

Implications of Repeal for Home Education

How does the Bill to repeal Section 59 of the Crimes Act hold implications for Home Education? Read on.

Home Education is inescapably a political statement. You apply to a huge, powerful government ministry to home educate legally. You submit to a second hugely powerful government agency for their review.

The implications of being outside the system are many and significant: a) that you, without a teaching credential, can do as good or better a job of teaching than do the state's professionals; b) that the local school has teachers who don't meet your approval; c) that you don't approve of the much-vaunted socialisation experienced at school; d) that there is something deficient in the local school's standards of discipline, speech and behaviour; e) that you are being elitist or racist in keeping your child from mixing with others; f) that you have something to hide from the highly trained professionals at the school who are indeed keeping an eye out for children showing signs of some kind of abuse, neglect or ill-treatment; g) that you have some kind of archaic phobia of sociological and technological advances and want to keep your children cloistered in a time warp. And on it goes. There is plenty of robust research and personal experience to back up the fact that many of us home educators would respond with a resounding "Yes, that's right!" to points a, b, c and d. Points e, f and g are odd ideas I've seen expressed at times, but I have never seen any research to back them up, only vaguely described isolated incidents and media hype.

Each of us makes these inescapable political statements as an individual family. We must have a certain amount of political savvy in order to gain the exemption and to get through a review in the first place. Or we soon gain it.

Since we make these political statements as individual families, and since we live them out on a day by day basis as individual families, we must continually understand that it is primarily by our individual commitment and perseverance that we will hold back the civil government's efforts to rein us back into their system, telling us how to educate and train and discipline our own children.

Grouping together is highly profitable for mutual encouragement and armament, and all of us should be tied in with at least one group somewhere along the line. However, there are difficulties with a group spokesperson being representative of other home educators, even of the members of that group! Each of us is highly unique. We differ in our pedagogy, educational philosophy, motivation, aims, objectives, family standards, methodologies, theology, political and social philosophies. So when a leader of a home education group speaks, he or she will of necessity make generalised statements which will not match every home educator, not even every one of his or her own group.

It is not to be discouraged, then, if home education groups of various kinds start to multiply, as each one will presumably cater for a different aspect of home education, a different set of characteristics the members of that group might hold in

Very Young University Graduates

A 16 year old recently graduated from Auckland University with a bachelor of science, making him one of the youngest university graduates in the country. Jesse Wu began studying maths and computer science at the age of 13.

Jesse is the youngest ever to graduate from the University of Auckland. The Henderson teenager is not sure what all the fuss is about. "I'm used to studying with, and being with, people older than me. It's a lot of work, but I enjoy it." Jesse was a student at Liston College when he asked his principal if he could sit School Certificate maths at the age of 11. At 13 he passed bursary exams.

However, Jesse is not the country's youngest university graduate. Shona Yu graduated with a bachelor of science degree from Massey University in 2001, aged 14. She sat some university papers when she was 8.

Michael Tan was also 8 when he enrolled in a maths paper at Canterbury University in 1992, and Christopher Butcher began at Massey University when he was 10 and graduated in 1994 at the age of 15.

See? The MoE can make exceptions to the compulsory attendance law, and Universities do like students who enjoy hard work and being around older people.

common. Membership with several groups is something I would definitely encourage.

That being the case, it is important, it is almost a necessity for survival, that each home educating family be able and willing to represent itself to government agents, especially when under threat. Each of us already does this in the exemption and review process. That doesn't mean we are to become isolationist or a pack of lone wolves and mavericks: far from it. Networking among ourselves and keeping each other mutually informed is essential. So is standing together whenever and however we can, and this only happens when we are interconnected.

To leave all the political stuff to those home educators who step in and make the effort to keep informed and keep others informed is a bit dangerous. The home education community, particularly in the Auckland area, suffered through many ugly problems for years because of the way the late Home Schooling Federation operated: "You elected us, so we will do the political stuff in consultation with ourselves...most of it is too complicated for the general membership,

and you'd find it too boring anyway." This was just great for some home education families who agreed with and trusted the leadership. Fair enough. But other members felt disenfranchised, belittled, unappreciated, and many squabbles broke out. Those ugly experiences illustrated how easy it was for a body of people to find itself being led where it didn't want to go and represented to officialdom in a way it didn't approve of by a small executive who had their own personal agenda based on their own personal philosophy of home education.

Nevertheless, whenever any one home educator speaks to a government official, especially a home educator who holds some position of leadership or authority within an organised and constituted home education group, that person will be seen to be representing other home educators to one degree or another. It is a fact of life we need to live with. Yet, it can be ameliorated by the efforts and good will of these leaders to network among themselves and to understand (but not necessarily agree with) each other's position. Having said that, it does seem that

today the home education community is so large, healthy and diverse that such misrepresentations are less of an issue than they once were years ago.

It seems to me that we need to work together for mutual support ***and also recognise*** that we are already required to stand up for ourselves (with exemptions and reviews) and be willing to do so more often as required.

A very important implication of all of this is the following: just as we must already deal with the MoE and ERO on an individual case-by-case basis, so we need to demand that the MoE and ERO deal with us on an individual case by case basis.

We need to keep an eye on them and pressure them as required not to force us into any single mould, since each of us is so unique.

This requires something hard for the MoE and ERO: that they recognise they do not have a corner on educational expertise, but that they are dealing with parent-educators, child development experts who are on duty 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Many of us know more about education than these officials ever will.

Our greatest weakness is that we often don't believe this about ourselves. And this often causes us to not even believe ***in*** ourselves. We are the parents, the ones in charge of the family government. We are teaching our children the art of self-government.

Various Governments

There are many governments in our society...the self, the family, the church, the workplace...the one in Wellington is only one among many, it is not over all the others, and may be properly called the civil government. Each government has its proper sphere of jurisdiction. These jurisdictions do overlap a bit. But we must never let the state, the civil government, take over the government of our own families. Where it has, *we must take the government back away from the state.*

The NZ Education Act of 1877 was a major interposition of the civil government into the affairs of every single family government of this country, with its compulsory school-attendance provisions. Children have ever since been required to separate from their parents and siblings for most of each day, five days a week, nine months a year for 10 years. Home educators, differing from Correspondence School parents, have been the only ones to challenge the claims of the civil government in this area and to take the government of our children's education and socialisation back away from the state.

Green MP Sue Bradford's Bill to repeal Section 59 of the Crimes Act is another, far more ambitious attempt by the civil government to intrude into and take over a major part of the rightful jurisdiction of

TEACH Bulletin

is a monthly publication of the Home Education Foundation and is concerned with those things which may impact on home educators. Articles will deal with political developments, statist and professional trends, correspondence with educationalists and other items of general interest to home educators. Information herein is not to be construed as legal advice. Opinions expressed in TEACH Bulletin are those of the writer and should not be assumed to reflect those of the Home Education Foundation Trustees or Board of Reference Members. TEACH Bulletin is available for a subscription of \$16 per year for 11 issues (none in December) or two years for \$30.

All correspondence to:

The Editor, Craig S. Smith
PO Box 9064
Palmerston North
New Zealand
Ph.: (06) 357-4399
Fax: (06) 357-4389
mail@hef.org.nz

www.hef.org.nz

Hear, my son, your father's instruction,
and reject not your mother's teaching.
— Proverbs 1:8

Trading Post



Wanted:

Pen Pals for:

Tabitha, 11. Hobbies: Rugby, Cricket and other sports. Animals. I am a tom boy and live on a farm.

Lydia, 9. Hobbies: I love animals and ballet, bikes and dancing.

Contact:

Tabitha or Lydia Jenkins
Oromohoe Rd.
R.D. 2
Kaikohe

the family government. It will remove the specific legal authority of parents to use any force to correct, train or discipline their children. This goes way beyond criminalizing and banning smacking, which it most certainly will do. Put simply, repealing Section 59 will take from parents all practical authority over their own children.

Here's how it works:

Removing from the Police and the courts their authority to use the force of arrest, imprisonment or fines to back up their requirements and prohibitions would reduce them to making suggestions everyone could safely ignore. In other words, removing all Police officers' legal ability to back up their authority with force would effectively nullify their authority: they could no longer enforce the law by using force, they could only suggest and ask that you do as you are told. In the same way, repeal of Section 59 will remove from parents their legal ability to back up their authority with force, reducing parents to making suggestions and merely asking rather than ensuring their children do as they're told. While some parents will sadly resort to manipulation, emotional blackmail or using money/sweets/privileges to negotiate for every bit of co-operation from their children (once children realise the powerlessness of their parents), this Bill to repeal Section 59 will effectively nullify parental authority over their own children.

The implications for home educators are grim: parents would not be legally authorised to use force to restrict, modify or direct their children's diets, viewing, reading, associations, dress standards, speech or behaviour. As too many of Sweden's parents have found out, New Zealand's civil government will also still be able to rule over children, for it will continue to reserve for itself the use of force and compulsion: compulsory registration on the National Health Index, compulsory school attendance, compulsory vaccinations, removal of children and arrest of parents accused of using force to discipline, train or correct (since such force will become criminal assault).

If we let the state have the government over our children, we might just as well give them everything else.

Now some will say such talk is way too radical, as if MPs and leaders of children advocacy groups were conspiring to take over from parents. I have read and listened at length to these people in the repeal lobby. It is clear: they generally *do not* trust parents. In spite of the fact that polls consistently show 80% of parents agree that smacking should remain as a disciplinary option, the repeal lobby want to force their no-smacking, no force, no physical discipline ideology onto everyone else. Obviously this is not democratic. But our Prime Minister ditched such romantic ideas in March 2003 when she said the (civil) Government's role is whatever that Government defined its role to be.¹

Such moves are buying into a world of future problems. As we know, "If one is forced against his will, he's of the same opinion still." Many, many of this country's best parents will find most of their parenting practises criminalized because they of necessity utilise force which, because of repeal of Section 59, they will no longer legally be authorised to use. They will be forced to practise civil disobedience. One set of people, saying they are against the use of force, want to force another

group of people to stop using force. Why do we listen to such insanity?

Swedish lawyer Ruby Harrold-Claesson is founder of the Nordic Committee for Human Rights. It is a group of lawyers from Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland who are all concerned about the great damage done to families in their respective countries by the anti-smacking legislation they have. Mrs Harrold-Claesson is coming to New Zealand in July this year to speak to MPs, children's advocacy groups, NGOs, the media and the Select Committee hearing submissions on the Bill to repeal Section 59.

According to my phone conversations with Ruby Harrold-Claesson, once the law that banned smacking in Sweden was passed in 1979, the activities of the Swedish government social workers increased. Many more were hired. The activities of the foster home industry increased. Many more foster parents were recruited. Sweden does what Bradford, Kiro and co. have been assuring us would not happen here: the parents are being arrested and charged *and* the children are being removed to foster homes.

These foster parents are paid very well. It tends to attract too many of the wrong kind of people. Here is where real abuse of children happens, yet the social welfare people rarely prosecute their own agents for abuse as it makes them look bad.

Once the civil government gets the idea that it can interfere with the family governments of the country without a great deal of opposition, then your desires and beliefs and convictions about your children's upbringing count for nothing. For example, the UK is toying with the idea of making *preschool* compulsory, taking children from their parents at an earlier age. A number of parents in California sued the Palmdale School District for failing to reveal the graphic sexual nature of some questions on a psychological assessment test of first, third and fifth graders (six to 11 year olds). However, 9th Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Stephen Reinhardt wrote in the *unanimous* opinion of the court (see <http://tinyurl.com/8pbkh>): "there is no fundamen-

tal right of parents to be the *exclusive* provider of information regarding sexual matters to their children, either independent of their right to direct the upbringing and education of their children or encompassed by it. We also hold that parents have no due process or privacy right to override the determinations of public schools as to the information to which their children will be exposed while enrolled as students. Finally, we hold that the defendants' actions were rationally related to a legitimate state purpose." [emphasis Reinhardt's].²

The New Zealand Government does the same. Parents' opinions are not sought by the teachers at state schools before presenting material in class loaded with value judgments or that raises many questions of morality. Sometimes the teachers are left free to push their own moral values, whatever they might be; sometimes the study materials have their own values to push; sometimes the programme is designed to get the children to work out their own value systems on their own or within their peer group.

There are some S.K.I.P. pages (Strategies with Kids / Information for Parents) on the Ministry of Social Development website (<http://www.familyservices.govt.nz/info-for-families/skip/>) that in among a lot of very useful tips make many clear authoritative type statements about children and child rearing which simply express a world view that is quite at odds with the traditional Christian worldview of Western civilisation. For example it says: "You can't stop a tantrum. Make sure your child is safe, stay near and carry on with other things. Don't try and talk to them, reason with them or discipline them. It's hard, but don't pay any attention to them." "Tantrums aren't bad behaviour, they're small child overload." "Smacking or hitting doesn't teach your child what they did wrong. It teaches then that hitting other people is okay." "Keep telling them how great they are." "Give in when things aren't important." "If they say 'no', change the subject or distract." "If your child swears, suggest other words they can use." "All brothers and sisters fight, some more than others."³ Just in case

there are any unbelievers among the readers of the Government's website, it is planning to repeal Section 59 so you will be forced by threat of prosecution for child assault and/or removal of your children by CYF to abandon the practise of smacking and any other form of physical discipline.

Please believe me when I write such things: one of the Labour party members of the Parliamentary Select Committee, Ann Hartley, on the first day of hearings on this Bill, got very upset with Dr Prasad, the Families Commissioner, when he suggested a phasing in period for the repeal of Section 59 of 18 months. She said they were all tired of waiting for change in this area and wanted to see the Government "show real moral courage and leadership" by repealing Section 59 regardless of public opinion, confident that public opinion would follow the Government's lead! So much for objectivity from the Select Committee; so much for the democratic ideal of majority rule. But then, Helen did tell us this isn't necessarily the Government's role.

The Sodomite Agenda

There is another reason to be very concerned about Section 59. It is regarded by the sodomite network within New Zealand as a barometer of the "Christian Right" as they call it, into which category many and perhaps the majority of home educators would fall. They have a far-reaching agenda. Here is an edited version of an opinion piece titled "Section 59: A Social Conservative Retreat?" and written by Craig Young on 25 February 2006 for gaynz.com:

"Lesbian feminists have had long-standing involvements within the child protection profession. Added to which, this particular political initiative is the first real test of opposition to the Christian Right during this political term, and will disclose what condition they might be in for later reform initiatives, like transgender inclusive anti-discrimination laws and adoption reform legislation. It has strategic significance to us.

"With the Bradford Bill, the Christian Right is facing one of its worst nightmares. Simply, the answer is: what Christian Right? Family Integrity, Christian News, Garnet Milne and SPCS are plugging away there still. The Maxim Institute put together an anemic looking guide to the bill. Conservative Catholics are nowhere to be seen.

"Bluntly, the Christian Right response has been pathetic.

"Again, this is significant to us. Pediatric and child development specialists will also be relevant to LGBT [Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgendered] debates around adoption law reform, when our time finally arrives.

"I still predict that the Christian Right will lose this one. There's nothing like the opposition that existed to either the decriminalisation of sex work or LGBT relationship recognition. And if it works for Section 59 Repeal, then what about Georgina's transgender protection bill and eventual inclusive adoption law reform?"

"[T]his bill [has] importance as an index of the strength of the Christian Right."⁴

This guy is trying to stigmatise anyone who is against repeal as part of the "Christian Right", a term generally understood to be derisive. He is of course wrong. Eighty percent of New Zealanders do not agree with repeal. There is now a very credible Section 59 Coalition of groups working against this Bill: so far it is composed of the Society for the Promotion of Community Standards (www.spcs.org.nz), Family First (www.familyfirst.org.nz), Sensible Sentencing Trust (www.safe-nz.org.nz), Muriel Newman's NZ Centre for Political Debate (www.nzcpd.com) and Family Integrity (www.FamilyIntegrity.org.nz). One certainly cannot pigeon-hole this crowd as the "Christian Right"!

Home educators have already taken a fair measure of their proper sphere of government back away from the state when we filled in our exemption forms. We need to preserve and protect ourselves and the next generations from this latest attempt by the civil government to encroach

upon our territory. Ask your MP to vote against this Bill.

Keep Section 59!

Notes:

1. Government spelled with a capital "G" refers specifically to the civil government, i.e., the one in Wellington's beehive.
2. WorldNetDaily, 3 November 2005, "It does take a village when it comes to sexuality", http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=47195
3. I will add some comments on these:
 - a) Tantrums are not like epileptic seizures....they *are* bad behaviour that the children can turn on and off. Each of my children threw a tantrum....once. They were immediately grabbed, given a stern talking to and told in no uncertain terms never to pull such a stunt again. End of tantrums.
 - b) Smacking and hitting are two entirely different activities, but this civil government website is trying to convince us that they are the same. It is pushing a different world view. Smacking is accompanied by full explanations and discussion of the child's crime. Note, the child's crime, not the child's mistakes or accidents or expressions of immaturity, but rebellious acts against rules of which the child is already aware. Hitting does just as the comment quoted says, but smacking does not.
 - c) Encouragement and praise when praise is due are great tonics for anyone. But if you constantly tell them how great they are while giving in to their demands or their recalcitrance and do not confront them when they challenge your authority with a "no", you are creating a rod for your own back. Children will constantly push the boundaries to find out where they are. Your job as parent is to make it clear to your children exactly where the boundaries are. This is what gives them safety and security. d) Swearing is unacceptable from two angles: the word used and the way it is used. Our children all picked up bad words from people who were around. If we parents were there, we'd take the first opportunity to privately tell the children that word is one we never use in this family. If they spouted a word they picked up on their own, we gave them the same message. They immediately began telling their friends who used such words at our house that they couldn't say that here and that they'd have to leave if they said it again. And while it might seem ok to say things like, "Every lousy time

I try to use that lousy phone I get the lousy busy signal," the word "lousy" has become a swear word; its use in this way is unacceptable. The advice given by the civil government here is that one must choose with care which swear words one uses. e) Certainly all siblings will have a tendency to fight with one another, until the parents step in and make it clear that such behaviour is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. It strikes me that this advice from the civil government is not just faulty, but based on the assumption that the children are or soon will be at a schooling institution for most of each day, so parents only need temporary fixes to get past the rough spots. These "strategies" do not appear to have long-term solutions or to help the child develop a strong sense of responsible self-government as part of their vision.

4. <http://www.gaynz.com/aarticles/anmvie wer .asp?a=1206&print=yes>

CYF to Merge into Super Ministry

After several years as a stand-alone entity, one that some critics say has been a law unto itself, Child Youth and Family Services (CYF) will merge with the Ministry of Social Development this July.

It will create a 9000-staff super-ministry dealing with social services. CYF's 2600 staff will join 6400 from the ministry.

The move is partly necessitated by the difficulty of recruiting a new chief executive, according to Prime Minister Helen Clark. CYF has been operating with an acting chief executive since Canadian Paula Tyler quit late last year, less than halfway through her contract. She had replaced Jackie Pivac, who resigned after a very poor review of the department in 2003.

Ministry of Social Development chief executive Peter Hughes will head the new entity. Huge bureaucracies do not have good track records. But neither did the old CYF. Miss Clark said bringing CYF within the ministry would improve its performance by "surrounding its operations with

an adequate policy framework."

CYF has more than 5000 children and young people in its care. Officials noted that since a 2003 review, its funding had been increased by 50 per cent, yet "it remains unclear to what extent this has led to improved outcomes".

The merger brings CYF under Social Development and Employment Minister David Benson-Pope – flanked by his associate minister Ruth Dyson and State Services Minister Annette King – and adds about \$450 million to the ministry's existing \$14 billion budget.

CYF has \$450 million to look after 5,000 children? That's \$90,000 each! And their schooling is on top of that. We home educators really do save the state a lot of money. But then, CYF is an example of the civil government extending its jurisdiction into the jurisdiction of the family government. Such waste is characteristic of government jurisdictional trespass.

(From *Dominion Post*, 7 March 2006, "CYF woes prompt merger," <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3595244a10,00.html>)

Schools Easy Targets

Special interest groups really do like to target schools because the children are a captive audience and many can be hit with one blow. Sodomites in California have managed to get three Bills before the State Congress to push their agenda through schools. One would remove "sex-specific" terms such as "mom" and "dad" from textbooks and require students to learn about the contributions homosexuals have made to society. Another would withhold state funds from any school district that does not adequately promote transsexuality, bisexuality or homosexuality in its school policies. A third measure would spend \$250,000 in taxpayer dollars to promote transsexual, bisexual and homosexual lifestyles as part of "tolerance education."¹

Dr James Levine, a British obesity

(Continued on page 6: *Schools*)

Coming Events

For updates on this information, see www.hef.org.nz and click Coming Events

Fri 16 June 2006 Science & Technology Fair Auckland

Venue: Auckland Central (tbc)

Time: 12:30—4:00pm

Cost: \$3 per entry, and \$2 for visitors, payable on the day.

Contact: Erin Lapish, P.O.Box 13043, Onehunga, Auckland

12.30-1.00pm Entries arrive

1.00-2.00pm Judging

2.00-3.00pm General viewing

3.00pm prizegiving

3.00-4.00pm Afternoon tea/tidy up

Children can enter individually or as a group (family or otherwise). The judging will be divided into five categories:

- Living World
- Physical World
- Material World
- Planet Earth and Beyond Technology

Wed 28 June 2006 6th Annual Home Schoolers History Fair Morrinsville

Venue: Campbell Hall, Canada St.

Time: 9:00am set up. Viewing from 10:00am.

Cost: \$5 for 1-2 entries. \$10 for 3 or more per family. Gold coin donation for those just coming to look.

Contact: Robyn Smith, (07) 889-7878, adriannrobyn@maxnet.co.nz

There are 3 age groups: Up to 7 years; 8-10 years; 11 and over. Family entries welcome.

Fri-Sun 25-27 Aug 06 Patchwork of Grace Christian Homeschool Mothers' Retreat Waikanae

Venue: Elm Court, Waikanae Christian Holiday Park

Speaker: Rosie Boom, www.boomfamily.co.nz.

Also several workshops on a variety of relevant topics. Take some

time aside to be refreshed, inspired and treated specially in your unique role. Electronic and printed brochures are available with programme details, accommodation and day visitor prices. Places for full-time accommodation are limited, so book early to avoid disappointment. Mums with nursing babies are welcomed.

Contact: Sara McDonnell, ph. (04) 567-3730, conradand-sara@xtra.co.nz or Gayle MacDonald, ph. (04) 388-7690, gayleandpaul@maxnet.co.nz.

Fri 1 Sept 2006 "Spring into History" History Fair Auckland

Venue: Mangere Memorial Hall, Dominion Road, Mangere Bridge

Cost: \$5 for one or two exhibits in family;

\$10 for three or more exhibits in family;

\$2 entry for those just observing

Contact: Katie Richards, grinders@ihug.co.nz, 220 St Andrews Rd., Epsom

*Please Register by
Friday 4 August 2006*

9:00am doors open to set up

10:00am exhibit - judges will circulate at this time

12:00pm prize giving

12:30 - 2:00pm lunch/chat/cleanup.

Those participating will choose a history topic: a particular time period, the history of a people group/person or the history of a subject (e.g. the history of the English language).

Stay up with Section 59 events and what to do:

1. Subscribe to Family Integrity e-bulletins at:

Family.Integrity@xtra.co.nz

2. Visit www.FamilyIntegrity.org.nz and see "Coming Events".

(Continued from page 5: *Schools*)

expert who has spearheaded a trial in Leeds where children, aged 10 to 12, stood up in the school classroom for up to five hours a day, said children were "more active and engaged" in stand-up lessons. "From our early findings, I would say that this approach has the potential to prevent an obesity epidemic," said Levine.²

The Education and Inspections Bill 2006, published in the UK on February 28, and not yet through the British Parliament, already has teachers increasingly called upon by parents to help them discipline children at home. The Bill gives school staff the legal right to discipline children outside the school gates, "putting an end to the 'You can't tell me what to do' culture"..... or so the Bill's explanatory note says.

"The boundaries between the responsibilities of parents and teachers to discipline children has become muddled," said Adrian Petty, a history teacher at St Edmunds College, Ware, Herts.

Alison Sherratt from Bradford said: "Almost every morning begins with phone calls, visits by parents and even breaking up fights between parents in the playground."³

Institutional schooling alienates parents from children and alienates everyone from common sense. Children are subjected to sodomite propaganda, used as lab rats to change schools into health weight-loss clinics, and teachers finally even take over the discipline of the children. Repealing Section 59 would cause chaos here since then neither parents nor teachers could discipline children.

Notes:

1. WorldNetDaily, 25 May 2006, "Arnold to veto bill nixing 'mom', 'dad'", http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=50379
2. *The Press*, 29 March 2006, "Standing up for health in class", <http://www.stuff.co.nz/stuff/0,2106,3620212a11,00.html>
3. *Telegraph*, 13 April 2006, "Parents call on teachers to help with discipline in the home," <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2006/04/13/n teach113.xml>