

Now Look Here, Mr Blunkett

David Blunkett, the UK Home Secretary, is blind. No, really, he's literally blind: he takes a **seeing-eye dog** into the House of Commons with him and everything. Admirable, and it's in no way his fault that this makes it somewhat difficult to criticise him for a certain range of political defects: lack of vision, short-sightedness ... and now – well, what is **this** but sheer *blindness*?

Everyone in Britain will have to pay around £25 for a compulsory identity card under proposals being put to the cabinet by David Blunkett, the Home Secretary ...

While forcing people to pay for the card could add to the anticipated objections from human rights campaigners, Mr Blunkett believes that concern about national security is sufficient to ensure that individuals will be prepared to bear the cost.

Mr Blunkett is confident that he can win support for the idea of a compulsory card even though previous ministers have failed.

Can't he see what's going to happen? Ought not someone take him aside and explain that it doesn't matter how many times he proposes such a measure, *we are still going to reject it?* Just as we have every time since **1952**, following a **1951 ruling**:

LORD GODDARD, *Willcock v. Muckle*, 26 June 1951.
Decision that led to Parliament's repeal of National ID card in 1952,

it is obvious that the police now, as a matter of routine, demand the production of national registration indemnity cards whenever they stop or interrogate a motorist for whatever cause. Of course, if they are looking for a stolen car or have reason to believe that a particular motorist is engaged in committing a crime, that is one thing, but to demand a national registration identity card from all and sundry, for instance, from a lady who may leave her car outside a shop longer than she should, or some trivial matter of that sort, is wholly unreasonable.

This Act was passed for security purposes, and not for

the purposes for which, apparently, it is now sought to be used. To use Acts of Parliament, passed for particular purposes during war, in times when the war is past, except that technically a state of war exists, tends to turn law-abiding subjects into lawbreakers, which is a most undesirable state of affairs. Further, in this country we have always prided ourselves on the good feeling that exists between the police and the public and such action tends to make the people resentful of the acts of the police and inclines them to obstruct the police instead of to assist them

...

They ought not to use a Security Act, which was passed for a particular purpose, as they have done in this case.

We agree. We have no objection to special wartime security measures where they are merited. But these are not merited, nor are they special wartime security measures. They are a piece of totalitarian nanny-state legislation, brazenly proposed under cover of the present emergency. This is shameful.

Tue, 04/22/2003 - 04:13 | [permalink](#)

Who's the blind one here?

I agree that ID cards would be a bad thing, but are you really saying they are not going to be brought in regardless? This flies in the face of all the evidence. Are you looking at the British government through rose-tinted spectacles? At what point do the British people get to say no? We're not going to have a referendum, are we? Isn't it inevitable that we'll get them?

by a reader on Tue, 04/22/2003 - 13:30 | [reply](#)

Two Modest Proposals

Here are two modest proposals which, after all, are not more inconsistent than an "entitlement card" which is not compulsory, but which will save you getting into a lot of trouble with the police when you don't carry it. My first proposal is that it be really an entitlement card, i.e, that it actually entitles you to be a citizen, that is, that it entitles you to carry a revolver. (A special law would be required to forbid policemen from carrying guns, as was the case during the few years following the creation of the New York City police: the normal situation is indeed that sovereign citizens be armed and state agents be not.) The second proposal is that the state finance itself exclusively with entitlement cards by charging, say, 6,400 pounds per card. After all, if the people want it, they will be willing to pay for it.

(The U.K GDP is 950 billion pounds. The tyrant's revenues are about 380 billion (i.e., 40% of GDP). With a population of 59,000,000 we get 6,400 pounds per capita.)

Pierre Lemieux <http://www.pierrelemieux.org>

by **Pierre Lemieux** on Tue, 04/22/2003 - 13:36 | [reply](#)

Who's the blind one?

are you really saying they are not going to be brought in regardless? This flies in the face of all the evidence. Are you looking at the British government through rose-tinted spectacles? At what point do the British people get to say no? We're not going to have a referendum, are we? Isn't it inevitable that we'll get them?

Sure, it's been inevitable for the last 51 years and it will continue to be inevitable for the next 51 million.

Look, people, we need to learn some method of analysis of political events beyond "*help, the evil government must irresistibly grow and grow and we're all doomed, doomed I tell you.*"

by a reader on Tue, 04/22/2003 - 17:01 | [reply](#)