

## Cameron For Slavery

The civilisation of the West, led by Great Britain, was the first in history to outlaw chattel slavery. We should be proud of this achievement, but not complacent. Any institution that allows one person to use violence or the threat of violence to cause an innocent person to work, is slavery, and all slavery is evil. Some forms of slavery survived long after its formal abolition. For example, military conscription is slavery. So is compulsory schooling.

Now David Cameron, the new leader of the Conservative Party in Britain, has decided that he wants to make community service for school leavers **compulsory**. He wants to *extend* the period for which the government enslaves schoolchildren. And he has descended from 'for their own good' or even 'national emergency' as the ostensible justification, to '*servicing others*'. In other words, from convincing oneself that the institution is something other than slavery to the insolent self-righteousness of the pre-Enlightenment slave owner who has never for an instant thought to doubt his ownership of the lives and persons of other human beings.

The Liberal party (then known as the Whigs) were at the forefront of the anti-slavery movement in the late 18th and early 19th century. Today their nominal heirs, the Liberal Democrats, have abandoned all trace of liberalism (in the original sense of advocacy of liberty). They make no exception in regard to slavery. Their leader Charles Kennedy

responded to the plan by saying the Liberal Democrat Youth Taskforce was already exploring a similar scheme.

"David Cameron wants to portray himself as a liberal but needs to be careful to attribute his 'ideas' to those who are genuinely doing the fresh thinking," he said.

Young people were forced into National Service in Britain from 1939 to 1960, so this idea is about as fresh as a fifty-year-old barrel of fish. Moreover, it is grotesque that politicians are now fighting over who is more 'liberal' by claiming ownership of the abomination.

Mr Cameron said that this scheme stemmed from the Party's belief in "trust and responsibility". Obviously Mr Cameron does not trust

young people with responsibility for their own lives. And we do not

trust him to use power responsibly.

Fri, 01/06/2006 - 11:39 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

## The government enslaves school

The government enslaves schoolchildren? What exactly is your definition of slavery? I thought school was optional.

by a reader on Sat, 01/07/2006 - 06:34 | [reply](#)

## In My Words

Forcing children to do school, among other things, "for their own good", is, at least explicitly, about helping them (to overcome their innate wickedness).

Forcing children to help others is about, at least explicitly, exploiting them for labor.

-- Elliot Temple

<http://www.curi.us/>

by [Elliot Temple](#) on Sat, 01/07/2006 - 09:04 | [reply](#)

## Children

While I generally agree, I wonder about the importance of any correlation between significant intrusive parenting and the long adolescence characteristic of our species. Perhaps there is some advantage at work.

by [Michael Bacon](#) on Sun, 01/08/2006 - 00:34 | [reply](#)

## advantage?

I am hard pressed to imagine an advantage to keeping people from fulfilling their potential by societal habits. Isn't adolescence a construct of society? Once a person develops the ability to reproduce, aren't they really an adult? We have created ways for people to not reproduce- that is societal- so that people can spend more time learning and growing before taking on the responsibilities of parenthood, but it is possible to have babies and continue to learn and grow, with support which is better if it respects autonomy and is not of the 'significant intrusive parenting' variety, babies or no.

by a reader on Wed, 01/25/2006 - 17:16 | [reply](#)

## Adult?

Once a person develops the ability to reproduce, aren't they really an adult?

So a sterile person can never 'really' be an adult?

It is fallacious to try to extract moral information from biological categories in that way.

by **Editor** on Wed, 01/25/2006 - 17:32 | [reply](#)

## Adult?

Isn't biology destiny, to some extent? Isn't morality inescapably intertwined with this destiny?

How to define "adult"? We can do so biologically- where "sterile" is an aberration from normal biological development- and we can do so through societal construct.

I suppose the societal way is by law, to decree when one is adolescent (and thus justifiably subject to significantly intrusive parenting, including the nanny state schools) and then the transformative moment when one becomes an adult.

I don't want to dismiss the possibility out-of-hand, but I am wondering about the possible advantage that Michael Bacon speculates exists, to the extension of the intrusion of authority into adolescent lives.

by a reader on Sun, 02/05/2006 - 15:05 | [reply](#)