stimulate the other person; dam – latex sheet to cover female genitals in oral sex; finger cot – latex finger glove to cover finger in digital sex; digital sex – when a finger penetrates the vagina or anus; orgasm – the climax of sexual activity." The official aim is to teach pupils "as they develop a sense of sexual identity" that there are "different sexual orientations" and "different cultural norms in society today in sexual relationships". Quite apart from the fact that I wasn't trained to teach any of this, and feel extremely uncomfortable doing it, should I really be required to introduce 12-year-olds to "a range of sexual lifestyles"?"

John Clare's answer was No. (Daily Telegraph - 16/11/2005)

- **Corruption of children through sex 'education'**

The Family Planning Association has produced a teachers' guide on sex education (produced with lottery money), and it includes a booklet for girls which includes illustrations of masturbation. That guide called 'Girls Out Loud' has been widely criticised and the guide which is aimed at 12-16 year old girls encourages discussions about possible planks of society which include "everyone has the right to use pornography" and "there is no age of consent for sex, alcohol or driving"; "regardless of age, contraception is free and widely available" and "abortion services are free and widely available". (Daily Mail 15.11.04)

39. *What's wrong with Sex Education?* Melvin Anchell MD, Central Bureau of the Catholic Central Verein of America and Human Life International, ISBN 0 9626257 4 4, pp 16, 17:

"The latency period is a period in which nature causes direct sexual energies in the 6 to 12 year old to become dormant. There is nothing hypothetical about the latency period. It has been shown to exist throughout the world – in primitive as well as civilised people.... Though direct sexual energies become quiescent during latency, these energies do not disappear, but are redirected by the 6 to 12 year old mind and are used to serve other purposes. For example, some redirected sexual energy is used for acquiring knowledge. This is why the 6 to 12 year old is most educable.... Repeated scholastic tests done on today's sexually educated 6 to 12 year old children indeed show that these students have accomplished less scholastically than pre-sex-education students."

40. *Towards Maturity*, Dr Louise Eickhoff (former Consultant Child Psychiatrist, Selly Oak Hospital), pp 1, 6:

"Childhood is the ONLY preparation for adulthood, a sudden spring into the sexual phase, as occurs in Sex Education, being as damaging personally as precipitate physically.

Perhaps it says much for modern education that it has found ways of undermining the ages-old, carefully planned, normally infallible programmes [of progression from pre-adulthood to adulthood]

and protection, but the end result of Education's substitute schemes fall so far short of Nature's perfection as to be actively destructive."

41. *Marriage and Family in the United Kingdom – an Overview. The Maranatha Community, October 2006, p20:*

- *It is interesting to note that parents stopped a junior school from showing a controversial sex education video. [Channel 4 series Living and Growing) to 9 year olds. It featured teenagers talking explicitly about masturbation.] (Kent (KM Extra) 22.3.96)*
- *The Primary School Workbook published by the Family Planning Association is a rolling programme of sex education including labels naming vagina, testicles and pubic hair (4 year olds), name game finding alternative words for penis, vagina (7 years). Children are to be taught in detail about masturbation, menstruation, orgasms and sexually transmitted diseases. (Independent 26.10.93)*

42. *Who Cares for Children? Valerie Riches, Family and Youth Concern, ISBN 0 906229 07 3, p1:*

"Children of this generation are increasingly losing an important dimension of their childhood, being thrust into adult roles and practices before they are equipped physically, psychologically or emotionally for these responsibilities. Successive governments and the judiciary have contributed towards this, and unfortunately other countries, particularly in the Commonwealth, tend to follow our example."

43. *Sex Instruction in the Home, Helen M Davies MD, The Association of Catholic Women, ISBN 1 897936 01 X, pp 16, 25:*

"It is both normal and natural for both sexes in a civilised society to remain chaste during puberty and adolescence, given the necessary help and support."

"Anyone who insists in foisting [adult sexual matters] on them [children in the latency and pre-adolescence stages] is acting, wittingly or unwittingly, as a child molester in the psychological sense."

44. *Deconstructing the Dutch Utopia. Joost Van Loon, Family Education Trust, ISBN 0 906229 17 0, website summary:*

"For many years, proponents of sex education for the very young have made substantial claims about the nature of sex education in the Netherlands and its purported relationship to the low teenage pregnancy rate in that country. The British Government's teenage pregnancy strategy places great emphasis on the role to be played by sex education in lowering our high teenage pregnancy rates, and the Netherlands has been held up as an example.

However, research conducted in primary and secondary schools in the Netherlands by Joost van Loon, a Dutch academic who is now a reader in social theory at Nottingham Trent University, calls into question the familiar scenario:

- *Schools in the Netherlands enjoy a degree of independence from the state which is far greater than that experienced here. There is no national curriculum.*
- *Different schools handle sex education in different ways, reflecting the views of the parents and teachers. Differences between Dutch schools are probably greater than any identifiable difference between the Dutch and British models of sex education.*
- *Sex education does not start at younger ages. It is not more explicit. There is no evidence that teachers are using sex education to promote permissive views. The difference between teenage pregnancy rates in Britain and the Netherlands cannot, therefore, be due to sex education. There must be another explanation.*

- *Teenage pregnancy is the result of teenage sexual activity. We need to relate differences in pregnancy rates to those factors which are known to influence the likelihood of young people becoming sexually active.*
- *It is well known that young people from single-parent and non-traditional family structures are more likely to be sexually active. It is in this area that we find a great difference between the two countries. British children are five times more likely to live in a family headed by a lone parent than their Dutch counterparts. They are more likely to be in third-party care, and to find their mothers out at work when they get back from school.*
- *There is little support from the welfare system in the Netherlands for teenage mothers, and until recently, almost none at all.”*

45. *Marriage and Family in the United Kingdom – an Overview. The Maranatha Community, October 2006, p20:*

- *Teenage pregnancies have risen fastest in areas of the country where the government has specifically targeted resources to reduce them according to a report, ‘Sex Education or Indoctrination’ published by the Family Education Trust. The report says the explicit sex education leaflets and free condoms provided to under-age girls by the government schemes have simply encouraged them to have sex. Figures released last week show that teenage pregnancies in England rose year on year by more than 800 despite the £15m spent by the Government on strategies to reduce them. There has been a 62% increase in the number of cases of sexually transmitted diseases among young people aged 19 and under rising from 25,143 in 1997 to 40,821 in 2002. Teenage pregnancy rates in Britain remain the highest in Western Europe – one in every ten babies born in England is to a teenage mother. According to Government figures one target area, Cornwall, saw a 17% rise in teenage pregnancies between 2001 and 2002, Torbay rose 22%, Haringey 8%, York 34% and Solihull 17%. In some targeted areas there was a decrease e.g. Bury 3% and Rotherham 8%. One of the leaflets being distributed states clearly “There is no right age to have sex”. (Sunday Telegraph - 14/03/2004)*

46. *Ibid, p25:*

- *Messages aimed at promoting ‘safe(r) sex’ alone, by aiming to increase condom use have failed and will continue to fail if they do not reduce casual sex at the same time. There is a strong positive correlation between increased condom use at first sexual intercourse and increased teenage pregnancy. If to encourage increased uptake of condoms were effective, an increased use of condoms would be associated with a decrease in unwanted pregnancies. However, this is not the case since condom distribution may be associated with increased sexual activity and condom use may give a false sense of security, which increases sexual risk-taking and casual sex. Finally, condom distribution does not ensure condom use: In a recent survey, $\frac{3}{4}$ of male students reported having sex without condom when they felt one should have been used to protect against pregnancy or infection. (Williams ES. Contraceptive failure may be a major factor in teenage pregnancy. *British Medical Journal* 1995; 311: 806-7. United States Agency for International Development: The ‘ABCs’ of HIV prevention. ‘ABC’ Expert Technical Meeting September 17, 2002. Warner L. Condom access does not ensure condom use: you’ve got to be putting me on. *Sexually Transmitted Infections* 2002; 78: 225.)*

47. *Ibid, p34:*

- **Government money fails to halt rise in teenage pregnancies**
Teenage pregnancies in England have risen by more than 800 in 12 months despite the millions of pounds spent by Government on strategies to reduce them. Latest figures from the Teenage Pregnancy Unit show pregnancies among under 18’s rose from 38,439 in 2001, of which 46% were aborted, to 39,286 in 2002. Abortion statistics for 2002 are not yet available. Teenage birth rates in Britain remain the highest in Western Europe. One in every ten babies born in England is to a teenage mother. Professor David Paton of Nottingham University Business School said, “Since the start of the teenage pregnancy strategy in 1999 the

Government has poured a lot of money into improving services such as family planning provision for young people. Unfortunately most of the research evidence suggest this sort of approach has very little impact on teenage pregnancy rates, compared to wider social factors such as educational achievement and poverty". A spokesman for the Department of Education and Skills, which oversees the Teenage Pregnancy Unit, said, "The marginal increase in teenage pregnancies highlights the importance of strengthening the implementation of our teenage pregnancy strategy". Asked what the point was of strengthening a strategy that did not appear to be working, the spokesman said, "It is a long-term strategy. We don't expect things to happen in a few years". Daily Telegraph - 05/03/2004

48. *Who Cares for Children?* Valerie Riches, Family and Youth Concern, ISBN 0 906229 07 3, p1:

A radical change of political thinking on family policy is needed if a stable future for the family, and therefore, society, is to be secured. The future of humanity passes by way of the family, for it is in the family that love and trust is nourished and we learn to relate to each other a unique human being. All political factions need to reflect this truth in their visions for the future. Political ideology is blind if it does not take into account basic human needs and aspirations."

49. *European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, Protocol 1, Article 2.*

50. *An inquiry into the relationship between the state and the family in the upbringing of children – Submission to the Commission on Families and the Wellbeing of Children established by the National Family and Parenting Institute and NCH, the children's charity; The Maranatha Community in association with the Council for Health and Wholeness, p 4:*

"Totalitarian regimes have shown the real dangers of the state in intervening in the relationships between parents and children. Totalitarian regimes systematically indoctrinate children in order to drive a wedge between children and parents in order to establish a new set of values in conformity with the state's ideology. This is why many parents in the UK today are extremely angry that, without their permission or knowledge, young children are being introduced to deviant sexual practices, provided with condoms, and even given the opportunity of having abortions. The influence of the State in this matter is deemed to be a gross intrusion into family life and is one that drives a wedge between parents and children. The State has a clear responsibility to intervene where children are or appear to be suffering from abuse or deprivation, [but] we maintain that parents have the right for their children to receive education in accordance with their values."

51. *Ref 1, para 1.2:*

"...It is also essential that governing bodies involve parents in developing and reviewing their policy. This will ensure that they reflect parents' wishes and the culture of the community the school serves..."

52. *Marriage and Family in the United Kingdom – an Overview. The Maranatha Community, October 2006, p27:*

- **Young women prefer marriage**

The 21st Century Young Women's Survey of Great Britain commissioned by More magazine reveals that almost seven in ten of the 5,000 women aged 18-25 questioned hoped to be married before they have children. Seven in ten women believe "there is too much pressure to have sex". The report portrays a generation of females who are determined not to repeat the failed marriages of their parents. (Daily Telegraph - 14/10/2004)

53. *Ibid, p37:*

- **No 'safe sex'**

There is no such thing as 'safe sex' relying only on condoms. Even the consistent use of condoms only leads to a delay in contracting STIs, especially non-HIV STIs. The overwhelming majority of the population does not use condoms consistently. Inconsistent (i.e. less than

100%) use of condoms does not decrease the transmission of STIs. The true meaning of 'safe sex' is mutual monogamy between uninfected partners. Current UK policy does not promote this definition of 'safe sex' but instead relies on condoms, which are not as 'safe' as has been claimed.

There is no such thing as 'safe sex', there is however only sex between safe partners. The National Institutes of Health, USA and The Medical Institute examined condom effectiveness for STIs. While there is good evidence that "always condom use, i.e. 100% of times" reduced the risk of HIV, gonorrhoea, syphilis and chlamydia transmission, there is insufficient evidence that condoms were effective in reducing transmission of many other STIs including human papilloma virus, which is associated with cervical cancer, genital warts, herpes simplex, and others. The large majority of people do not use condoms consistently. Consistent condom use is observed in only 24% of men and 18% of women in the UK. Even a doubling of consistent condom use would still mean that less than half of the population would use condoms consistently. However, inconsistent condom use (i.e. less than 100% of times) has not been shown to reduce the risk of transmission of most STIs. 14% of couples experience an unintended pregnancy during the first year of "typical" use of condoms for contraception. It is surprising to note that – while everyone is aware that condoms may break or slip, resulting possibly in an unwanted pregnancy – the assumption is still that condom use equals "safe sex. More recent research shows that consistent condom use delays – rather than prevents – the transmission of STIs, especially non-HIV STIs. Regular twice weekly intercourse using condoms leads to a delay in contracting chlamydia, gonorrhoea and syphilis but is unlikely to prevent the transmission of these STIs. When using condoms, these STIs are transmitted within a few years rather than within a few months without using condoms. (National Institutes of Health. Workshop summary: Scientific evidence on condom effectiveness for sexually transmitted disease prevention; 2000. The Medical Institute for Sexual Health: Sex, condoms and STI's – what we now know. 2002. Johnson AM et al. Natsal 2000; Lancet 2001: 358; 1835-42)

54. *Ibid*, p37:

- **ABC: 'Abstinence, Be faithful, or use Condoms'**

Uganda promotes 'ABC' as the basis of sex and relationship education: ABC stands for 'Abstinence, Be faithful, or use Condoms', in that order of emphasis. It is not 'abstinence only' or 'condoms only'. Condoms are needed if 'A' or 'B' fail. Rather than relying on failed policies such as the distribution of condoms without emphasising partner reduction or abstinence, Uganda adopted a successful campaign at modifying behaviour, mainly aimed at reducing casual sex. The subsequent fall in HIV cases has been dramatic.

'Recent data from Uganda and other countries where HIV prevalence has been reduced or stabilized suggest that an "ABC"-based approach can alter patterns of personal behaviour ... Successful prevention programs in places like Uganda, Senegal, and Jamaica have employed a multi-pronged approach to behaviour change, involving promotion of abstinence or delayed onset of sexual debut and fidelity/partner reduction, along with condom use especially for higher risk sexual encounters. By finding common ground among diverse political, religious, public health, and other constituencies, such an approach can facilitate a more concerted and unified prevention effort.' (United States Agency for International Development: The 'ABCs' of HIV prevention. Press release January 2003)

- **Government urged to follow ABC**

While we are aware of cultural differences, we urge the government to learn from the success of Uganda's balanced 'ABC' approach to sexual health and urge this approach to be adopted throughout the UK. A public health campaign aimed at modifying behaviour, with a predominant emphasis on reduction of casual sex, is the only measure that will stop the epidemic of STIs in the UK. To combat STIs with the currently adopted strategy will fail.

The current UK policy on sexual health is based on the National Strategy for Sexual Health and HIV, (Department of Health 2001) and the Teenage Pregnancy Strategy in 1999. The government has been attempting to tackle high teenage pregnancy rates and increasing rates of STIs in the UK. The aim is to halve teenage pregnancy rates by 2010. The Teenage Pregnancy Strategy policy initiatives are very similar to those introduced by the Conservative Government in 1992 with the aim of halving the underage pregnancy rate by the year 2000. The National Strategy for Sexual Health does not promote the only evidence-based definition of safe sex, which is (apart from abstinence) mutual monogamy among uninfected partners. The

National Strategy does not even mention the word marriage, even though the majority of the population – 83% - still considers monogamy and marriage as the preferred form of relationship. Reduction in casual sex does not even feature in the National Strategy for sexual health and HIV. The National Strategy is therefore doomed to fail, since it does not address the underlying problem, the dramatic increase in casual sex. (In a recent poll 83% of respondents aged 16 or over believed that monogamy is desirable. Source: The Observer, Sex uncovered. 27 October 2002; National Strategy for Sexual Health and HIV, Department of Health, 2001; (www.doh.gov.uk/nshs/bettersexualhealth.pdf)

- **Contrast between UK and Uganda**

The contrast between the UK approach and the Ugandan approach to sexual health can be demonstrated by graphs examining the prevalence of STIs in both countries over time. While in the UK, STI rates increase despite a National Strategy of sexual health, in Uganda, within a few years of adopting ABC to combat HIV, the rates of HIV fell. It is therefore obvious, that the current approach to sexual health has failed to stem the rise in STIs.

Despite a massive increase in family planning clinics for underage girls and the distribution of the morning-after pill, there has been no significant change in the underage conception rate since 1975. However, access to family planning clinics and distribution of emergency contraception is being promoted in the National Strategy for Sexual Health and HIV and the Teenage Pregnancy Strategy (TPS) as measures to be taken to reduce teenage pregnancy.

The aim of the current TPS is to halve teenage pregnancy rates by 2010. The TPS policy initiatives are very similar to those introduced by the Conservative Government in 1992 (following their Health of the Nation report) with the aim of halving the underage pregnancy rate by the year 2000. It is therefore unlikely that policies that failed in the 1990s suddenly become effective a decade later. Also of relevance is the Gillick Ruling when access to family planning by under 16s in England (but not in Scotland) was severely restricted for most of 1985 and which led to a temporary halt in the year-on year increase in teenage conceptions in England, but not in Scotland.

The failure of current policies shows a near tripling of the rates of chlamydia infections in 16-19 year olds and a significant increase in the under 16-year-olds over the past decade despite a sexual health strategy. (Professor D. Paton, Presentation, Attlee Suite, Portcullis House, House of Commons, 12th November 2003)

55. Ref 1, para 1.21:

“...Within the context of talking about relationships, children should be taught about the nature of marriage and its importance for family life and for bringing up children... Therefore, children should learn the significance of marriage... as [a] key building block[...] of community and society.”
