

Colliding Worldviews: How to Survive as a NARTH Member in the Public School System

Presented by Chris Kemping, M. Ed., M.A., R.C.C.
Quesnel, British Columbia, Canada

A parent in an adjacent community called me up a few years ago, and said, “My 19-year-old daughter wants to become a man, and insists we call her ‘Mike’.” She is taking hormones and is on the waitlist for gender reassignment surgery. We are Christian and know that this cannot be right. And our 10-year-old son and 8-year-old daughter are very confused. We don’t know what to tell them about what has happened to their sister, or how deal with this. Can you help us?”

This was my first request for assistance with a transgenderism issue. Although I never did meet “Mike,” I was able to help that family through this crisis. But it certainly showed me how little I knew about this issue. That is one reason I decided to join NARTH.

But it’s not the only reason. The main reason I joined is because I needed professional reinforcement to help me deal with a concerted effort to prevent me from exercising my constitutional right of freedom of speech. I have been censured by my professional body, the British Columbia College of Teachers, for conduct unbecoming a member of the College, for publicly expressing my views that orientation can be changed and for pointing out that the sexual practices common among homosexual men put young people at serious risk of disease infection. The homosexual lobby in my country appears to think they are entitled to absolute immunity from any critical comment on their conduct.

One colleague who disagrees with my point of view, commented that the current situation with gay rights is like the aftermath of a Communist revolution. The revolutionaries are now in control and all opposition must be silenced, the way Stalin and Castro did so effectively. That is the way it appears to be now in Canada, and in many US states as well. While this collision of world views is wrapped up in the struggle between the Christian heritages of our two countries, and the emerging dominance of secular humanism, on a smaller scale it is a collision between professionals who believe that homosexuality should be celebrated and affirmed, and those who believe it is rooted in dysfunction, for which therapies should be available.

So how did my conflict with the “thought police” get started? In August of 1996, I attended a Ministry of Education sponsored workshop in Vancouver called Youth at Risk. One of the sessions was entitled “Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Youth at Risk,” and I thought it would be a good idea for me, as a high school counselor, to find out more about this student group. In the session, the presenters made the erroneous claim that

homosexuals form 10% of the population. They also handed us a copy of *Xtra West* newspaper, the paper of the gay community in Vancouver, and recommended we use it in our classrooms and counseling office waiting rooms. They said, "But you may not want to look at the classified ads." Of course, we all did. I was appalled by what I read. There were numerous advertisements for bathhouses, which are notorious venues for orgies and perversion. The personal ads were absolutely pornographic with people describing their genitalia in great detail and requesting partners for casual sex, including sex involving urine and feces. They gave us another resource booklet with addresses and phone numbers of programs and services for gay youth. I was a little confused by one called Vancouver Jack and asked what that was. I was told it was a masturbation club.

When I realized that these workshop presenters actually wanted us to provide pornographic material to students and encourage them to join masturbation clubs, I was greatly disturbed and started writing letters privately, to my union and to the Minister of Education. Neither was concerned. When I realized that no one in authority was prepared to take any action, I decided to educate myself, and start writing directly to the public, to make parents aware of what was being proposed for their children.

The result of my efforts to inform parents was that on May 9, 2001, I was convicted of conduct unbecoming a member of the BC College of Teachers. The reason was because I expressed my opinion in the local newspaper, the *Quesnel Cariboo Observer*. Between April 1997 and July, 2000, I wrote one freelance column and six letters to the editor in the *Observer*, debating with others who held differing points of view. I questioned the wisdom of promoting the homosexual agenda, and provided rebuttal arguments to those who clearly were unaware of well-documented research.

I provided factual information on rates of promiscuity and disease infection, which had been previously published in scholarly journals. I quoted from members of the homosexual community such as John McKellar, the president of a Toronto based organization called Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism (HOPE), who do not share the radical agenda espoused by the Gay and Lesbian Educators of BC (GALE-BC) and the BC Teachers' Federation, which is the teacher's union in British Columbia. I said that many religions consider homosexuality to be immoral, that it may be caused by negative psycho-social influences, and that it wasn't something to be applauded. I said this not in my classroom, or my staff room, but on the editorial pages of our newspaper, primarily during the summer months. I had thought that the editorial page was a place where all Canadians have the right to express their points of view, whether other people like them or not.

I have been a freelance journalist for over 20 years, and I highly value the freedom of the press. I believe all points of view should be represented in our newspapers, including those opposed to mine. But a man by the name of Hayward Broun once said,

“Everyone favours free speech in the slack moment when no axes are being ground.”
And how true that is.

The *Quesnel Cariboo Observer’s* editor made the decision to publish my letters, and believe me, he does not personally support my point of view. While I do not always agree with his editorial decisions, I respect him as a fellow professional, and one who values freedom of the press as much as I do.

Freedom of the press is a vital element of any democracy. Mr. Horner published four letters from Quesnel citizens who were supportive of me. He published more than twice as many letters from people who were opposed to my point of view. They criticized me very harshly, calling me homophobic and undeserving of being a teacher in the public school system.

That I am allegedly homophobic is absurd. I have yet to meet a gay person with whom I do not get along, and certainly am not afraid of them. In fact, I have been a guest in the home of an openly gay man, a colleague whom I befriended during my masters degree program at the University of Victoria, as well as two others. Homophobic? I don’t think so. In fact, I have yet to encounter anyone in my 17 years of being a mental health therapist who has an irrational fear of homosexuals, although I’m sure there are some out there. The gay lobby is misusing a mental health term for propaganda purposes. Orientation bias is a more accurate term and one that ethical educators ought to be using.

Someone in Quesnel, who is not a homosexual, and who has no connection whatsoever with the school system, collected all these newspaper clippings and sent them to the College of Teachers. When they asked me to respond in my defense, I sent them copies of private letters I had written to Quesnel city councilors, as well as confidential memos to my senior supervisor. I also sent them two unpublished research essays I had written as part of my doctorate in psychology. All of these documents clearly showed that my views were based on scholarly research and my Christian beliefs. None of the recipients of these private letters expressed any concerns to me, or to the College, over their contents, and that includes a city councilor who was the most prominent homosexual person in our community.

The College’s response was to add these documents to their list of evidence against me, and to declare that “everything you have written in its entirety is discriminatory and derogatory.” When I pointed out that Human Rights legislation in BC forbids the use of private documents to establish that public discrimination has occurred, and that my Christian beliefs are protected by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, they simply repeated their claim that everything I had written was derogatory and discriminatory in its entirety. This included quotations from gay writers, quotes from the Bible, and even a letter which actually supported one of the major goals of the gay lobby. But, because these were contained in something I wrote, it was deemed discriminatory. I’m still trying

to figure out why quoting homosexuals constitutes discrimination against homosexuals. It's very Orwellian.

If their verdict stands, teachers will not be able to write privately to their own supervisors to question a new curriculum resource, or write privately their own elected officials on a matter of public policy, nor will they be able to address the topic of homosexuality in unpublished post-graduate research papers. This is an unacceptable restriction of freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, and freedom of intellectual expression.

The College of Teachers thinks that my membership with them trumps all of my other memberships and associations. It doesn't. I have the freedom to associate with a Christian church and the freedom to act as a self employed therapist who believes that orientation can be changed. And if we cannot act or speak in a manner consistent with our other associations, what kind of freedom is that? I rent 40 hours of my time each week to be a teacher—and the College of Teachers has no right to tell me what to think or say when I am acting on my own time, with my own religious beliefs, or in ways consistent with my membership and associations with other groups, if those actions have no negative effect on my ability to do my job—even the College has admitted it found no evidence of negative impact.

But I'm a reasonable guy. So in October of 2000, I promised my superiors that I would stop writing on this topic in the local paper. I had made my point, and saw no further need to continue the debate. In February, 2001, I made the same offer to the College of Teachers, without being asked to, so that the matter could be resolved without further controversy. Their response was to launch a full investigation, and send a lawyer to Quesnel to speak to community members, to my colleagues, and supervisors. They did not even ask to interview me, and to this day I have yet to speak directly with anyone from the College of Teachers about my case. Can you imagine being convicted of a crime without ever being interviewed by the police? It happened to me.

The investigator did not find any evidence of a "poisoned atmosphere" at my school. She did not find any evidence that students, gay or straight, were negatively impacted by what I had written. They ignored the 14 letters of commendation in my personnel file, as well as the letter from my former Vice Principal, who declared that in his seven years of supervising me, my publicly expressed views had no impact whatsoever on the learning atmosphere at my school. Four other administrators at my school wrote letters saying basically the same thing.

The College presented no complaints about what I had written publicly from teachers, none from students, none from parents, and most importantly, none from any member of the gay community. The people who did disagree with me did so by writing their own letters to the editor, and I fully support their right to do that.

In their verdict, the College of Teachers compared me to writers of anti-Semitic literature who had been convicted of hate-mongering. That really hurt. I have dedicated my entire adult life to supporting children. I am a Big Brother, and am on my third match in 12 years. I was president of the Quesnel agency of Big Brothers/Big Sisters for four years. I have been a member of the Quesnel Child & Youth Support Society for twenty-one years and was president for 14 of those years. Currently, I am a part-time children's therapist for that society. To have the College of Teachers declare that I am somehow a danger to children is outrageous and defamatory. They actually intended to suspend me from teaching for five months, and decided on a lesser penalty only after my lawyer made a vigorous defense on my behalf

So where did this hostility to freedom of speech come from? Perhaps the clue is in a conversation between a retired teacher and Douglas Smart, who is now the ex-registrar of the College of Teachers. When this teacher asked Mr. Smart in 1996 what he hoped to accomplish by suppressing teachers who wished to comment on homosexual issues, he allegedly replied, "We intend to arrange it so that no teacher will dare to write any letter to the editor critical of homosexuality, and will not even raise their voice on this issue on a public street corner." My Member of Parliament, which is the equivalent of a member of the House of Representatives, called the College of Teachers, the "thought police" in a recent newspaper column, and given Mr. Smart's statement, I'm inclined to agree.

Some people have wondered if I am getting any support. The College of Teachers has already received hundreds of letters of protest. The December 3, 2002, edition of the *Vancouver Province* newspaper, published 17 letters to the editor on my case and 16 of them were critical of the College. I have had e-mails, letters of support, and financial donations from almost every province and many U.S. states. I recently received donations to my legal trust fund of \$1000 from three different people. The Catholic Civil Rights League, REAL Women of Canada, and the Canadian Alliance for Social Justice and Family Values Association have pledged their support. I have received character references or letters of support from my current Mayor, the former mayor, my MLA Dr. John Wilson (who is the equivalent of a state representative), the president of Big Brothers, the president of the Child & Youth Support Society, the CEO of our hospital, the chair of the Quesnel Christian Ministerial Association, the President of the Quesnel School District support workers union, my current principal, my former principal, and three former vice principals. In April, Rafe Mair, a very popular talk radio host in Vancouver, blasted the College for their suppression of free speech in his radio show. Last July, a group of nuns in Alabama e-mailed me to say that they would be praying for me for 30 days for 24 hours per day. I cried when I read that. I am receiving a great deal of support. But did any of this make any difference? Unfortunately, no.

The Supreme Court case which occurred in July was about whether my Constitutional rights to freedom of speech and freedom of religion have been violated. The College of Teachers has told my lawyer that they do not need any evidence of actual harm to

discipline a member, only the possibility that harm could occur. This position is so alarming that even the BC Teachers Federation lawyer Susan Charlton stated, “This a very bad decision for teachers.”

The School Act of British Columbia states that the highest morality must be inculcated. To inculcate means to emphasize by repeated teaching. I ask you—why is Christian morality not considered to be part of the highest morality? Why is it that a very small cohort of a small minority can dictate to the rest of us that our version of morality is not acceptable? According to Murray Mollard, the executive director of the BC Civil Liberties Association, the equivalent of the ACLU, highest morality means secular morality and for that reason he has refused to offer any assistance to protect freedom of speech and freedom of religion. He said I might try to convert someone at my school, which frankly is a stupid statement. His declaration was very surprising to me since I had not even asked them for support. He basically volunteered not to help me, before I even asked for it. I find it appalling that this Civil Liberties Association has such a low regard for freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

But they didn't stop there. In June, my lawyer informed me that the BC Civil Liberties Association had applied for intervenor status in my case. It was granted to them and they intervened on the side of the College of Teachers. It seems they objected to two sentences which I had written. Because of those two sentences they stated that I should not be permitted to work as a public school teacher at all, unless I publicly recanted. Shades of Galileo. Frankly, I am dumbfounded that a civil liberties organization would take such an Orwellian position.

But it got worse for me. In February, CBC, the main national TV network, broadcast a documentary on my case. They had sent a team from Toronto to follow me around for five days. A week after the broadcast I was summoned to the district board office and grilled for 90 minutes by the assistant superintendent. He admitted that no one had contacted him to complain about the broadcast. After I refused to sign a letter relinquishing virtually all of my freedom of speech, he gave me a letter of direction. The letter stated that I was forbidden to publish or distribute anything on the topic of homosexuality, and that I was prohibited from expressing my opinion on the topic in any school district facility. I responded by arguing that this was a serious infringement on my freedom of speech, and that furthermore, not one person had complained about the CBC broadcast. It fell on deaf ears. That letter of direction is still in place. When I preached a sermon this summer in another town on the topic of homosexuality, again, I was given a letter of discipline, announcing I was being investigated for contravening my letter of direction. I'm happy to announce, however, that they decided a sermon on homosexuality was not something I should be disciplined for. Nevertheless, they have not withdrawn the letter of direction, so I am still facing the prospect of being disciplined for making my views public on my own time.

As it now stands, I cannot have a private conversation in my counseling office about reparative therapy with a parent, make a presentation on the issue in a public school board meeting, or defend the Christian point of view if a public debate is called by the school board at a neutral venue.

Does this seem like a totalitarian dictatorship to you, where taking a principled stand on a matter of morality subjects someone to loss of income, enormous legal bills, and, even a civil liberties group arguing for a permanent ousting from the profession?

It is important for you to understand the zeitgeist in our country on this divisive social issue. In 1995, a homosexual man named James Egan won a Supreme Court of Canada decision that changed everything. When our national Charter of Rights and Freedoms was officially established in 1982, sexual orientation was intentionally omitted, partly because no one was really sure what that would include. Mr. Egan was denied spousal benefits under the national pension program even though he had been in a stable same sex relationship since 1948. He sued the government and won. As a result of this decision, sexual orientation was “read into” the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and since then, all major court decisions affecting gay rights has been based on the Egan case.

There was one very significant statement in the Egan case, which puts reparative change therapists at some risk in our country. One sentence in the judgment says this: “Sexual orientation is a deeply ingrained personal characteristic that is either unchangeable, or changeable only at unacceptable personal cost.” I’m going to read that again. This statement was used against me in my court case, because I had the audacity to publicly imply that orientation could be changed, and that it was in the best of children to seek help for that purpose. But a Supreme Court of Canada decision is extremely influential. Basically, it is the legal position of the highest court of the land in Canada that orientation is unchangeable or, if people want to change, it will ruin their lives to try. I have no idea why the court reached this decision—obviously, the government, who was the defendant in the Egan case, neglected to call someone from NARTH as an expert witness!

The situation for teachers in British Columbia is strongly influenced by the teachers union, the BC Teacher’s Federation. In 1997, the BCTF launched a campaign to eliminate so-called homophobia and heterosexism. To that end they published and distributed to every school district, lesson aids written by the Gay and Lesbian Educators of BC. In these lessons aids, GALE implies that everyone who does not support the pro-gay agenda is homophobic and needs to change their views. When I wrote to them saying that it was unprofessional to accuse people who happened to believe that homosexuality was morally wrong due to their religious beliefs, and entirely inappropriate to declare that those who held those beliefs had some sort of mental illness, a phobia, or irrational fear, they ignored me.

In their lesson aid *Counselling Lesbian and Gay Youth*, (1995) the authors state that “we must dishonour the prevailing belief that heterosexuality is the only acceptable orientation”. I pointed out to them that it was unprofessional and unethical for any teacher to attempt to dishonour the religious beliefs of children in their classrooms, and the moral teachings of their parents. They ignored me.

In their lesson aid *Challenging Homophobia in Schools*, (1998) GALE states that homosexuals make up 10% of the population. Naturally, we in NARTH know that is a false figure from the discredited Kinsey study in 1948. Most people don't know that 26% of the men in his study were prison inmates, and he asked them if they had had sex with another man in the last year. Well, duh! The most recent comprehensive and valid study done by researchers at the University of Chicago in 1994 by Laumann et al found that it is between 2-3%. Another study done in Holland by Sandfort, et al, in 2001 found identical figures. The College of Teachers found me guilty of misconduct for publicly correcting that error.

They blame the high suicide rate among homosexuals on homophobia. There have never been any studies which show that. The majority of suicides are in reaction to clinical depression, and homosexual people have rates of depression that are approximately four to five times those of heterosexuals according to a Sandfort, et al's study.

GALE stated in their lesson aid that homosexuality is inherited and unchangeable. That is not true, either. The origins of homosexuality have never been proven by any current research, and anyone who claims there is definitive proof of homosexuality as an inherited condition is talking through their hat. Even the authors of the studies which seem to show a genetic connection, such as Dr. Dean Hamer, have publicly denied that their studies prove inherency.

Furthermore, there is plenty of evidence that homosexual individuals who wish to change their orientation can do so, and some of them do so with no therapy whatsoever. I have met and spoken with some of them and they are very happy to be ex-homosexuals. The journal of the American Psychological Association has recently published research on reparative therapy, and so has the Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy. Moreover, the psychiatrist who spear-headed the removal of homosexuality from the handbook of psychological disorders in 1973, Dr. Robert Spitzer, has published research on successful orientation change in the *Archives of Sexual Behavior* in the last month's issue of that journal.

GALE states in a lesson plan resource called Famous Gays and Lesbians in History, that David, the author of the Psalms, was the gay lover of Jonathan. The resource is unprofessional, unethical, inaccurate, and in my opinion, meets the definition of propaganda. It is both insulting and insensitive to members of the Christian faith. But they absolutely refused to change or edit anything in it.

The BCTF AGM passed a resolution in 1998 that called for pro-gay themes in every grade from Kindergarten to grade 12 and in every curriculum area. Currently, two homosexual teachers have launched an appeal to the BC Human Rights Tribunal to force the Ministry of Education to implement this policy and make it mandatory for all teachers to teach this to our children. The BCTF has devoted thousands of dollars of union funds to publish and distribute the GALE resources.

I am in trouble, because I publicly stated that these policies were offensive to the religious beliefs of many students, parents and teachers, and that I would refuse to implement them. I am a Christian seven days a week, both on the job and off the job, and I will not compromise my faith to deliver these union directives.

So what can we do? I promised you I would give you some ideas on how to survive in the public school system even though you espouse NARTH positions.

1. Most teachers' organizations have a code of ethics. The BCTF Code of Ethics requires that teachers be "mindful of the rights and sensibilities of their students." Now, that means that I cannot preach in my classroom, or refer a student for orientation change therapy if they or their parents have not requested it. But it also means that students from faith communities who believe that this is a moral issue, should not be indoctrinated with teachings about sexuality which directly contradict the values of their faith. That would create a poisoned atmosphere for our children. It means that teachers should not use biased, inaccurate, and propaganda-like teaching resources. Appeal to your colleagues' sense of professionalism and insist that any resources used to teach about homosexuality are balanced, ethical and accurate.

There is another point in the Teachers' Code of Ethics which says this: "The teacher recognizes that a privileged relationship with students exists and refrains from exploiting that relationship for material, ideological, or other advantage." That means that using biased resources to implement policies hostile to Christian beliefs is unethical, because it exploits children for ideological advantage.

Find out what your organization's code of ethics says, and use it to your advantage.

1. Most school districts have a policy which allows anyone to question the use of proposed classroom materials. Find out what that policy is and follow the protocol. Generally, that means directly contacting the teacher first, then the principal, then the superintendent, and finally the school board. You will be afforded much more credibility by your critics if you follow the established protocols. The policy in my district is called the Reconsideration Policy, and requires the superintendent to formally investigate every complaint. I recently used it to have the Hollywood movie *Shakespeare in Love* prohibited from

classroom use. I didn't think that Gwyneth Paltrow's breasts were suitable for senior students to be viewing in their English classes.

2. Be very careful what you write publicly. There are one or two statements I wrote in rebuttal to some pretty unpleasant letters to the editor which personally targeted me, that I wish, in hindsight, that I had worded differently. Have someone whose judgment you trust proofread everything you write. Make sure you explain to your spouse and your family what you are doing and why. My daughter recently asked me why I "hate" gay people. Some students at her school had let her know that is what they thought I believed.
3. Stay physically, mentally, and spiritually fit. While many people will privately express support, very few will publicly stand with you. It will take all the stamina you possess to hold your public position. Personally, my Christian faith is what has sustained me throughout this seven-year ordeal.
4. If you are targeted for discipline, engage the support of your union immediately. This was very hard for me to do, because they were the primary source of everything I was publicly protesting. Nevertheless, unions tend to be very concerned about protecting their members against unfair or unconstitutional discipline, and want to see due process given, even if they are philosophically opposed to your position. In my case, my union reluctantly decided to pay a portion of my legal fees, which are now close to \$40,000.
5. In some cases, you will have no choice about legal representation if the union is paying the shot. In my case, I hired a lawyer privately who was an expert in administrative law. His entire practice involves defending professionals who are undergoing discipline by their professional associations. Later, my union decided to contract the job out to him. Hiring a lawyer because you know them personally, or because they share the same faith as you, may not be in your best interests. Hire an expert in the field. So far, I have been very satisfied with my representation.
6. You may wish to consider hiring a public relations expert to help you deal with the media, and to keep your message consistent. I have not done this yet, but I certainly see the advantage of this. My lawyer estimated it would cost me \$3,000 for this type of expertise.
7. Establish a legal trust fund, so that your fund-raising can be done at arm's length. This will prevent your opponents from accusing you of misappropriation. My trust fund is called the Christian Public School Teacher's Legal Defense Fund. It has three Christian men from three different denominations as trustees, and no check can be disbursed without two signatures. Furthermore, the trust fund language makes it clear that excess funds will be distributed to a registered charity. The

trustee who handles the paperwork responds personally to everyone who makes a donation and provides an official receipt. Your lawyer will take care of the legal necessities of establish the trust.

8. Be willing to go on the road to promote your cause and raise funds. It means having a good speech, and supporters who are willing to set up venues and engagements for you. In my case, I joined an organization called British Columbia Parents and Teachers for Life, a pro-life, pro-family non profit society, with a website and e-mail update. This has gotten my message circulated around the globe. Recently, I was told that my story was all over the newspapers in Britain.
9. Keep careful records of everything. Believe me, your lawyer will want a copy of it, and a detailed chronology of everything that has happened, as well as every piece of correspondence you wrote and received on the matter. Help your lawyer to help you.
10. Trust your lawyer and be careful to follow his or her advice. There was a valuable argument my lawyer wished to make on my behalf, which involved several pieces of correspondence. But because I got very snide in one letter to the College's lawyer, he couldn't use any of them, for fear of making me look like a total jerk. As a general rule, the less said the better.
11. Talking to the media is a double edged sword. Expect some of them to be hostile and sympathetic to your opponents. Stick to a short, simple, low key message, and do not vary from it no matter what the provocation. This is how politicians survive the most outrageous scandals.
12. Become extremely well informed on the latest research which supports the NARTH perspective, as well as that which supports opposing points of view. Most studies have flaws of some kind and it is to your advantage to be aware of as many of them as possible. I have found that my opponents rarely cite credible research, and thus are very vulnerable when asked to substantiate their positions.
13. Do not be surprised to be vilified despite merely citing previously published research and making logical arguments. Expect your opponents to use emotional arguments and repeat old discredited research. Recognize that this is not about fact, viable therapy, or what's best for children. It is about social politics, and we are in a minority position.
14. Keep religious arguments out of it. This has simply not worked at all for me, unless I am talking to "the converted." You will be more credible by sticking to established social science research studies (which NARTH will be happy to keep

you updated on). Focus instead on safety for children, and be supportive of inclusive anti-bullying, anti-violence programs (i.e. those which include protection for sexual minorities). This is the common ground all right minded people can support.

I am in trouble, because I stood up and said that teachers should not be encouraging behavior which puts children at risk. The risks of practicing the gay lifestyle are life threatening, life shortening, and a detriment to mental health. The mandatory Personal Planning curriculum in BC requires teachers to teach students to avoid lifestyle practices which put them at risk of acquiring HIV-AIDS and other STD's. And I agree with that requirement. I think we should teach children the truth, and teach them how to stay safe. We harangue kids repeatedly about the dangers of tobacco, alcohol, drugs, drinking and driving, reckless driving, and other high risk activities. But when I taught a lesson on this in my Personal Planning class, my principal gave me a letter of discipline alleging I was "indoctrinating the students." He admitted that not a single person had complained about my lesson, nor did he talk to any student in my class to see how I had actually taught the lesson. How did he find out? I gave him an advance copy so that he could give me some feedback if he had a problem with it. I was totally blindsided by his letter of discipline 10 days after I had taught the lesson, and forbidden to ever use it again.

I find it amazing that the BC Teachers Federation and everyone in positions of authority believes it acceptable to teach children that engaging in homosexual behavior is safe, normal, and okay. When a colleague of mine, a math teacher from Vancouver, put a pamphlet called the *Medical Risks of Homosexuality*, in the mail box of a colleague who was sponsoring the Gay Straight Alliance Club in his school, he was and still is being subjected to disciplinary action by his principal, and the College of Teachers. This is not a job for the faint of heart.

But when we take action, we must do it in a way that protects not only our own children, but children who are indeed confused about their orientation. They need to be protected from harassment and name-calling, and I call upon the parents here to encourage your children to stand up in defense of those who are, or appear to be gay. Let it never be said of our children that they participated in the harassment of their classmates because of their orientation. These children deserve our compassion and support, because I am convinced that most of them cannot help how they feel. The research shows that large numbers of adults who are homosexual were molested or seduced by gay pedophiles before the age of 14, the legal age of consent in many jurisdictions.

Parents, talk your children as I have done with my own, and tell them that you expect them to intervene to protect those who are subjected to name-calling and harassment. There is a middle ground, where children who need support and protection from

harassment can receive it, while children from the various faith communities are also protected from inaccurate teaching resources about orientation issues.

But some children and their parents need to hear a message of hope that orientation is indeed changeable, and that there is help for them if they wish to change. As a member of NARTH you can assist your colleagues to understand that help is available to those who want to change.

In a short while, I will hear the verdict from the judge who will decide whether I have acted within the Charter rights of freedom of speech and freedom of religion. My lawyer has said these precedent setting cases are used for all types of regulated professions—nurses, doctors, engineers, social workers, pharmacists, and so on. He has also told me that there has never been a case like this before, where a professional has been disciplined for off the job conduct, when there was no evidence of that conduct causing a problem on the job. It is common practice to cite cases from countries which base their legal traditions on English common law. My lawyer cited a number of American cases in my defense. So if I lose my appeal, I think you can expect American professional organizations to be citing my case to discipline NARTH members.

I am standing up for freedom, and I am standing up for the safety and well being of our children, and I ask you to stand with me. Thank you for inviting me to speak.

Summary of Strategies For Holding Your Own

Below are 12 strategies for “holding your own” against those who would like you to keep quiet or go away. It will take courage and perseverance, but a little strategy helps, too.

1. Become familiar with the published research on orientation change therapy, as well as the studies which purport to affirm the inherency of orientation. They have flaws, and it is to your advantage to be better informed than your opponents.
2. Most teachers’ organizations have ethical codes of conduct which prohibit teachers from exploiting their positions for ideological purposes, and require that teachers be sensitive to the religious backgrounds of their students. Use these codes to your benefit.
3. Most school districts have policies that allow the public to challenge the use of any materials proposed for classroom use. Use the protocol and write out your reasons for objecting in clear, well documented language which avoids polemicizing.

4. Be cautious about what you write publicly. It can come back to haunt you. Have someone whose judgment you trust proofread everything. Keep very thorough records.
5. Stay physically, mentally and, spiritually fit. You will need all your stamina to stay at your post. Personally, Psalms 3, 25, and 34 have been my greatest spiritual support.
6. If targeted for discipline, seek the support of your union or professional association, as they are usually committed to seeing that you have due process, even if they oppose you on ideological grounds. If they are the ones targeting you, seek help from national pro-family organizations that often have legal staff specifically for this purpose.
7. Hire a lawyer as soon as possible, but they should be an expert in administrative law.
8. Consider hiring a public relations expert, who can strategize with you about the press. Feel free to contact me (Kempling@telus.net) if you wish to consult.
9. Be very cautious when dealing with the media. The liberal media has their own agenda, and it generally supports the homosexual lobby.
10. Establish a legal trust fund. I titled mine the Christian Public School Teachers' Legal Defense Fund. Donations can be made c/o Mr. Jim Sagert, 798 Beaubien Avenue, Quesnel, BC Canada V2J 1A6
11. Be willing to go on the road to promote your cause and raise funds.
12. Stay away from religious arguments. It simply has no currency with those who oppose you. Stick with hard data (fortunately there is plenty of it available).