

Copyright 1996 Suzanne Shell
All Rights Reserved

Putting children first.

An innocuous phrase. Altruistic. Surely a holy endeavor. Who would condemn such a righteous cause? Who would even question such a benign phrase?

I would. This is an insidious campaign coincidentally conducted in concert with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (and all its associated spinoffs) that is designed to usurp parental rights and authority. It is propaganda, woven from the lies of statistics which only record 'reported cases of child abuse' and disregards the fact that 60 to 90% of those 'reported' cases are unfounded. It is a masterful marketing scheme to 'reeducate' people into thinking children are more important than anything (except for the convenience of the mother if she chooses to abort an unborn child, oops, I mean fetus). It makes children think the world revolves around them (not a good notion for children to have). Its entire focus is off-center, highlighting the children and excluding the parents thereby invalidating the family as a viable union.

There is no wisdom or logic to this reasoning. How can children always be the number one most important thing? On the television show "*COPS*" you often hear a cop asking a mother: who is more important, your husband or your children? Mother knows she must say the children, or the cop will take her babies away. But in truth, the husband could take priority, for he supports the family and he will be with her long after the children have grown and moved away. Without dad, the kids will suffer. Why must parents make that choice?

I am not disputing the importance that children must take in the family. The raising of children should be a priority for parents, probably more so than it is in most families. The key issue here is the family. This devious campaign is encouraging outsiders to assume a role they are not ordained to take, by intruding into the realm of the family and usurping the parents' prerogatives.

I have seen commercials advocating 'children first', urging children and teens to develop relationships and dialogs with teachers, coaches, mentors, and various other concerned and 'enlightened' adults. Oddly, they are not encouraged to develop a relationship with their own parents, or to even learn to communicate with their parents. The same message is repeated to our children in our public schools. What's wrong with this picture?

This is a classic example of how this campaign is seeking to replace the parent's role with the 'it takes a village to raise a child' pattern of raising children. God didn't command villages to 'be fruitful and multiply', or provide governments with scriptural advice on how to raise children. God charged parents with that responsibility. Based on my observations, the 'village' is full of idiots, and I don't think the 'village idiots' can raise children as effectively or lovingly as the vast majority of parents can.

Take for example the recent announcement regarding rating television shows. Parents have overwhelmingly demanded to know the content of the shows, i.e., whether there is profanity, nudity, casual sex scenes, homosexual situations, graphic violence, etc. The village idiots in Hollywood and Washington, D.C. just this past week insisted parents should accept the movie-style age-based rating system that has failed miserably with parents around the country. I know I couldn't let my children watch PG-13 movies without pre-screening. I never knew when some naked piece of private anatomy would be flaunted or foul language uttered. And this is ok for 13 year olds? Not in my book. But it is ok in the Village Idiot's book.

You may say I'm too old-fashioned. As a parent, it's my prerogative. This country isn't suffering a societal crisis because too many children were raised with strict morals and conservative values.

The 'Children First' campaign is just Big Brother telling us that parents can't do a good enough job raising their own children. The ever-benevolent and wise Big Brother decrees that the village idiots have the right and the obligation to interfere with the way you raise your children. The 'Children First' campaign is trying to subtly condition us to accept the doctrine that our children, borne of our own bodies, belong to the state.

Unbelievably extreme? Not any more. The courts have recently ruled that the state has a 'moral imperative' to insure that our children are raised according to the best interests of the state, regardless if the state's interests conflict with the parents' values. 'Putting Children First' means ignoring one of the most important needs of children by putting parents last.