
Safe Schools Coalition Persuasive Speech

Australia, as we know it, is a multicultural country, a melting pot of different languages and cultures. Imagine if our government decided to obliterate English from our curriculum and replace it with studies of foreign languages and culture in order to reflect Australia's cultural diversity. It will be chaos, as we, as Aussies, can't even understand our own culture. This far-fetched fantasy may be closer to us than we think, with the advent of the Safe Schools program. Safe Schools is currently siphoning off indispensable funds away from standard sex education that applies to a much larger tranche of the student population. It is also accused of exposing children to inappropriate materials as well as online sex predators that hides behind the screen of anonymity. Lastly, Safe Schools could misinform children about their sexualities, encouraging heterosexual children to become homosexual or vice versa when they are only developing naturally. Obviously children should be free to choose their sexualities, LGBTI or heterosexual, with minimal interference from other adults.

Safe Schools supposedly teaches schoolchildren gender diversity, however its utility is dubious, with less than 3% of children being identified as LGBTI. The \$8 million spent maintaining the program each year could've found much better use, namely in standard sex education. Sex education helps prevent many of society's problems like unexpected pregnancies, STD and rapes, which are problems for LGBTI people as well. LGBTI children would make uneducated decisions that would affect their lives profoundly if they're not taught basic sexual conduct. \$94 million were spent by President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) to combat HIV alone globally. Just think about how worldwide healthcare bills will rack up when funds are directed away from sex education into programs like Safe Schools. Other STDs and rape will be more prevalent. Yes, the birds and the bees are still important in this day and age. Obviously pulling the plug on Safe Schools will be better for all families, including those with LGBTI children.

Ironically, the very "appropriately" named Safe Schools Coalition makes schools a much more perilous environment for all children. Children participating in the program are exposed to sexually explicit material hosted on a website called Minus18, endorsed by Safe Schools. 70% of 16 year olds were exposed to pornography and with Safe Schools directing more young people to questionable content, it's certainly not doing them a favour. Online sex predators are also tangible threats to the wellbeing of LGBTI children. Minus18 is infested by pedophiles who groom them by taking advantage of their fear indirectly generated by Safe Schools, which draws attention to the fact that LGBTI children are different, which in turn fuels homophobic bullying. They are easily deceived because they feel that Safe Schools is turning against them. Statistically, 1/4 of girls and 1/6 of boys will be solicited sexually before adulthood. We all want the best for our children, and with these menaces lurking behind the facade of Safe Schools, our children aren't truly safe.

Safe Schools confuses children about their sexualities by engaging in confronting activities, so its removal will bring clarity in gender education. The activities often involves unrealistic role playing and superfluous imagination that pushes heterosexual children towards homosexuality and vice versa. Safe Schools restricts everyday language, causing even more confusion when basic addresses like "boys and girls" or "ladies and gentlemen" are eradicated for gender-diverse Newspeak. A traditional sexually divided society is detrimental for all, but with Safe Schools making the rounds, it's the lesser of two evils. We all want our children to be free to choose, free to decide, free from indoctrination. Mass rallies held by Safe Schools are dividing LGBTI children because they transform groups of communicating, strong and united young people into a collective of drones, mindlessly intaking disinformation about gender identity. Safe Schools has lost its soul, its mission

of enabling informed decisions traded for manipulating children's ideals on gender identity. Yes, Safe Schools should be retired to protect all children's gender integrity.

Safe Schools is unnecessary in schools and it deserves to be eliminated from our education system. The \$8 million federal government funds allocated to Safe Schools should be directed towards standard sex education in order to prevent and alleviate other sex-related problems of our society. The disposal of accompanying pornography bundled with Safe Schools will make our children truly safe, and the confusion Safe Schools bring to young people's ideas on gender identity will be gone. Really, the removal of Safe Schools will be better for all members of our society, be they adults, children, LGBTI or heterosexual. So what can we do counteract the damage done by Safe Schools? Simple. We could write to our MPs voicing our views against Safe Schools, or we could avoid Safe Schools-endorsed schools for our children's education. Let's take control of our own children's education and destiny instead of leaving it inundated by questionable material and utter confusion.

Bibliography

1. Jose Izazola. (2015). Funding for HIV and AIDS. Available: <http://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/global-response/funding>. Last accessed 25th November 2016. (*Facts and figures on the economic impact of HIV and other STDs on a global scale*).
2. Internet Safety 101. (Unknown). Predators 101. Available: <http://internetsafety101.org/internetpredators>. Last accessed 28th November 2016. (*Statistics of the effects on online predators on adolescent children and the modus operandi of pedophiles*).
3. Wendy Francis. (2016). Safe Schools- Make Up Your Mind. Available: http://www.acl.org.au/safe_schools_make_up_your_mind. Last accessed 30th November 2016. (*Documents the confusion among students that arose from the implementation of the Safe Schools program*).
4. Various. (Unknown). You're teaching our children what? Parents who want to know more about the 'Safe Schools Coalition' program. Available: <http://youreteachingourchildrenwhat.org>. Last accessed 1st December 2016 (*Provides an insight into the types of activities involved in the Safe Schools program and the associated dangers such as pedophiles and pornography*).
5. Advocates for Youth. (2009). Comprehensive Sex Education: Research and Results. Available: <http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/publications/1487>. Last accessed 1st December 2016 (*Demonstrates the benefits and importance of standard sex education, society's problems sex education can solve and why it should not be removed in favour for other programs such as Safe Schools*).
6. Bill Muehlenberg. (2016). Seven Things You Must Know about the Safe Schools Program. Available: <https://billmuehlenberg.com/2016/03/17/seven-things-you-must-know-about-the-safe-schools-program/>. Last accessed 1st December 2016 (*Reflects involuntary nature of Safe Schools and the types of inappropriate/confronting activities participating children are exposed to*).

Safe Schools Persuasive Speech Reflective Analysis

The overall quick, steady and serious tone of the speaker was maintained throughout the delivery of the speech, with variations in both tone and pace when reaching more emotional passages eg: "...free to choose, free to decide, free from indoctrination." The contention of the speech is that Safe Schools should be removed: "It will be chaos...the advent of the Safe Schools program." No persona was adopted for the speaker or for the audience, with the target audience being identified as the speaker's Year 11 classmates and English teacher, as well as parents of the speaker's school.

The first argument made about how Safe Schools funds should be reallocated to standard sex education is mainly an appeal to the logos. The delivered pitch exposes how Safe Schools is unnecessary because it does not apply to a large proportion of the Australian student population. It also berates the Safe Schools program for wasting money that could have saw use of preventing

sexually-related problems of Australia through standard sex education. This is an appeal to the parents' (and tax payers') hip pockets, an accusation of Safe Schools wasting their precious tax dollars on a program of dubious use. The predominant persuasive techniques are statistics, used to induce the audience to reject Safe Schools as useless.

An appeal to the pathos was delivered in the second argument, exposing the unsafe nature of Safe Schools, with the main point being how Safe Schools is exposing schoolchildren to sexually-explicit material through websites endorsed by it. A reference to the real-world perils (such as pedophiles) associated with Safe Schools was made. Scare tactics, aka appeals to fear, uncertainty and doubt as well as statistics on pedophilia were used extensively in the delivery of the speech, raising the audience's concern over the security of Safe Schools and compelling them to reject its legitimacy.

Appeals to the pathos was also made in the third argument about how Safe Schools is rendering schoolchildren bamboozled about their gender identities. In the first half of the paragraph, a serious tone was adopted during the speech's delivery when mentioning facts about how classrooms in Safe Schools function in an unconventional manner with negative connotations (as an appeal to the logos). The tone then shifts to a passionate one (signifying an emotional appeal), when the speaker appears indignant about how Safe Schools is doing young people injustice by indoctrinating them and creating more barriers than connections among them. The intended effect is to sympathise with the audience, making them feel that Safe Schools has gone too far, and is becoming more authoritarian with its brainwashing in the style of "Minitrue" in "1984".

The main objective of the speech against the Safe Schools Coalition is to dissuade the target audience from embracing, accepting or endorsing the program. The speech intends to cast light on the facts that Safe Schools is overly specialised, Safe Schools expose children to online perils and Safe Schools distorts children's notions on gender identity. These arguments will induce the audience to hold condemnatory attitudes towards the Safe Schools program. The style of the speech is solid but quite rhetorical (persuasive) so that the target audience will sympathise with the contention.