

(This article by Peter Hitchen's appeared on his Blog at Mail Online <http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/> it has been posted on the Apropos website www.apropos.org.uk in reference to one of our own blogs.)

Get ready to go to jail - your children will denounce you!



I told you that David Cameron was a continuation of Blairism by other means. Along with all his other mimicry of the Blair creature, his most striking policy is his determination to continue New Labour's revolutionary plan to destroy the married family, drive women out of their homes into wage-slavery and abolish the whole concept of the father and husband.

This scheme is always disguised as something else. It always means more State meddling in family life. Usually it is called 'Equality'. But sometimes it is called 'Children's Rights'.

Both these expressions are lies. Women are not more equal, but far worse off thanks to the anti-marriage revolution, as they are increasingly finding.

They must work inside and outside the home, spend endless hours driving from home to day-orphanage to work to hypermarket, and then back again, and see less and less of their children

As for children, their supposed 'rights' actually mean ever-increasing power for the State to intervene in their lives. Oddly enough, this never seems to diminish or prevent horrible abuse.

The emotional reaction to the ghastly death of Maria Colwell – a little girl beaten and starved by her stepfather – in 1973 led to the vast increase in State power over the family in the Children Act of 1989.

Yet in 2000 we saw the very similar case of Victoria Climbié, pictured below, and in 2007 that of Peter Connolly (Baby P). There will, I fear, be another such horror before long.



Most of these cases have two effects: calls for 'something to be done', and personal attacks on the social workers involved. Both reactions are stupid.

The State is no good at childcare, and nothing will ever make it any good at it. Power and bureaucracy cannot create an ounce of love.

The State's own care homes are notorious scenes of abuse and chaos, from which many children emerge with their lives already ruined, destined for prison or mental hospital.

We need to accept that we simply cannot make society perfect by passing laws, that people who choose to be evil are skilled at concealing their crimes and scaring away social workers and even the police.

It is time MPs realised that these crimes will happen again, whatever they do.

These schemes sold as safeguards for children are in fact power grabs by the State. Yet we are now told that the Queen's Speech will contain proposals for a 'Cinderella Law' under which parents can be imprisoned for 'emotional cruelty'.

The chief booster of this Bill is a supposedly Conservative MP called Robert Buckland. When I discussed his plan with him on Radio 2 on Monday, I was amazed

at his naivety. As a lawyer and part-time judge, he really should know that vague, subjective laws are the tools of tyrants.

Under such legislation, nobody can ever be sure if he is breaking the law or not. No jury could ever be sure who was telling the truth. But the resulting inquisitions into families – the well-publicised dawn raids, the search and seizure of private possessions, the smears in court that will never wash out – will ruin the lives of any who are arrested, even if they are eventually acquitted. In the old communist countries, the regimes also encouraged denunciations by children, who usually had little idea what would follow.

In Soviet cities, until 1991, there were statues of a little monster called Pavlik Morozov, who turned his own parents in to the secret police for hoarding grain. Schoolchildren would be marched to these shrines of evil and told to revere his memory.

And yet the 'Conservative' Party is proposing to write childish denunciation of parents into the law of the land this summer, and the poor Queen will have to recommend this ghastly measure to MPs in her speech in June.

When the Tories said 'New Labour – New Danger' back in 1997, they did not know how right they were.

Nor did they, or we, know they would be part of the danger.