

Bad v Worse?

Alan Forrester has **had it** with the British Conservative Party. Why? Just as the government and the Eurocrats are showing signs of ending their Luddite, anti-American, **starvation-promoting** tactic of banning genetically modified foods, what does the Conservative Party do? It emerges briefly from hibernation to speak out *in favour* of the ban. On what grounds? Mainly that (1) the ban is popular; and (2) it is opposed by (wait for it...) *the government's friends in business*. OK they do also make the legitimate conservative point that the introduction of GM crops would be hard to reverse; but under the circumstances, given the benefits of such crops and the fact that there has already been a lengthy delay during which intensive efforts have failed to discover a single danger or disadvantage, this argument is mere window-dressing. In reality there is nothing here but the "**pointless, opportunistic sniping** ... without bringing to bear any coherent criticism either on that or most other issues" of which we have complained before.

It seems likely now that at the next British election there will be no party that one could unequivocally say was the least bad of the bunch. Therefore one should vote for candidates on their individual merits. In this regard, Alan has come to a radical conclusion:

My local MP voted against the war on Iraq and I would *still* vote for him in preference to the bunch of oily, weasel brained, political runts that is the Conservative Party. From this moment on, the Conservatives are dead to me.

Given that the war on terror is still in progress, we have to doubt that conclusion, though we do sympathise with the sentiment.

But how did things get this bad?

Mon, 09/22/2003 - 11:51 | [permalink](#)