

CONNECT

A World of Sex - In School

3065 RA

Sex education in schools is based on rights - but - WHOSE rights???

- 1 Five parents recently lost their attempt to have the way schoolchildren in Wales are taught about sex and gender identity subjected to legal scrutiny. They were also hit with a £50k legal costs order – double the usual cost.

The unsuccessful attempt by *Public Child Protection Wales* to enable a Judicial Review into sex education in schools is merely one of many such cases. Parents and other campaigners across the world are fighting sex education in schools - but why? Sex education used to be OK, albeit in a useless and embarrassing way – so what's changed? A lot, it appears.



- 2 Many older adults don't realise how different school sex education is now from when they were at school and had it inflicted on them. People of a certain age – like me - probably remember cringing as they watched films about how babies were made – and born. The fortunate ones – possibly - may also have been subjected to a film on how their bodies were going to betray them when they became teenagers. I remember that, in my school, the boys asked to see the girls' film about menstruation – and they had their request granted. Us girls were furious when we found out, because we hadn't done the same back.

Looking back, perhaps it was just as well.

To sum up – sex education in schools used to be shocking and embarrassing in roughly equal measure. The formal education was, of course, complemented by the sharing of a few dog-eared copies of top-shelf magazines – again, an experience shocking and embarrassing in equal measure.

Sex education in school is completely different now, however. So – what IS going on, sex-wise, in schools in different countries?

Firstly, it's not Sex Education any more – it's now *Sexuality Education*. Who or what is behind it? Why are so many people – parents, educators and campaigners - against it? Why is children's sex education now such an emotive and divisive topic, as evidenced by social media postings such as this one on Mumsnet – [“All about me” Sex & Relationships primary education?](#)

- 3 At CONNECT we've been sharing articles from around the world – such as this [News Punch article Parents Sue Local Government after Kids Are Taught How to Perform Oral Sex and Take Hard Drugs](#) – for some time. We've also written about this topic – links to some of those articles, by CONNECT and other people's media platforms, are under Further Reading at the end of this article. The above News Punch article was about an action by parents in Catalonia, but these issues are going on across the world, I'm extremely sad to say.

The recent case against the Welsh government was brought by **Public Child Protection Wales**. This is a group of Welsh Assembly members, child abuse survivors, therapists and concerned parents who fought a legal battle against the Welsh government to win the *right* to exclude their children from sex education lessons. The group lost their court case, as was explained in a story CONNECT shared - BP-3043B [Your Children Are Not Yours](#) - because *Relationships and Sexuality Education* has now become a compulsory element of the school curriculum. So, parents have no *right* to withdraw their children from lessons. I've italicised the word *right* because the now-compulsory sex education in schools is based – we're informed on human *rights*.

Do note that [the judge's ruling](#) on the UK Judiciary website explains in section 23 [on page 8] that the Welsh government is legally allowed to enable “*development work or experiments*” to be carried out. How interesting. Could this mean - experimentation on children in schools without their – or their parents' knowledge or *consent*? Again, I italicise, because *consent* is another buzzword in *Relationships and Sexuality Education*.

On [its website](#) Public Child Protection Wales describes its mission, in part, as being to:

- Promote a high standard of safeguarding to the children of Wales;
- Raise awareness of exploitation and abuse;
- Campaign to ensure a wholesome approach to all aspects of education.

This last aim involves *ensuring that parents and carers are involved*.

The group's website carries a vast array of information on the subject of school sex education, including links to [curriculum materials](#), the legal

background to sex education in Wales, articles and resources for campaigners.

- 4 *Relationships and Sexuality Education* has been made compulsory in schools, as I said above. The *right* for parents to withdraw their children from lessons has been removed from them. The way this *right* was removed is explained in [the judge's ruling](#) as follows:

In 2014, the Welsh Government commissioned an "independent review" of the Welsh school curriculum. When the report was published in 2015, the government accepted all the recommendations. One recommendation was that the curriculum should be organised into six "areas of learning and experience", including "health and well-being" which should include education on sex and relationships.

In 2017, an "expert panel" - the SRE Panel - was set up to advise on the sex and relationships element of education. The panel recommended that *sex and relationships education* should be re-named *sexuality and relationships education* [SRE], which later became RSE - and that this new form of sex education should be mandatory *for all schoolchildren from the age of three*.

The SRE panel said that *high-quality, holistic and inclusive SRE* was associated with a range of positive and protective outcomes for children, young people and their communities. Sounds good - so what were these outcomes? Lower rates of teenage pregnancy? The panel didn't mention that. Fewer sexually transmitted infections? No mention of that, either. So what are these "positive and protective outcomes"?

The panel claimed that *high-quality, holistic and inclusive SRE*:

- Helps young people make informed decisions about sexual intimacy and reproductive health.
In my opinion, this outcome is quite vague and woolly.
- Helps to reduce homophobic, biphobic and transphobic bullying.
How would learning about sex enable children to develop compassion and tolerance for others who are different from themselves?
- Increases safety and wellbeing for LGBTQ+ children and young people.
As above - how would learning about sex enable children to develop compassion and tolerance for others who are different from themselves?
- Helps to challenge gender and sexual stereotypes, and advance awareness of sex, gender and sexual equality and equity and VAWDASV [Violence Against Women, Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence].
This claimed outcome bundles together many different objectives and issues - I wonder why that is and how it is helpful to do so.

- Helps to increase children and young people's understanding of safe, consensual, equitable and positive relationships.
Is it only me who's wondering - what does this even mean?

5 In July 2019, according to the judge's ruling, the Welsh Government published a White Paper called Our National Mission: A Transformational Curriculum – Proposals for a new legislative framework. They did this to discover parents' views about having their right to withdraw children from lessons taken away. Of the 1,632 respondents, just 10.2% agreed with the proposal to make RSE compulsory. The vast majority - 87.5% - disagreed. On the question of whether the right to withdraw their children from RSE should be retained, 88.7% said yes. Just 9.2% said no. Having recognised that many parents held strong and "genuinely-held" - as the Welsh government put it - opposition to RSE being compulsory, why did the government make RSE compulsory? How is doing so, complying with their obligations to carry out the democratic process and respect the *rights* of parents?

Could the idea of making sexuality education compulsory have originated from the SRE Panel? The panel was chaired by [Prof Emma Renold](#), the author of a book called [Children, Sexuality and Sexualisation](#) and a member of a group that in 2018 ran, with the Welsh government, an advertising campaign with an online toolkit called AGENDA. Seriously! This campaign was designed to help people understand that men don't HAVE to work as mechanics or lumberjacks and women don't HAVE to be secretaries or nurses. Was this because, clearly, people didn't understand that was the case, until the government explained it to them?

To return to the thought processes behind making sex education compulsory – is it possible that the government chose the advisers who would advise them to make SRE compulsory? How can we know, when the SRE Panel's decision-making processes are a secret.?

An unsuccessful Freedom of Information request was made in September 2022 to the Welsh government - [Meeting minutes & attendees of the expert panel who informed the development of the future Sex and Relationships \(SRE\)](#). The reason for keeping the process a secret is:

"to protect the integrity of the co-development process and all organisations and individuals involved" because of the "wide ranging views - and strongly felt and conflicting views, values and opinions."

To make this information publicly available would "prejudice future policy development."

Might the government have a point here? Being that - *they might not get away with it a second time.*

The government also said that publication of discussions was likely to dissuade *stakeholders* from engaging in the policy development process, especially in a sensitive area of policy such as RSE.

Again – might they have a point here? Being that - *if people were to find out who said what... no, let's leave it there.*

Incidentally, the judge's ruling mentioned that the SRE Panel met with many organisations, including children's charities and churches. How interesting. The judge didn't explain whether the panel were seeking views from those parties – or seeking, perhaps, to “educate” them – or what the purpose of those meetings was.

- 6 Whatever the SRE panel discussed – in secret – about the Welsh situation, *sexuality education* in schools is being promoted all across the world by a great number of unelected international organisations. Among these are the World Health Organisation, UNESCO and the United Nations. Another is [GSDRC](#) – a partnership of research institutes, think tanks and consultancy organisations supported by the UK's Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, that published a 2015 paper called [Comprehensive sexuality education](#).

This paper says that CSE is supported by *a relatively robust evidence base*. Relatively? Wouldn't it have been appropriate to have a *robust evidence base* before rolling out something to people all over the world? The paper describes, in the Overview, what CSE is and its history. The International Planned Parenthood Federation defines comprehensive sex education as:

“Education about all matters relating to sexuality and its expression. Comprehensive sexuality education covers the same topics as sex education but also includes issues such as relationships, attitudes towards sexuality, sexual roles, gender relations and the social pressures to be sexually active, and it provides information about sexual and reproductive health services. It may also include training in communication and decision-making skills.”

Historically, the paper says, CSE is rooted in United Nations agreements, in particular, the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development's Programme of Action – known as the Cairo agenda. This agenda called on governments to *provide for the wellbeing of adolescents* with education on sexuality, sexual and reproductive health, gender relations, gender equality, and violence against adolescents.

The paper says that CSE is rooted in a *rights-based approach*, including gender and power; gender focus; participatory learning; youth advocacy and civic engagement; and cultural appropriateness. It also says that evidence *suggests* – *wouldn't it have been appropriate to have evidence that proves before rolling out something to people all over the world?* – that CSE has positive impacts on behaviour change, such as increased condom use, girls' empowerment and delayed sexual debut.

However, the paper says that there's less evidence on whether CSE can change biological indicators – notably incidences of STIs, including HIV – and pregnancies. More evidence is needed.

It's just before the second section – Evidence – begins when this paper presents us with – a BOOM! To put this BOOM! into context – this is a paper, it

appears, that presents the foundation for CSE taking place in schools across the world – it's a paper that contains the justifications for CSE.

"CSE is mostly implemented through the lens of preventing HIV/AIDS, and is mostly directed at adolescent girls."

WHAT???

It appears that this paper is on the subject of CSE as a whole, without any distinction being made between participants of different ages or in different countries. A "one size fits all" approach, in other words.

Leaving that aside, in terms of evidence for CSE, the paper says that the most widely-cited guidance document is UNESCO's 2009 International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education. This guidance is based on evidence of the effectiveness of sexuality education programmes. One-third of the studies it reviewed were from "developing countries" and just 70 % were from schools. The other 30% were from communities and clinics.

Here is a quote:

"None of the programmes in this comprehensive review had any negative effects on outcomes, but the results were not overwhelmingly positive."

Overall, nearly all programmes increased knowledge and two-thirds changed behaviours, including delayed sexual debut, frequency of unprotected sex, number of partners, increased contraceptive use, and reduced risky sex.

Here's another quote:

"In developing countries, most of the programmes demonstrated no significant impact..."

Also, although UNESCO said that the evidence is quite strong for improved condom and contraceptive use, there's a problem with this apparent evidence of success.

The aim is to reduce STIs and unwanted pregnancies – isn't it? Shouldn't those outcomes, then, be the indicators of success – among others?

Under section 3 – Outcomes – the paper says that there is strong evidence that CSE produces positive behavioural outcomes, but less evidence of positive biological outcomes, particularly HIV and STIs. UNESCO claimed there was evidence that CSE is effective due to reduced misinformation and increased correct knowledge, increased skills to make informed decisions and act upon them and increased communication with parents and other trusted adults, among other outcomes.

I expect there's another world in which these outcomes justify what's going on in schools across our world. It's not a world, however, that I recognise or wish to inhabit.

The paper goes on to say:

"Although there is plenty of evidence for changing sexual behaviours, there is no focus as yet on other outcomes, such as gender equality, critical thinking, empowerment, or confidence."

and also:

"There is also some slight evidence to suggest CSE might be able to influence a broader range of social changes, such as early marriage, sexual coercion, sex trafficking, intimate-partner violence."

That's good, then. Oh, wait... the paper goes on:

"As yet there is not enough research conducted on these areas to make a definitive statement."

Despite this expanded admission that CSE isn't evidenced as being effective, the next section, section 4, is:

Strategies for implementation at scale.

It reads as if: the decision has been made – the boring evidence part's finished – now, let's roll it out!!!

Does this mirror what the Welsh government did? In their case, was it a matter of – *'the boring due process part is finished – now, let's roll it out'!!!*

- 7 As I described above, the Welsh government – it appears from the judge's ruling – *has not complied with due process* in making it compulsory for children to take part in sex education lessons in school. This government is also – it appears from the Freedom of Information request – *not prepared to be transparent* about how the decision to make it compulsory was arrived at.

Aren't these two issues alone sufficient to raise reasonable concerns?

Particularly as UNESCO in its article [Why comprehensive sexuality education is important](#), says [the embolding is mine]:

"Sexuality education has the most impact when school-based programmes are complemented with the involvement of parents and teachers, training institutes and youth-friendly services."

Other reasonable concerns about sexuality education are:

What evidence is there that it's good for children?

Does sexuality education make children more vulnerable to sexual abuse?

In terms of evidence, UNESCO openly admits that there doesn't exist – yet – *comprehensive* evidence for the effectiveness of comprehensive sexuality education [CSE]. UNESCO says this on page 31 of its [International technical guidance on sexuality education](#) – subtitled, ironically, *an evidence-informed approach*.

This guidance says that there is limited evidence about the impact of CSE on

LGBTI young people; violence prevention; and long-term positive outcomes for sexual and reproductive health.

Despite this lack of evidence, soon after the above guidance UNESCO published the article referred to above - [Why comprehensive sexuality education is important](#).

The World Health Organisation [WHO], which carries the UNESCO technical guidance on its website - [International technical guidance on sexuality education](#) - says:

"Comprehensive sexuality education plays a central role in the preparation of young people for a safe, productive, fulfilling life in a world where HIV and AIDS, sexually transmitted infections (STIs), unintended pregnancies, gender-based violence (GBV) and gender inequality still pose serious risks to their well-being."

The WHO does not explain how CSE helps to reduce gender-based violence or gender inequality. I don't see that learning about sex – or rather, sexuality – will help with either of those issues. This issue is one of the reasons that I'm so concerned about CSE. The reasons being given for pushing it aren't credible - to me, at least – which brings me to another oft-quoted justification for CSE – that is pornography.

The WHO goes on to say:

"Countries are increasingly acknowledging the importance of equipping young people with the knowledge and skills to make responsible choices in their lives, particularly in a context where they have greater exposure to sexually explicit material through the Internet and other media."

This one-size-fits-all approach is incredibly troubling – to me and I'd imagine many other people too. The idea that all children are exposed to *porn* or any other sexually explicit material is simply untrue and ignores cultural differences. "All children are going to go online and look at sexual material – we need to show it to them first" seems to be the mantra behind CSE.

[Sexuality Education: What Is It?](#) is a policy brief published by the WHO in partnership with Germany's [Federal Centre for Health Education](#) and the [United Nations Population Fund](#) [UNFPA]. The latter is the United Nations' sexual and reproductive health agency.

An odd statement about age-appropriate CSE appears in this document, being:

"A child aged four to six years learns for example about topics such as friendships, emotions and different parts of the body."

Hold on a moment.

How is any of the above - *friendships, emotions and different parts of the body* - sexuality?

This document also makes a number of claims including:

Good quality sexuality education does not lead to young people having sex earlier;

Sexuality education does not deprive children of their "innocence" – *why the quotation marks, I wonder?;*

Sexuality education and an open attitude towards sexuality do not make it easier for paedophiles to abuse children. The opposite is the case: when children learn about equality and respect in relationships, they are in a better position to recognize abusive persons and situations;

Sexuality education is not damaging to children or adolescents.

Little evidence is provided to support these claims. Some of the evidence that IS offered comes from studies in Finland and Estonia. It's almost as if CSE is a magic bullet – it works the same in any country and culture – and then there's that old chestnut - correlation does not equal causation.

Sexual abuse – as defined by [the NSPCC](#) – includes some of the activities being done with – or to – children in schools across the world. The NSPCC defines "non-contact abuse" as "where a child is abused without being touched by the abuser."

This can take the form of [the embolding is mine to indicate activities which are going on in schools]:

exposing or flashing

showing pornography

exposing a child to sexual acts

making them masturbate

forcing a child to make, view or share child abuse images or videos

making, viewing or distributing child abuse images or videos

forcing a child to take part in sexual activities or conversations online or through a smartphone.

I am unaware of any evidence that sexualisation of children by trusted adults makes children less vulnerable to abuse. There's a horrifying level now of paedophilia – in every sense. It appears that the sexual abuse of children is going on at every level in society.

And there's evidence that sexuality education makes children more vulnerable to such abuse – and may even facilitate it. The Public Child Protection Wales website carries a link to a research paper called [Re-Examining The Evidence For Comprehensive Sex Education In Schools: A Global Research Review](#).

This 2019 study, by the Institute For Research and Evaluation, makes sobering reading. The study's findings contradict the widely-promoted view that school-based comprehensive sex education [CSE] is highly effective. Not only does this research indicate that only a small proportion of studies into CSE found positive outcomes – some of these studies were carried out by the same people who ran the CSE programmes!

Another report on the website, that also makes sobering reading – in fact, requires a strong stomach – is the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse's [Residential Schools Investigation](#).

The issues revealed include:

- Shocking and horrific instances of child sexual abuse in schools by school staff and other children.
- Teachers exploiting the positions of trust they hold to groom and abuse children.
- A reluctance by schools to report allegations of sexual abuse.
- A culture within schools which discouraged reporting.
- Head teachers who found it inconceivable that staff might abuse their positions of authority to sexually abuse children.
- Head teachers who were unaware of current statutory guidance or did not understand their role in responding to allegations against staff.
- A focus by some staff on protecting the reputation of the school, rather than protecting the children.

The report says that many of the school staff in positions of authority and responsibility have not been held to account for their failures of leadership and governance – and that many of the perpetrators have not been brought to justice.

Although this report is obviously into residential schools, can we be sure that the issues revealed within it are not present in day schools? Why would there be any difference?

- 8 CSE is not evidenced to be effective, it appears. Evidence that it does no harm would require experimentation – which, of course, would be grossly unethical – just like the “evidence” that is often used to support the idea that children are sexual from birth was grossly unethical. And that’s putting it mildly.

The “evidence” I refer to is from the sexologist Alfred Kinsey’s “research” into children’s sexuality, most notably the infamous “[Table 34](#)” from his book “Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male.”

As explained on Dr Judith Reisman’s website, this table presents data from around the clock experiment on children from 5 months to 10 years of age. There’s a lot of discussion online as to whether the collector of this data was a paedophile. Obviously, the data was collected by a paedophile! The act of taking part in – or even observing – “sexual activity” involving children is an act of paedophilia. I don’t remember seeing any questioning online about who the children were – or where they were sourced from.

- 9 It appears that CSE is being rolled out all over the world, as shown by the film [The War on Children: The Comprehensive Sexuality Education Agenda](#) on the website for Stop CSE. The film – which exists in two versions of different lengths – explores how CSE is being rolled out, even in parts of the world where people lack access to clean water and other essentials of life. A key

partner in this rollout across the world, it appears, is the International Planned Parenthood Foundation.

Many parents who stand against CSE are portrayed by the mainstream media as religious extremists or prudes. One of the parents in the above film, however, not only makes an excellent point but identifies one of the issues with CSE.

She says in the film:

"We couldn't show this content on the TV news... yet it's being shown to our children in school."

One puzzling thing is that a lot of the content of CSE curriculum material in schools could not be shown on TV before the watershed – or possibly, even afterwards – because of obscenity laws. In many states in the USA, however, CSE material is exempt from obscenity laws, as stated at 27m 20s in the video of a talk by Sharon Slater, the President of Family Watch International. The film is called – [Protecting Children from Pornographic Materials in the Schools](#).

At 31:00 the film reveals that, in many states in the USA, a loophole called the Obscenity Exemption Statute protects CSE materials.

A video on the [Parents' Rights in Education](#) website appears to show a parent being removed from a school meeting in New Hampshire, USA – and arrested in handcuffs – simply for challenging the material that his daughter is being exposed to – in school by her teachers.

Schools used to carry out a detailed risk assessment before they did anything. Now, it seems, anything goes. Literally, as shown by Stop CSE's [Materials Index](#), which gives links to some of the curriculum materials in use around the world.

The index doesn't include the UK but the UK government's guidance for schools – [Relationships Education, Relationships and Sex Education \(RSE\) and Health Education](#) – gives an overview.

As for Scotland, before looking at the content of the curriculum in Scotland as presented by Regina Erich on Think Scotland in [What the Scottish Government wants your kids to learn about sex and relationships](#), it might be a good idea to take a stiff drink. A wee dram, perhaps.

The reason is that, as the Scots government are happy to show us on their website, "Sex" in Sexuality Education includes anal sex. How can informing children about this, NOT result in the expectation that it's on the menu? CSE advocates claim to protect children from inaccurate information about sex. How does anal sex in the classroom [not literally, I hope!] NOT give children inaccurate information about sex? They're learning about anal sex in school – so anal sex MUST BE sex.

- 10 We're told that CSE is a "rights-based" form of sex education. One, in other words, that is based on the "rights" of children and young people.

But has anyone ever heard of a grassroots movement by children demanding to be taught about sex? Without such a movement – led by young people themselves – how is the *rights* argument valid?

Are children's *rights* being used to justify an agenda? Because - if children and young people have *rights* -

Why don't schoolchildren have the *right* to choose what they learn in school?

Why don't they have the *right* to privacy when they go to the toilet in school? Schools routinely film children – often removing the cameras when they're found out – as I've covered before in a previous article on CONNECT: [Who's Filming Our Children?](#) : M-1375AG

We've also shared a news story [Cameras In School Toilets](#) SC-2292A which, extremely worryingly, suggested that not only are students being filmed in school but they are being taught that *they cannot say no to members of staff*.

Why don't they have the *right* to be safe in school? Many schools have police on the premises – and children have been [assaulted by them by being strip searched](#) [as reported by SKY] without even an appropriate adult present.

The only arena in which – we're told – children have rights is in the arena of sexuality education.

They *surely* have the right to learn about sex – and sexuality – on their terms, at the right time for them. Not before.

They *surely* have the right to see CSE ended – forever.

They *surely* have the right to remain free from sexualisation from an external source – whether that's their teacher, school or government - until they blossom into their sexuality – *theirs*, that is.

Not the school's or the government's.

Not the UN's, UNESCO's or the WHO's.

So – if CSE isn't about children's rights – whose rights ARE being served by CSE?

I've referred to several organisations which are promoting it – but, like fractals, there's always a deeper level and beyond that, a deeper level still.

So - what might really be behind this push to push sex onto children?

That'll have to be the subject of another article!

CONNECT'S Maxim and Oath

Connect is only interested in finding and sharing the TRUTH.
In search of that TRUTH, we only pose questions – we have no answers.

By: Helen King

Contact/Source: CONNECT: [Magazine](#)

- 2 [LINK](#) **Mumsnet:** discussion thread: "All about me" Sex & Relationships primary education
- 3 [LINK](#) **News Punch:** Parents Sue Local Government after Kids Are Taught How to Perform Oral Sex and Take Hard Drugs
- 3 [LINK](#) **Connect:** BP3043B: Your Children Are Not Yours
- 3 [LINK](#) **UK Judiciary:** Approved Judgment: Kimberly Isherwood, AXD, Grace Patton, Mark Thomas and Kate Broom vs The Welsh Ministers
- 3 [LINK](#) **Public Child Protection Wales**
- 3 [LINK](#) **Public Child Protection Wales:** Curriculum Materials
- 5 [LINK](#) **Cardiff University:** Professor Emma Renold joins Welsh Government in launching #THISISME campaign
- 5 [LINK](#) **Cardiff University:** New expert healthy relationships group to advise on curriculum
- 5 [LINK](#) **What Do They Know:** FOI request: Meeting minutes & attendees of the expert panel who informed the development of the future Sex and Relationships (SRE)
- 6 [LINK](#) **GSDRC**
- 6 [LINK](#) **UK gov't:** GSDRC: Comprehensive sexuality education
- 7 [LINK](#) **UNESCO:** Why comprehensive sexuality education is important
- 7 [LINK](#) **Public Child Protection Wales:**
UNESCO: International technical guidance on sexuality education
- 7 [LINK](#) **World Health Organisation [WHO]:**
UNESCO: International technical guidance on sexuality education
- 7 [LINK](#) **World Health Organisation:** Sexuality Education: What Is It?
- 7 [LINK](#) **Federal Centre for Health Education [BZGA]**
- 7 [LINK](#) **Wikipedia:** United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA]
- 7 [LINK](#) **NSPCC:** Sexual Abuse
- 7 [LINK](#) **Public Child Protection Wales:**
Re-Examining The Evidence For Comprehensive Sex Education In Schools: A Global Research Review
- 7 [LINK](#) **Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse:**
Residential Schools Investigation
- 8 [LINK](#) **Dr Judith Reisman:** Table 34 [Alfred Kinsey]
- 9 [LINK](#) **Stop CSE: film:** The War on Children
- 9 [LINK](#) **Vimeo: Sharon Slater:**
Protecting Children from Pornographic Materials in Schools
- 9 [LINK](#) **Parents' Rights in Education:** Obscenity in Schools

- 9 [LINK](#) **UK government's guidance for schools:** Relationships Education, Relationships and Sex Education (RSE) and Health Education
- 9 [LINK](#) **Think Scotland:** Regina Erich: What the Scottish Government wants your kids to learn about sex and relationships
- 10 [LINK](#) **Connect:** Who's Filming Our Children? M-1375AG
- 10 [LINK](#) **Connect:** Cameras In School Toilets SC-2292A
- 10 [LINK](#) **SKY:** Child Q assaulted by police in school - strip searched

FURTHER READING

- [LINK](#) **Connect:** Sex In Schools M-2345EC
- [LINK](#) **Connect:** Schools Have Superior Power BP-3054B
- [LINK](#) **Connect:** Schools Are Sexualising Kids DD3044A [includes a link to the film "Kinsey's Paedophiles"]
- [LINK](#) **Connect:** Can You Believe This? SC-2495A
- [LINK](#) **The Reisiman Institute:** The Kinsey Coverup

PLEASE DOWNLOAD AND SHARE THIS ARTICLE



Opportunity to join the **CONNECT** [team and network](#)

END