

## **Valuing All God’s Children: Not What It Says On The Tin!**

Lisa Severine Nolland PhD

A recent document on homophobic bullying and church schools has been produced and endorsed by the Church of England Archbishops’ Council Education Division and the prestigious National Society. Entitled *Valuing All God’s Children* [VAGC, Eastertide 2014], it aims to ensure schools are ‘safe’ places for all youngsters, and does so through foregrounding the evils of homophobia, and offering a decalogue of far-reaching recommendations to the nation’s 5,500 church schools.

However, given how the issues are framed, VAGC is an excellent vehicle for sex rights activists to embed an agenda in church schools which is antithetical to core Christian morality.

But first, two positives. VAGC focuses on the horrific impact of school bullying and says, ‘Enough!’ Secondly, it affirms the traditional biblical understanding of human sexuality and that all sex outside heterosexual marriage falls ‘short of this ideal’.

However, even these positives are seriously compromised by the overwhelming preponderance of gay-affirming presuppositions and assumptions, and the lack of a proper critique of the LGBT agenda.

A charitable summary of VAGC might be: ‘The church still believes in the sanctity of heterosexual marriage (for now) but realizes that many others, Christians included, don’t, so let’s agree to disagree, expose children who lack the cognitive and moral ability to evaluate such matters to a variety of ‘Christian’ and other views and lifestyles and hope for the best. Meanwhile we ensure schools are “safe and welcoming”, which means everyone is taught about politically-correct sexual orientations and relationships and the imperative to be “inclusive”.’

Indeed, by setting sexual orientation alongside characteristics such as race and ethnicity, VAGC reinforces the false idea that sexual orientation is fixed and that gay people are ‘born that way’ i.e. created that way by God. However, the Royal College of Psychiatrists has now changed the statement on homosexuality that it originally submitted to the Pilling Commission. The College now concedes that sexual orientation is not set at birth, nor is it immutable.

Moreover, in relation to the ‘safe’ mantra, there is far greater and more deadly risk facing adolescents via the risk of HIV infection (and other STIs) from experimenting in homosexual behaviour. What happened to the concern for ‘safety’ here?

In LGBT parlance, ‘safe and welcoming’ means no-one should suggest that homo (or bi) sexual behaviour is wrong as to do so might offend someone with this identity. In effect this means CofE schools will become ‘LGBT-affirming’.

Other problems of VAGC include: Its reliance on skewed and faulty ‘research’ commissioned by the powerful campaigning/advocacy group, Stonewall; an ignoring of the lion’s share of bullied youngsters, those bullied because of appearances and disability (three of the former killed themselves last year alone); its suggestion of graphic SRE materials such as *Living and Growing* (p 61) which sexualizes children aged 7-9 by showing them a video of a couple in the act of sex itself, i.e. soft pornography; and fulsome promotion of the key author’s own publications at the expense of other resources.

Moreover, VAGC endorses a trans agenda which foists the Trojan Horse of ‘gender theory’ on children which none of us had to endure growing up, and which divorces bodies from gender and sex (‘Am I a boy, a girl, both, neither?’).

Finally, given the emergence of more extreme family forms (such as polygamy and polyamory), how can VAGC quote (p 28) Archbishop Tutu’s famous ‘Everyone is an insider, there are no outsiders’ with any credibility? Have the memos on these others all gone astray?

Though undoubtedly written with good intentions, VAGC is deeply problematic. Bullying concerns can and must be addressed, but not by this means.

## **Endangering all God’s children – *how and why the Archbishop of Canterbury has got it so wrong***

VAGC launches a culture war against the established Christian ethos of CofE schools. VAGC is not so much about homophobic bullying (HB), it is much more about embedding a new philosophy, a new ethos in CofE schools. That ethos is *gender identity*, the notion that “male” and “female” should be replaced by “gender neutrality” (explained below). That notion is in direct conflict with scriptures which teach that God created man and woman, male and female. The conflict arises because sexual rights activists deny the Christian concept of sexual morality and the existence of a creator God to whom all are ultimately accountable. That is why VAGC is so dangerous for the 1 million children – and their successors – in all 5,500 CofE schools.

According to one pro-family organisation, in the USA schools are often *"told they must comply with advocacy groups' demands - such as mandatory "diversity" training or homosexual-themed curricula - or they could face legal liability for not making their school "safe." But all too often, "safety" is used as a political tool to force an adult agenda into schools that can actually put kids at more risk of serious emotional and physical harm. Too often, classroom materials promoted in the name of "safety," "tolerance" or "anti-bullying" teaching go far beyond the realm of safety prevention into political advocacy, and even indoctrination."*

Because VAGC condones and promotes the acceptance of non-Christian moral values such as homosexual behaviour and same-sex relationships, it contradicts the established CofE public position on sex and relationships education, "homophobia and homophobic bullying" and the ethos of CofE schools published on the CofE Education website. This states, *inter alia*, that:-

- "... church schools will continue to place sex education within the framework of a Christian understanding of sex and human relationships, which stresses the importance of a faithful marriage as the best framework for sex.
- The Anglican Church's traditional teaching is that homosexual practice (as distinct from orientation) 'falls short of the ideal' expression of sexual love, which should be set within the framework of a faithful marriage.
- A vital part of that ethos comes through understanding the person and teachings of Jesus Christ who is at the heart of our faith and who also provides an example to aspire to. The Christian values which underpin the life of the school will be experienced through worship and teaching and will be reflected in every aspect of the school's life"

The real bullies are the sexual rights activists, intolerant as they are of anyone who will not wholeheartedly embrace their agenda. VAGC plays directly into the hands of these activists. They want to turn the perpetrators of bullying into victims – to make them victims of the victims. Why should a young child innocently making a chance "that's so gay" remark in the playground be turned into a victim of a bureaucratic enquiry? Is not that highly likely to damage a young developing child? A reprimand by a teacher perhaps but documenting everything, reporting and encouraging children and teachers to tell tales on each other! That's a recipe for bullying the bullies. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Perversely, VAGC actually hinders the expression of God's love by potentially making all schools risky and dangerous places for every child.

In the following analysis, paragraph numbers refer to paragraphs in the main body text of VAGC, unless otherwise made clear.

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
<p>1.  General</p>	<p>With little reference to Scripture and equivocal references to Christian sexual morality, VAGC is <b>obsessed with “homophobia” and “homophobic bullying”</b>, as shown by its extensive use of these words. By using the word “homophobia” so extensively, VAGC gives it validity as a concept.</p>	<p>The 72-page document is complex, repetitive and contains sections which have little to do with bullying but much to do with other elements of the sexual rights activists agenda (e.g. same-sex marriage legislation, the Equality Act 2010 and “modernity and plurality”). As noted in para 37, <i>“bullying in itself is not a specific criminal offence in the UK”</i>.</p> <p>VAGC gives the impression that it has been prepared largely by sexual rights activists with an agenda at variance with the core established teachings of Christianity.</p>	<p>Word occurrence in VAGC (excluding use in web addresses):-</p> <p>Homophobia: 95 Homophobic bullying (HB): 60 Stonewall: 7 (plus 2 website references) Jesus Christ: 1 (in para 17) Bible: 1 Scripture/scriptures: 1 each Specific references to a verse in Scripture: 1 Sin or sinner: 0 Repent or repentance: 0</p> <p><u>This article</u> explains the significance and origin of the word “homophobia”.</p>
<p>2.  General  Foreword and Para 16</p>	<p>By repeatedly linking phrases such as <i>“all God’s children”</i> and <i>“every child is loved by God”</i> with homophobia and HB, VAGC <b>tries to embed the idea that sexual orientation is fixed and that gay people are ‘born that way’</b> i.e. created that way by God.</p>	<p>By so doing, VAGC attempts to shut down any suggestion that people are not, in fact, born gay.</p> <p>Whereas traits such as eye and skin colour are certainly genetic, there is no evidence that the development of same-sex attraction is.</p> <p>Rather, the evidence points to post-natal environmental factors (e.g. family relationships and experiences, childhood sexual abuse) as being significant in the development of same-sex attraction.</p> <p>Indeed, in April 2014, the Royal College of</p>	<p>See especially <u>The “Gay Rights” Deception</u> by T H Cripps and Neil Whitehead’s book <u>“My Genes made me do it!”</u> (chapters <u>2</u>, <u>9</u> and <u>10</u> in particular). For example: <i>“Homosexuality is not genetically inevitable. If it were, identical twins would show 100% concordance for SSA and no modern twin study on any behavioural trait has come remotely near that figure. In fact SSA is a good example of a trait little influenced by genes.”</i> (Chapter 10).</p> <p>Even well-known sexual rights activist Peter Tatchell says <u>on his website</u> <i>“Homosexuality: It isn’t natural. Ignore those researchers who claim to have discovered a ‘gay gene’,</i></p>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
		<p>Psychiatrists altered its position on the nature of same-sex attraction when it published a <u>new position statement</u>, saying it now believes sexual orientation is "<i>determined by a combination of biological <b>and postnatal environmental factors</b></i>", i.e. not fully determined at birth. It also rejects the notion that sexual orientation is unchangeable, saying that "<i>it is not the case sexual orientation is immutable</i>". Instead, it recognises that sexual orientation may vary during someone's life.</p> <p>As it stands, VAGC perpetuates the “born gay” myth.</p>	<p><i>Gay desire is NOT genetically determined". He adds: "Much as I would love to go along with the emerging 'born gay' consensus, I can't. The evidence does not support the idea that sexuality is a fixed biological given". He also writes "Born gay? No. Human sexuality is too varied and complex to be reduced to a simple equation of genes plus hormones."</i></p>
<p>3. Foreword</p>	<p>By making “<i>eradicating homophobic stereotyping and bullying</i>” his aim (VAGC Foreword), the ABC makes it necessary for CofE schools to teach all children what ‘homophobia’ is. <b>That in turn necessitates teaching young children what same-sex attraction (homosexuality and lesbianism) is.</b></p>	<p>Children will be taught from a very young age that same-sex attraction is normal and to be ‘revered’ (see also para 16). Such teaching conflicts both with a child’s normal understanding of his or her biological sex and with Scripture (e.g. Genesis 2 and Matthew 19).</p> <p>Teaching young children about these issues causes confusion about their biological identity potentially resulting in developmental harm.</p>	<p>This is explained by <u>Dr Judith Reisman</u> in various publications and her testimony to Congressional committees.</p> <p>See also “<u>The Kinsey institute Exposed: A Warning to Parents and Governments Throughout the World</u>”, published May 2014, which exposes Kinsey’s fraudulent research as the basis of the heterosexualisation and homosexualisation of children.</p>
<p>4. Para 3 of the Foreword</p>	<p>The wording of paragraph 3 of the Foreword implies that schools which do not follow VAGC guidance <b>are not and have never been ‘safe and welcoming places’.</b></p>	<p>This is subtle coercion by the ABC. In LGBT parlance, ‘safe and welcoming’ means no-one should even suggest that homosexual behaviour is wrong as to do so might offend</p>	<p>The Bible is very clear that all sexual relations outside marriage (a life-long exclusive monogamous heterosexual public covenant relationship) are morally wrong</p>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
		<p>someone who considers themselves to be ‘gay’. This means that CofE schools need to become ‘pro-gay’. However, scripture is clear that all sexual acts outside one woman/one man faithful, lifelong marriage are wrong and this is what really needs to be taught in schools which claim to provide a Christian ethos such as CofE schools.</p>	<p>(Leviticus 18:6-23, 20:10-21; Matthew 19; Romans 1:26-27; 1 Corinthians 6:9,10; Colossians 3:5; 1 Thessalonians 4:3; 1 Timothy 1:9-10; Jude; Revelation 22:15). This includes fornication, adultery, same-sex relations and all other sorts of sex imaginable, even if one is deeply in love with the other person.</p>
<p>5.  General</p>	<p>By concentrating on HB, <b>VAGC plays down the 94% of school bullying that has nothing to do with sexual orientation!</b></p>	<p>The <b>vast majority of school bullying has to do with appearance</b> (e.g. overweight or underweight, wearing glasses or teeth braces, having ragged or ‘wrong’ clothing), <b>academic ability</b> (Mencap claims that 82% of those with a ‘learning disability’ are bullied), <b>physical ability/disability and cyberbullying</b> (e.g. ‘sexting’).</p> <p>VAGC refers to HB 60 times and cyber-bullying 5 times. Disablist remarks: twice. Appearance (in the context of bullying): once.</p> <p>VAGC is therefore gravely out of balance in giving such overwhelming emphasis to HB at the expense of other types of bullying. Confusingly, para 9 labels some types of non-homophobic bullying as HB!</p>	<p>The <u>Toronto District School Board</u> survey of 100,000 children found only 6% of bullying among 11/12 year-olds was gender-related.</p> <p>The <u>Longitudinal Study of Young People in England</u> tracked more than 8,000 pupils from age 13 to 14 onwards over seven years. <i>“For the year 9 age group, when bullying is at its worst, around 94% was purportedly of heterosexual young people and 6% was directed at LGBs. To address only LGB bullying leaves 94% unaddressed.”</i> (source: unpublished research, Patricia Morgan, 2014).</p> <p>The 2012 OFSTED <u>No Place for Bullying</u> report struggled to find evidence of significant homosexual bullying. <i>“Ofsted could only find three primary and five secondary pupils seemingly bullied over sexuality. What did it do? It imagined that friendship and appearance issues “may mask issues around perceived or actual sexuality”.</i></p>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
			<p><i>It presented no evidence the pupils involved were secretly ‘gay’.</i> (source: unpublished research, Patricia Morgan, 2014).</p> <p>See also <a href="#">Digging deeper - the Bully Free Program</a>.</p>
6. Para 50(8)	<p>By specifically calling for “<b>sexual orientation</b>” to be included as an aspect within the secondary phase’s Sex and Relationships Education programme, VAGC <b>invites the teaching and acceptance of same-sex lifestyles to teenage children</b>. Further, because VAGC also calls for all people to be revered and respected, these lifestyles will need to be taught as <b>equivalent to heterosexual lifestyles</b>.</p>	<p>As well as conflicting with official CofE Education policy on sexual morality, this is an endorsement for the teaching of moral relativism in CofE secondary schools (<i>“ensuring that traditional Anglican views are taught clearly alongside other viewpoints also held by Anglicans, by other Christians, and by those of other faith perspectives and world-views”</i>).</p>	
8. Para 1 and para 49	<p>The VAGC homophobia definition brands as “homophobic” <b>anyone who does not wholeheartedly accept or embrace</b> gay people. That this is the intention, is made clear in para 49 which states (in the context of all being loved by God) <i>“...an unconditional acceptance of differences should be a hallmark of every Church of England school.”</i></p>	<p>VAGC defines homophobia as “fear, <b>rejection or aversion</b>, often in the form of stigmatising attitudes or discriminatory behaviour towards those who are, or are perceived to be, gay”.</p>	<p>A phobia is an irrational fear.</p> <p>Disagreement is not the same as hate. To disagree with respect is true tolerance.</p> <p>By branding disagreement or lack of wholehearted support for gay issues as ‘hate speech’, sexual rights activists endeavour to shut down any debate.</p> <p>This is evident in the recent <a href="#">CPS</a> activity and their “Classroom activities and guidance for teachers” pack: <a href="#">LGBT hate crime in schools</a>.</p>
9.	<p>By explicitly calling on CofE schools to <b>“ensure that their Christian ethos statement</b></p>	<p>Sexual activity outside the one man/one woman marriage relationship is contrary to</p>	<p>“Inclusivity” and “diverse” are codewords frequently used to promote the involvement</p>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
Para 50(1)	<b>emphasises an inclusivity that welcomes all, and reveres and respects all members of the diverse community as individuals who are known and loved by God</b> , VAGC is asking schools to publicly endorse same-sex behaviour.	God’s Word. That is why holding people who engage in a homosexual behaviour in reverence and respect is calling for the behaviour of unrepentant sinners to be treated with reverence and respect. That is something Jesus did not do: rather He called and calls sinners to repentance.	of people who experience same-sex attraction.
10. Paras 1 and 3	The VAGC homophobia definition brands anyone who <b>thinks</b> gayness is wrong as “homophobic”.	VAGC defines homophobia as “fear, rejection or aversion, often in the form of stigmatising <b>attitudes</b> or discriminatory behaviour towards those who are, or are perceived to be, gay”.	<b>Attitudes</b> means thoughts, not evident to an observer. Contrast <i>behaviour</i> which can be observed by another person.
11. Para 1	By including reference to the <b>perception</b> of a person being gay, children who are treated as gay because a teacher <b>perceives</b> them to be gay when in reality they are not may become confused as to their identity and thereby damaged in their development as a person.	VAGC defines homophobia as “fear, rejection or aversion, often in the form of stigmatising attitudes or discriminatory behaviour towards those who <b>are, or are perceived to be, gay</b> ”.  Perception of ‘gayness’ will vary from teacher to teacher in the absence of clear definition.	
12. Para 1 and Appendices D, G, K and L	By including “ <b>gender identity</b> ” in the definition of HB <b>and in five other places</b> , VAGC opens a portal to whole new world of weirdness.	A concept emerging from the USA in the late 1980s, ‘gender identity’ means the identity a person chooses, irrespective of biological sex. The concept separates the mind from the body. For example, a person with a male body may decide they are a female, identify as such and demand to be treated accordingly. Gender ideology transfers the labels "male" and "female" from the body to the mind. This denies a child's God-given	Other Definitions are offered by <u>Gendered Intelligence</u> “ <i>In this way then we might say that gender is not something that you are, or have, but is something that you do</i> ” and the <u>Crown Prosecution Service</u> “ <i>A person’s sense of him, or herself, as being masculine or feminine, male or female.</i> ”  The very concept of gender identity is anti-Christian in that it directly conflicts with the



Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
		<p>sexual identity, instead forcing the child to "create" themselves (assign themselves a gender identity). Facebook acknowledges the existence of <u>56 gender identities</u>.</p> <p>In practice this means a person changing “sex” without changing biological sex. Advanced by sexual rights activists, this concept has gathered some momentum in <u>England</u> (“<i>Surgery is not a prerequisite for obtaining a Gender Recognition Certificate</i>”), <u>Argentina</u>, <u>Uruguay</u> and <u>Denmark</u> (“<i>New procedure for obtaining preferred gender coming into force on 1 September 2014 makes the person concerned the sole decision maker without any conditions imposed by the state: an application for legal change of gender is submitted to a relevant authority and after 6 months the applicant simply needs to confirm their application.</i>”)</p>	<p>concepts of God creating male and female and sexual complementarity (e.g. Genesis 2 and Matthew 19).</p> <p>In France, primary school parents have been <u>withdrawing their children from schools</u> one day a month in protest at the planned introduction of gender theory in French schools in 2014.</p> <p>An overview of the sexual politicisation of American schools is <u>available here</u>.</p> <p>Plans for transgender mainstreaming in Massachusetts schools <u>are explained here</u>.</p> <p>As <u>this article reveals</u>, in Sweden the plan is to be “<i>not simply gender-equal but gender-neutral. The idea is that the government and society should tolerate no distinctions at all between the sexes. What many gender-neutral activists are after is a society that entirely erases traditional gender roles and stereotypes at even the most mundane levels.</i>”</p> <p>Sex-change surgery presents serious ethical and other issues. See, for example, Fitzgibbons, Sutton, O’Leary <u>The Psychopathology of “Sex Reassignment” Surgery</u> and Paul McHugh <u>Transgender</u></p>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
			<u>Surgery Isn’t the Solution.</u>
<p>13.</p> <p>Para 1 and Appendices D, G, K and L</p>	<p>By including “<b>gender identity</b>” in the definition of HB, VAGC opens the door to introducing <b>gender-neutral pronouns</b> into CofE schools.</p>	<p>The use of such pronouns reinforces the replacement of God-given biological sexual identity with a self-determined gender identity.</p>	<p>The <u>Vancouver Sun</u> of 17th June, 2014 reports that according to new school rules passed by the education authority in Vancouver, teachers should replace “he” or “she” with new pronouns to refer to children who believe they are transsexual: “xe”, “xem” and “xyr”, if required by pupils.</p> <p>Pronoun replacement has been advocated in the <u>USA</u> (“ze,” “hir” and “hirs” to replace “she,” “her,” “he,” his,” “him,” “they,” “their” and “them”) and in <u>Sweden</u> (<i>hen</i> to replace he [<i>han</i> in Swedish] and she [<i>hon</i>]).</p>
<p>14.</p> <p>Para 1 and Appendices D, G, K and L</p>	<p>The inclusion of “<b>gender identity</b>” in the definition of HB, opens the door to introducing arguments about the <b>use of toilets and locker rooms in schools by “transgender” children</b></p>	<p>This extract from an official letter from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (February 2013) “<u>Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Gender Identity</u>” shows how the student decides which room is to be used:-</p> <p><i>“In all cases, the principal should be clear with the student (and parent) that the student may access the restroom, locker room, and changing facility that corresponds to the student’s gender identity. Some students may feel uncomfortable with a transgender student using the same sex-segregated restroom, locker room or changing facility. This discomfort is not a</i></p>	<p><i>The same Massachusetts letter also states “...the person best situated to determine a student’s gender identity is that student himself or herself. A student who says she is a girl and wishes to be regarded that way throughout the school day and throughout every, or almost every, other area of her life, should be respected and treated like a girl. There is no threshold medical or mental health diagnosis or treatment requirement that any student must meet in order to have his or her gender identity recognized and respected by a school.”</i></p> <p>Intersex is a medical condition affecting the body. For example, a male intersex body</p>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
		<i>reason to deny access to the transgender student.”</i>	looks in some ways as though it is female. In effect, “gender identity” makes everyone intersexed, since it gives every person a choice whether to be male or female regardless of medical condition.
15. Para 1 and Appendices D, G, K and L	By including “ <b>gender identity</b> ” in its definition of HB, VAGC opens the door to introducing <b>mixed sex school teams</b> into schools.	Gender theory enables a person who is biologically male to declare himself female and demand to be included in female sports teams.	<u>Californian experience</u> shows where this concept is leading. The State has passed a law allowing public school athletes to play for whatever team matches their self-perceived gender, without regard for biological sex. NCAA rules allow transsexual college athletes to play on the opposite sex’s team regardless of surgical status. The U.S. Soccer Federation, which governs many state youth soccer organizations, passed blanket rules in 2012 permitting “self-determination” for transgender athletes. All one needs is a state-issued ID or a doctor’s note declaring one’s preferred sex.
16. Para 6 and para 17	By suggesting that staff need to create “ <i>an environment in which being homosexual is not thought of as being inferior</i> ”, VAGC <b>subtly suggests that homosexuality is equal or superior to heterosexuality.</b>	This suggestion contrasts with the official CofE teaching about the human sexual act (helpfully stated in para 17) that “ <i>it is an act of total commitment which belongs properly within a permanent married relationship and that <b>homosexual acts fall short of this ideal</b></i> ”.  No verse in Scripture approves of homosexuality or homosexual behaviour.  According to <u>Public Health England</u> , an	<u>There is evidence</u> that the earlier a boy ‘comes out’ to explore and engage in same-sex sexual behaviour, the more detrimental it is to mental and physical health – in terms of forced sex, HIV seropositivity and other serious sexual diseases, abuse, substance use, self-harm and later depression.  <u>Professor Brendan Bain</u> states the majority of sexually transmitted diseases caused by viruses such as herpes, hepatitis B, HPV, HIV and HTLV- 1 still cannot be cured. Control is

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
		<p>estimated 100,000 people were living with HIV in the UK in 2012 of which some 21,900 people living with HIV were unaware of their infection. Men who have sex with men (MSM) remained the group most affected by HIV with an estimated 41,000 living with HIV in 2012, of whom 7,300 were undiagnosed. New diagnoses among MSM continued to rise and reached an all-time high of 3,250 in 2012.</p> <p>A homosexual life or lifestyle is typically unhealthier, unhappier and potentially shorter, especially where HIV is present.</p> <p>As regards costs, <b>the average cost of drugs used to treat a person diagnosed with HIV is currently estimated to be £18,000/year/person.</b> This <b>excludes</b> other costs such as sampling and social care. Assuming an average 40-year survival following the commencement of treatment, the lifetime cost per person is £18,000 x 40 = £720k. Therefore <b>the amount saved from the NHS budget by preventing a single case of infection is £720k.</b> Given the actual number of patients being treated in 2012 was 77,610 (according to the AVERT website), the projected <b>cost of drug treatment for the current number of HIV sufferers is £18,000 x 40 x 77,610 = over</b></p>	<p>difficult, being long-term and costly.</p> <p><i>The Jubilee Centre (2012) suggests “STIs are estimated to cost the NHS – and therefore the taxpayer – more than £1 billion per year. There are also longer-term costs. HIV treatment is now estimated at around £0.5 billion a year in the UK, with lifetime costs per case estimated at more than £300,000. Preventing the 3,550 new cases that were diagnosed in 2008 would ultimately have saved £1.1 billion. The estimated 83,000 cases of HIV in the UK at the end of 2008 represent a total lifetime cost of £26 billion.”</i></p>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
		<p><b>£55bn.</b> However, given there are more than 6,000 new cases in the UK each year, this cost can be expected to <b>increase by £18,000 x 6,000 = £108m each year.</b></p> <p>So, given the human suffering and financial implications, why is the CofE effectively promoting such a lifestyle to schoolchildren?</p>	
17.  Paras 10, 47 and 57	By suggesting staff need training and support to understand how to recognise and challenge HB (para 10), VAGC <b>encourages and promotes the HB training industry.</b>	Schools will feel obliged to appoint HB consultants and training organisations to come in and run courses for teachers and staff (para 47, 57). Schools and children will be vulnerable to exploitation by such providers.	As well as consuming school financial and time resources, external providers will typically be promoters of the homosexual agenda, in order to justify their own existence and charges.
18.  Paras 10, 47 and 57	By calling for <b>all school staff</b> to be trained to <b>“recognise and understand how to challenge all types of bullying including homophobic language and behaviour”</b> and to be trained to <b>“offer pastoral support in the context of issues surrounding sexual identity and homophobic bullying”</b> , VAGC is stretched from HB to sexual identity issues.	Experience elsewhere shows that outside organisations can use these opportunities to promote a sexual rights agenda at variance with Christian teaching on sexual morality.  As well as teachers and teaching assistants, <b>“all school staff”</b> includes caretakers, catering assistants and cleaners. Cost?	This is an <u>example from Maine.</u>
19.  Para 50(4)	By suggesting that <b>“themes and values that play a part in combatting bullying in all forms”</b> should be <b>explored</b> In Collective Worship, VAGC provides an opening for sexual rights activists to promote their agenda in front of the whole school.	The use of music, singing and drama can be very effective ways of changing attitudes. Outside providers or same-sex attracted staff members could present material significantly at odds with school’s Christian ethos.	
20.  Para 57	By failing to recognise that children’s beliefs about their sexual orientation can and do change over time, <b>VAGC perpetuates the</b>	Teaching a child about same-sex behaviours carries a serious risk of encouraging the child to experiment, especially during teenage	See pages 234 and 235 of chapter 12 of <u>“My Genes made me do it!”</u> :-

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
	<b>myth that same-sex attraction is fixed and cannot change.</b>	years.  Whether adult or adolescent, a large degree of spontaneous change in sexual orientation takes place.	<i>“Most teenagers will change from same-sex attraction. In fact, in the 16 to 17 year age group, 98% will move from homosexuality and bisexuality towards heterosexuality. Most teenagers thinking they are gay/lesbian/bi and will be for the rest of their life, will in fact probably be different the following year. It is therefore totally irresponsible to counsel affirmation of same-sex feelings in an adolescent on the grounds that the feelings are intrinsic, unchangeable, and the individual is therefore homosexual”</i> and, quoting Professor Barnhouse, <i>“It is impossible for me to state strongly enough that to present this [homosexual] model to young people, or to allow them—as often happens in the contemporary climate of open discussion—to imagine that their transitory adolescent experiments are truly indicative of a settled homosexual disposition, is not only evidence of psychiatric ignorance, but is specifically wicked as well”</i> .
21.  Para 50 and the Executive Summary	The last two of the ten <i>“Recommendations for good practice”</i> listed in the Executive Summary <b>are not printed</b> in the corresponding section in the main document!	Such an omission shows lack of care in preparation and checking.	
22.  Para54 and	VAGC identifies the derogatory use by schoolchildren of <b>the word “gay” as “homophobia”</b> (Appendix K).	VAGC thereby brands a large but unknown number of English schoolchildren as “homophobic”.	<i>“The specific use of homophobic language is endemic in most English schools and 40% of primary school teachers reported</i>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
Appendix K			<i>homophobic bullying, name-calling or harassment in their school”</i> (para 54).
23. Para 50(6) and Appendices B and K	By treating all incidents of bullying as “Bullying and Prejudice Related Incidents” (BPRI) and requiring their recording on BPRI incidents forms with subsequent logging and reporting to Governors and others, a <b>bureaucratic and potentially counterproductive investigatory</b> system is established.	“You shall not say these words” or “What you have said will be documented, your parents informed, you will be closely monitored, sent on training courses, your peers will be encouraged to report you.”  A BPRI investigation could easily become a Spanish Inquisition. That could well be the intent.	Is this really a recipe for a happy, safe school environment? Or is the idea to impose an intolerant culture in CofE schools, intolerant of ideas and language which are not unequivocally pro-gay?
24. Further Resources	By failing to identify which of the 41 websites, books, papers and similar resources listed under <b>Further Resources</b> are deemed suitable, <b>VAGC leaves it to schools and teachers to waste resources investigating all of them.</b>	Teachers are busy people. Are teachers really expected to spend time wading through all this? Was it beyond the ability of the writers to identify even half a dozen or so particularly helpful resources which promote Christian sexual morality?  Even more seriously, the list interweaves pro-gay and not-pro-gay resources and it is not always clear which is which.	The introduction to the <b>Further Resources</b> section makes it clear the resources are <i>“suggested rather than recommended, and the choice of resources is a decision to be made by the school that knows its unique context best”</i> . But the unique context is known – a CofE Christian ethos school!
25. Further Resources	By including certain books and resources in the Further Resources section, <b>VAGC promotes the homosexualisation of young children</b> – such resources are inappropriate for use in a CofE primary school	Examples include <i>“The Family Book”</i> ( <i>“Whether you have two moms or two dads, a big family or a small family, a clean family or a messy one, Todd Parr assures readers that no matter what kind of family you have, every family is special in its own unique way... Perfect for young children just beginning to read...”</i> ), <i>“Mummy never told me”</i> ( <i>“Why do some women prefer to fall in love with other women...and some men with</i>	The <i>“most helpful critical review”</i> of <i>“Mummy never told me”</i> on Amazon: <i>“Disgusting! Completely inappropriate! As a Primary School teacher I found the book absolutely unsuitable for young children. SOME of the pictures were suitable for young eyes, however, the text is very much on an adult level. A lot of the questions discussed are not necessary for Infant children.”</i>

Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
		<p><i>other men?”), “<u>And Tango makes three</u>” (in which a baby penguin is brought up by two male penguins – the “most banned book” in 2009) and the infamous “<u>King and King</u>” (in which a prince marries his prince – “<i>It is a very useful tool to use to introduce children to homosexuality</i>”, says <u>one reviewer</u>).</i></p> <p>These nicely-printed, cleverly-illustrated little books sow the seeds of gender identity confusion in very young children’s minds and implant ideas contrary to scripture.</p>	<p>Many resources produced for primary schools by the sex education industry contain graphic material that is highly unsuitable for classroom use. Samples from these books are included in <u><i>Too much, too young: Exposing primary school sex education materials</i></u>, Christian Institute, September 2011.</p>
26. Further Resources	Some of the Further Resources listed are <b>inappropriate for use in a CofE primary and secondary schools</b>	<p>Examples include the notorious semi-pornographic Channel 4 <i>Living and Growing</i> DVD series, “designed” for 7 to 9 year olds. Confusingly, this is listed just above the excellent (Christian) resources produced by Lovewise and CARE.</p> <p>There is heavy emphasis on the four <i>Love and Sex Matters</i> resources, one of the authors being listed as the compiler of VAGC (in “<i>Acknowledgments</i>”). Might Katy Staples benefit from prominent inclusion of her resources in VAGC?</p>	<p>The list progresses beyond homophobic bullying to SRE.</p> <p>The Christopher Winter Project is campaigning for compulsory sex education in schools.</p>
27. Bibliography	The <b>Bibliography</b> fails to identify which of the listed resources are considered appropriate for use in CofE schools and which are not. The compilers of VAGC could and should have done this.	<p>This 46-item list of books and other publications would be perhaps more at home as a second-year undergraduate reading list.</p> <p>The evaluation burden therefore falls on</p>	



Item	Issue – what is wrong	Why it matters	Evidence or further explanation
		schools and teachers, already very hard pressed for time.	
28. Bibliography	Because there is no introductory or other qualification, the <b>Bibliography carries implicit unqualified CofE approval.</b>	Why is it here? What are teachers supposed to do with it?	
29. Bibliography	Several well-known and significant resources which support traditional Christian teaching on human sexuality are <b>omitted</b> from the Bibliography.	Why are these resources not listed? Had such resources been included, a more balanced and practical booklet, better suited for use in CofE schools, might have been published.	Such resources include authoritative books such as Professor Robert Gagnon’s acclaimed <i>Homosexuality and the Bible</i> , Paul Burgess seminal paper <i>Homosexuality in Church and Society: Charting the Issues</i> , Lambeth Conference 1.10 Human sexuality and the Dromantine communique.

25.6.14