



Nanny State Shock: California Bill Would Strip Parental Rights

A new bill introduced in the California Senate promises to guarantee "children's rights." But it really amounts to eviscerating parents' rights and empowering the state — to raise your kids in its own image. And with 38-million-strong California being a trendsetter, the legislation's success could mean it would soon appear in a government near you.





Introduced by the notorious [Dr.] Richard Pan, the mover and shaker behind the mandatory vaccination law in CA — [and] this new one, SB18, is a grab-bag of generalities basically giving over care of children to the State.

Catch the flavor of the wording. It emerges like swamp gas: "The Legislature finds and declares that all children and youth, regardless of gender, class, race, ethnicity, national origin, culture, religion, immigration status, sexual orientation, or ability, have inherent rights that entitle them to protection, special care, and assistance, including, but not limited to, the following: The right to parents, guardians, or caregivers who act in their best interest. The right to form healthy attachments with adults responsible for their care and well-being. The right to live in a safe and healthy environment. The right to social and emotional well-being. The right to opportunities to attain optimal cognitive, physical, and social development. The right to appropriate, quality education and life skills leading to self-sufficiency in adulthood. The right to appropriate, quality health care."

As if all these outcomes could be delivered to children on a silver platter.

And the State would make it so.

The state's victory is in the vagueness. For example, what constitutes a child's "best interest"? Will this mean exposing him to explicit sex education, including the "transgender" agenda; to "tolerance training" relating the "all values are equal" notion that "truth" is relative; and to "freedom" from necessary discipline? These things are in fashion, after all.

Second, how can the "right" to "emotional well-being" be guaranteed when even adults often have trouble achieving such? And how can liberals claim to be guarantors of it? Studies have shown they suffer from mental illness (and what is thus labeled) more often than conservatives do, a phenomenon I observed during my many years working with children. I virtually never saw a youngster from a conservative home diagnosed with "ADHD," for example, and this is no surprise. As family psychologist John Rosemond has pointed out, ADHD behavior is simply typical toddler behavior extended into later childhood by permissive (read: liberal) parenting.



Written by **Selwyn Duke** on December 21, 2016



And what is proper "social development" and what would "opportunities" to attain it be? Would this involve encouraging early dating; exposure to (corruptive) popular culture; interaction with a "diverse" set of peers, where one bad apple can spoil the bunch; and inculcation with globalist ideas to create good little "citizens of the world"?

There's also another agenda here. As the website Modern Alternative Health <u>points out</u>, "Most likely, the state defines 'optimal cognitive, physical, and social development' as occurring within the public school system. Pan has not been shy about his opposition to homeschooling, and this point may be used to remove or severely restrict the right to homeschool."

No doubt. Statists are unanimous in their opposition to homeschooling; the Big Brother governments in <u>Germany</u> and <u>Sweden</u>, which persecute homeschoolers, are good examples. And why is no mystery. Ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle stated, "Give me a child until he is seven and I will show you the man" and Abraham Lincoln observed, "The philosophy of the school room in one generation will be the philosophy of government in the next." Of course, the philosophy of the school room today cannot be the philosophy of government tomorrow unless you get students in the schoolroom in the first place.

Yet what's truly dangerous about SB18 is, again, it's vagueness, which gives bureaucrats great latitude to interpret its provisions as they see fit. Just consider the following provision:

(b) It is the intent of the Legislature in enacting this act to expand and codify the Bill of Rights for Children and Youth of California created by Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 80 (Res. Ch. 101, Stats. 2009), to establish a comprehensive framework that governs the rights of all children and youth in California, outlines the research-based essential needs of California's children, and establishes standards relating to the health, safety, well-being, early childhood and educational opportunities, and familial supports necessary for all children to succeed.

Modern Alternative Health analyzes this passage thus:

This point basically sums up what they've said so far. This law doesn't do anything, except give them permission to create standards and programs to enforce those standards. We won't know exactly what they're going to come up with or to what extent they'll enforce them until after this law is passed.

It is not acceptable to pass a law like this that has such vague and sweeping implications with poorly-defined parameters. Especially not in California, where parental rights have been stripped increasingly over the last 5 years.

The bill continues in this open-ended vein, stating in SEC. 2 that it is "the intent of the Legislature ... to enact appropriate legislation to accomplish all of the following": "Develop and put forth research-based policy solutions," "Determine the amount of revenue and resources," and "Identify and obtain the revenue and resources ... necessary to ensure that the Bill of Rights for Children and Youth of California, in its totality, is applied evenly, equitably, and appropriately to all children and youth across the state."

What will these "research-based policy solutions" be? How much will this agenda cost and how will it be paid for? The government doesn't say, but apparently has carte blanche with the "solutions" and a blank check with the budget. It's as with Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi <u>infamously saying</u> about ObamaCare, "We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what's in it." Except in this case you'll keep finding out, again and again and again, as the "solutions" continuously change and the price tag ever grows with SB18 measures that can morph like the <u>shape-shifting space alien</u> in *The Thing*.



Written by **Selwyn Duke** on December 21, 2016



And who may cash in on this pot of gold? Most suspicious is that one of the entities behind the bill is The Silicon Valley Community Foundation, Jon Rappoport informs, "a non-profit that has assets of \$7.3 BILLION" and "runs 1800 philanthropic funds." It has a list of big-money corporate partners, too. As he also writes, "For some reason, this huge Foundation is pushing a children's bill of rights that … will eventually make the State the top-dog controlling force over all children in California. You can bet these corporate partners will reap profits. Beyond that, this is their version of a MASSIVE social engineering program."

It's the state's version, too. The good news is that the bill is still in its early stages and wouldn't take effect until 2022, so there's still some chance to scuttle it if people fight hard. And hopefully they will because, with SB18, the red flags are everywhere. The only telling promise we haven't yet heard is, "If you like your child, you can keep your child."









Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.