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| |  | | --- | | Children should not be forced by law to be educated by either public schools or home schooling if their parents do not wish them to be.  Write a response in which you discuss your views on the policy and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider the possible consequences of implementing the policy and explain how these consequences shape your position. | |

Education is the process by which children are taught different concepts to get them ready for their professional lives, and for an all-round brighter future. Many governments from around the world have made education compulsory for children, and have multiple laws pertaining to public schools and home schooling. In my opinion, I mostly disagree with the prompt's claim of making education optional for children, at their parents' discretion. One may argue that people have a 'right' to education, as opposed to a 'duty,' and must, thus, be optional. However, this argument is baseless. There are three main points to consider when refuting this claim and taking a stand on education.

To begin, it would be in a government's best interests to make education mandatory. Why is this so? The reason is pretty straightforward: Governments aim to ensure the welfare of their people, and for a strong economy. If a government were to make education optional, children who are not schooled or educated are more likely to not get high-paying, or even average-paying jobs. If a country's workforce is uneducated, its people would have to resort to unskilled or low-skill jobs; the economy would not prosper as it would with an educated populace. Hence, to ensure a booming economy, a government would be incorrect to not to pursue literacy among its people. In fact, multiple research studies have observed the correlation between the illiteracy and unemployment. But does this mean that education should be pursued only due to the potential value for the economy?

One must also consider the possible socio-economic effects of not educating children. When the youth of poorer communities are educated, they are able to climb the rungs of the social ladder, and help their communities gain much-needed wealth and resources. Take the example of Indian villages: Of the economically weaker villages, the ones whose conditions improved were the ones who educated their young. This is, in itself, proof of the positive socio-economic effects of education. Another related thing to consider is the recent technological advancements that have been leading to a gradual decline in unskilled or low-skill job openings. Uneducated people would be hard hit by this if the very jobs that they learnt were taken over by Artificial Intelligence or robots. Considering all these aspects, would it be worth it to allow parents to not give their child an education? After all, it would even be beneficial to the family's economic condition, in a lot of cases.

Finally, if a parent were to not send their child to school (or home-school them), then is it really in the child's best interests? It is important to remember that children are incapable of huge decisions, since they are yet to learn the ways the world, the economy, and the society work. If they are not sent to school, then it would be an infringement on a child's potential, and on their inability to consent when it comes to such issues. If such a child, after growing up, despises their parents for not sending them to school, or regrets not getting an education themselves, they cannot reverse time; it is better to be educated young and open up all opportunities, than to stay uneducated and struggle afterwards.

In conclusion, I mostly disagree with the claim provided, since it is in the entire community's best interest that children are educated and literate. Any cases where children do not go to school would lead to a hardship-laden career life, and a delay in their studies and literacy. One may argue that the prompt is true since parents should be able to send their children to private school, but this is beyond the point, since there is nowhere an implication that, if the prompt were true, the parents would still educate their children.