

The Homage of the Slaves

[The Homage of the Slaves](#)

by [Iain Davis](#)

May 4, 2023

As the coronation of Charlie-boy approaches, the Royal household thought it would be nice to offer the British public the opportunity to [swear their allegiance](#) to King Charles III and declare themselves his slave. This "[homage of the people](#)" has been very popular amongst some. Presumably, they're dead keen to live a life of slavery.

[Apparently](#), Shabana Mahmood, the Labour Party's national campaign coordinator, thinks slavery is a "lovely idea" and that involving the people in the coronation, by offering them to opportunity to become slaves, was a "lovely touch." The UK transport secretary, Mark Harper, thinks that elective slavery represents a "fantastic opportunity." Although, he didn't specify for whom.

Harper went on to suggest that enslaving millions of people will provide a "great showcase for Britain around the world." This doesn't appear to be necessary. Given its colonial past and current foreign policy, it seems likely that most people are already familiar with the way the British state rolls.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the "homage of the people" has not been pitched by [the Establishment](#) as the "homage of the slaves". It's an invitation, [not a command](#), and everyone knows that merely attempting to enslave people is a kind of altruism.

Like Shabana and Mark, Vince, the Archbishop of Westminster, described this invitation as "remarkable" and "lovely," with

Sky News reporting:

For the first time in history the public will be given an active role in the coronation, having been invited to say the oath to the King out loud.

Of course, the whole point of his oath is that he, as the head of state, [swears his allegiance to us](#). But let's not allow our codified constitution to get in the way of a good old, statist hallucination. We haven't [for more than 800 years](#), so why start now?

That being said, it is not without good reason that an apparent majority of people have decided that they [do not want](#) to pay "homage" to [an inept toff](#). This seems reasonable, because it avoids making the bat-shit crazy decision to pledge your "obligation of fidelity and obedience" to some bloke wearing a load of moody gold.

For those who fancy the idea of enslaving themselves to a clueless aristocrat, before you guffaw in scornful rejection of any suggestion that you are, in fact, choosing to be a slave, it is perhaps worth noting what an oath of allegiance [actually means](#):

[. . .] the obligation of fidelity and obedience which the individual owes to the government under which he lives, or to his sovereign in return for the protection he receives

Your "allegiance" means you pledge your "obedience" in return for protection. This is commonly known as a "protection racket."

It get's worse:

The citizen or subject owes an absolute and permanent allegiance to his government or sovereign, or at least until, by some open and distinct act, he renounces it and becomes a

citizen or subject of another government or another sovereign.

You may have noticed your somewhat limited choices if you are ever dumb enough to swear an oath of allegiance to [the parasite class](#). You can't really get out of it unless you subsequently swear your "absolute and permanent" "fidelity and obedience" to the next parasitic scumbag that elbows their way in to your life.

Still, each to their own. Who am I to put anyone off opting to be a slave?

Nonetheless, before you do, perhaps spare a moment to consider your choices. There are better slave masters laying about, should you want one.

Perhaps you could choose to be [Elon Musk's slave](#) instead? As these things go, choosing Charles as your personal oppressor might be a bit iffy.



[then] Prince Charles and Uncle Dickie Mountbatten
Charles was mentored by his father's uncle, Lord Louis

Mountbatten (Prince Louis of Battenberg), [who he affectionately called](#) “Uncle Dickie.” A frequent visitor to his “honorary grandpapa’s” Broadlands estate, the young Charles often holidayed with the Mountbattens.

As an adult, Charles was encouraged by “Uncle Dickie” to use Broadlands for any sexual rendezvous that Charles would rather keep quiet. The US Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) [described Mountbatten](#) as a paedophile “with a perversion for young boys.”

King Charles’ was [extremely close to Jimmy Savile](#). The necrophiliac paedophile and child pimp was a [confidant and adviser](#) to the Royal household, and Charles in particular, for more than 30 years.



Child rapist Savile and King Charles – an interesting power dynamic.

When the Bishop and [notorious paedophile](#), Peter Ball, first accepted a caution—prior to his subsequent conviction in 2015—Charles felt that a “monstrous wrong” had been inflicted upon the pederast. Knowing the nature of the allegations, and

Ball's admission of guilt, Charles purchased a property for Ball and his twin brother.

King Charles subsequently denied all knowledge of Ball's vile crimes in the [letter he submitted](#) to the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse. The explanation he offered was idiotic:

I was certainly not aware at the time of the significance or impact of the caution that Peter Ball has accepted, or indeed sure if I was even told about it. Whilst I note that Peter Ball mentioned the word in a letter to me in October 2009, I was not aware until recently that a caution in fact carries an acceptance of guilt.

This is in keeping with the story we are given about Charles which suggests he is a [gullible pillock](#). Presumably, this naive stupidity extends to the [enormous advisory team](#) that surrounds Charles and the Royals.

It seems, no one advised Charles to stop hanging around with nonces. Although, admittedly, [in his family](#), it is hard to avoid them.

Not a single one of his vast array of advisers took the time to explain to Charles what the legal implications of a caution were. Furthermore, all of them were completely unaware that their future, simple-minded King was "accidentally" maintaining a series of close friendships and "special" relationships with child rapists.

Despite all of this, some people really love waving their little flags and remain eager to declare their oath of obedience to this man. Perhaps because they have have no idea what it means or perhaps because they are as thick as he is.

It is good to know that becoming Charles' slave is not a direct command. Many people would prefer to completely ignore

the [World Economic Forum](#) (WEF) spokesman and [hypocrite](#), King Charles III. We certainly wouldn't want to spoil his day by telling him to shove his "invitation" where the sun doesn't shine.

[Connect with Iain Davis](#)

Cover image based on creative commons work of: [johnhain](#) & [Clker-Free-Vector-Images](#)