

## Chapter 1 : Lame Cherry: the deciding factor in freedom

*The concept of freedom means different things to different people, depending on the level of freedom that you have in your life. Most people, when they think of the definition of freedom, they think of Liberty, which includes freedom of speech. The definition of liberty is having the ability to act.*

Anti-Federalism In , the second year of the American Revolutionary War , the Virginia colonial legislature passed a Declaration of Rights that included the sentence "The freedom of the press is one of the greatest bulwarks of liberty, and can never be restrained but by despotic Governments. However, these declarations were generally considered "mere admonitions to state legislatures", rather than enforceable provisions. Other delegates—including future Bill of Rights drafter James Madison —disagreed, arguing that existing state guarantees of civil liberties were sufficient and that any attempt to enumerate individual rights risked the implication that other, unnamed rights were unprotected. Supporters of the Constitution in states where popular sentiment was against ratification including Virginia, Massachusetts, and New York successfully proposed that their state conventions both ratify the Constitution and call for the addition of a bill of rights. Constitution was eventually ratified by all thirteen states. The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established, nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretext, infringed. The people shall not be deprived or abridged of their right to speak, to write, or to publish their sentiments; and the freedom of the press, as one of the great bulwarks of liberty, shall be inviolable. The people shall not be restrained from peaceably assembling and consulting for their common good; nor from applying to the Legislature by petitions, or remonstrances, for redress of their grievances. Establishment Clause Thomas Jefferson wrote with respect to the First Amendment and its restriction on the legislative branch of the federal government in an letter to the Danbury Baptists a religious minority concerned about the dominant position of the Congregational church in Connecticut: Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties. United States the Supreme Court used these words to declare that "it may be accepted almost as an authoritative declaration of the scope and effect of the amendment thus secured. Congress was deprived of all legislative power over mere [religious] opinion, but was left free to reach [only those religious] actions which were in violation of social duties or subversive of good order. In the preamble of this act [. Originally, the First Amendment applied only to the federal government, and some states continued official state religions after ratification. Massachusetts , for example, was officially Congregational until the s. Board of Education , the U. Supreme Court incorporated the Establishment Clause i. The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion to another. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach. Watkins , the Supreme Court ruled that the Constitution prohibits states and the federal government from requiring any kind of religious test for public office. Grumet , [12] The Court concluded that "government should not prefer one religion to another, or religion to irreligion. Perry , [14] McCreary County v. ACLU , [15] and Salazar v. Buono [16] —the Court considered the issue of religious monuments on federal lands without reaching a majority reasoning on the subject. President Thomas Jefferson wrote in his correspondence of "a wall of separation between church and State". It had been long established in the decisions of the Supreme Court, beginning with Reynolds v. United States in , when the Court reviewed the history of the early Republic in deciding the extent of the liberties of Mormons. Chief Justice Morrison Waite , who consulted the historian George Bancroft , also discussed at some length the Memorial and Remonstrance against Religious Assessments by James Madison, [18] who drafted the First Amendment; Madison used the metaphor of a "great barrier". Everson laid down the test that establishment existed when aid was given to religion, but that the transportation was justifiable because the benefit to the children was more important. In the school prayer cases of the early s, Engel v. Vitale and Abington School

District v. Schempp , aid seemed irrelevant; the Court ruled on the basis that a legitimate action both served a secular purpose and did not primarily assist religion. Tax Commission , the Court ruled that a legitimate action could not entangle government with religion; in Lemon v. Kurtzman , these points were combined into the Lemon test , declaring that an action was an establishment if: The Lemon test has been criticized by justices and legal scholars, but it remains the predominant means by which the Court enforces the Establishment Clause. Felton , the entanglement prong of the Lemon test was demoted to simply being a factor in determining the effect of the challenged statute or practice. Simmons-Harris , the opinion of the Court considered secular purpose and the absence of primary effect; a concurring opinion saw both cases as having treated entanglement as part of the primary purpose test. Some relationship between government and religious organizations is inevitable", the court wrote. Douglas that "[w]e are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being". Free Exercise Clause "Freedom of religion means freedom to hold an opinion or belief, but not to take action in violation of social duties or subversive to good order. United States , the Supreme Court found that while laws cannot interfere with religious belief and opinions, laws can regulate some religious practices e. The Court stated that to rule otherwise, "would be to make the professed doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land, and in effect permit every citizen to become a law unto himself. Government would exist only in name under such circumstances. While the right to have religious beliefs is absolute, the freedom to act on such beliefs is not absolute. Verner , [33] the Supreme Court required states to meet the " strict scrutiny " standard when refusing to accommodate religiously motivated conduct. This meant that a government needed to have a "compelling interest" regarding such a refusal. The case involved Adele Sherbert, who was denied unemployment benefits by South Carolina because she refused to work on Saturdays, something forbidden by her Seventh-day Adventist faith. Yoder , the Court ruled that a law that "unduly burdens the practice of religion" without a compelling interest, even though it might be "neutral on its face", would be unconstitutional. Smith , [37] which held no such interest was required under the Free Exercise Clause regarding a neutral law of general applicability that happens to affect a religious practice, as opposed to a law that targets a particular religious practice which does require a compelling governmental interest. Since the ordinance was not "generally applicable", the Court ruled that it needed to have a compelling interest, which it failed to have, and so was declared unconstitutional. In City of Boerne v. Freedom of speech in the United States and United States free speech exceptions Wording of the clause The First Amendment bars Congress from "abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press". The practice in America must be entitled to much more respect. In every state, probably, in the Union, the press has exerted a freedom in canvassing the merits and measures of public men, of every description, which has not been confined to the strict limits of the common law. Madison believed that legislation to be unconstitutional, and his adversaries in that dispute, such as John Marshall , advocated the narrow freedom of speech that had existed in the English common law. For example, the Supreme Court never ruled on the Alien and Sedition Acts ; three Supreme Court justices riding circuit presided over sedition trials without indicating any reservations. Sullivan , [52] the Court noted the importance of this public debate as a precedent in First Amendment law and ruled that the Acts had been unconstitutional: Specifically, the Espionage Act of states that if anyone allows any enemies to enter or fly over the United States and obtain information from a place connected with the national defense, they will be punished. United States , Debs v. United States , Frohwerk v. United States , and Abrams v. In the first of these cases, Socialist Party of America official Charles Schenck had been convicted under the Espionage Act for publishing leaflets urging resistance to the draft. United States, the court again upheld an Espionage Act conviction, this time that of a journalist who had criticized U. United States, the Court elaborated on the "clear and present danger" test established in Schenck. Debs , a political activist, delivered a speech in Canton, Ohio , in which he spoke of "most loyal comrades were paying the penalty to the working class " these being Wagenknecht , Baker and Ruthenberg , who had been convicted of aiding and abetting another in failing to register for the draft. In upholding his conviction, the Court reasoned that although he had not spoken any words that posed a "clear and present danger", taken in context, the speech had a "natural tendency and a probable effect to obstruct the recruiting services". The Supreme Court denied a number of Free Speech Clause claims throughout the s, including the appeal of a

labor organizer, Benjamin Gitlow, who had been convicted after distributing a manifesto calling for a "revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat". *New York*, the Court upheld the conviction, but a majority also found that the First Amendment applied to state laws as well as federal laws, via the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *California*, [70] in which Communist Party USA organizer Charlotte Anita Whitney had been arrested for "criminal syndicalism", Brandeis wrote a dissent in which he argued for broader protections for political speech: Those who won our independence. *United States*, [75] the Court upheld the law, 6â€”2. The demands of free speech in a democratic society as well as the interest in national security are better served by candid and informed weighing of the competing interests, within the confines of the judicial process. *United States*, the Supreme Court limited the Smith Act prosecutions to "advocacy of action" rather than "advocacy in the realm of ideas". Advocacy of abstract doctrine remained protected while speech explicitly inciting the forcible overthrow of the government was punishable under the Smith Act. Though the Court upheld a law prohibiting the forgery, mutilation, or destruction of draft cards in *United States v. Ohio*, [84] expressly overruling *Whitney v. California*, [89] the Court voted 5â€”4 to reverse the conviction of a man wearing a jacket reading "Fuck the Draft" in the corridors of a Los Angeles County courthouse. *California*, [91] the Court struck down a Los Angeles city ordinance that made it a crime to distribute anonymous pamphlets. Justice Hugo Black wrote in the majority opinion: Anonymous pamphlets, leaflets, brochures and even books have played an important role in the progress of mankind. *Ohio Elections Commission*, [93] the Court struck down an Ohio statute that made it a crime to distribute anonymous campaign literature. *Keene*, [95] the Court upheld the Foreign Agents Registration Act of , under which several Canadian films were defined as "political propaganda", requiring their sponsors to be identified. *Federal Election Commission In Buckley v. Valeo*, [97] the Supreme Court reviewed the Federal Election Campaign Act of and related laws, which restricted the monetary contributions that may be made to political campaigns and expenditure by candidates. The Court affirmed the constitutionality of limits on campaign contributions, stating that they "serve[d] the basic governmental interest in safeguarding the integrity of the electoral process without directly impinging upon the rights of individual citizens and candidates to engage in political debate and discussion. *Federal Election Commission* The Supreme Court upheld provisions which barred the raising of soft money by national parties and the use of soft money by private organizations to fund certain advertisements related to elections. In *Federal Election Commission v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.* The Court overruled *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, [] which had upheld a state law that prohibited corporations from using treasury funds to support or oppose candidates in elections did not violate the First or Fourteenth Amendments. *Federal Election Commission*, [] the Court ruled that federal aggregate limits on how much a person can donate to candidates, political parties, and political action committees, combined respectively in a two-year period known as an "election cycle," violated the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment. Street was arrested and charged with a New York state law making it a crime "publicly [to] mutilate, deface, defile, or defy, trample upon, or cast contempt upon either by words or act [any flag of the United States]. *California*, [] found that because the provision of the New York law criminalizing "words" against the flag was unconstitutional, and the trial did not sufficiently demonstrate that he was convicted solely under the provisions not yet deemed unconstitutional, the conviction was unconstitutional. The Court, however, "resist[ed] the pulls to decide the constitutional issues involved in this case on a broader basis" and left the constitutionality of flag-burning unaddressed. The Supreme Court reversed his conviction in a 5â€”4 vote.

### Chapter 2 : Freedom Riders - HISTORY

*What has been violated here is your freedom of choice, and every woman's freedom of choice, too. If abortion was legal, a woman would have a choiceâ€”and so would you. You could feel free not to do it because someone else would.*

I lived there for a couple years, but after my girlfriend and now wife moved in, it got a little too small for us. We found a slightly larger place, and instead of selling the condo, I decided to turn it into a rental. If I had decided to sell at that point in time, I would have taken a pretty good loss on the property. Instead of doing that, I figured that I could rent it out for a while and at least have the renters pay all or most of my mortgage. In fact, it seems like at least once a year I strongly consider whether or not the whole rental is worth it. Recently my current renters were at the end of their lease term. Part of this was due to an initial lease agreement where I guaranteed to the tenants that I would not increase the rent for a period of two years inducement for them to rent my unit and not somewhere else. During the third year, I debated increasing the rent, but in the end decided that I would keep things the same since they had been good renters. As the end of their lease term approached, I reached out to them and asked if they had plans to stay for another year or to move out. It was still about four months before the end of the agreement, so this was fine. Their situation had changed pretty dramatically though. Over the course of the past year, they had not one, but two babies! The interesting thing about this, is that in the lease agreement I had specifically stated that the occupancy standard for the unit was two persons. Suddenly, the occupancy had jumped to four! Granted, only half of the residents are adults, but still. With about a month to go before the end of the lease term, I reached out again to ask about their plans. To my surprise, they told me they wanted to continue renting from me. Due to my market research, and the fact that my property taxes and condo fees had gone up during the previous three years, I felt this was a pretty reasonable increase. I communicated the increase to my tenants in a short but clear email. Whatever the case, they were pushing back on the increase. I thought about it for a while. I also asked Mrs. Freedom 40 for her thoughts. I then asked my Mom and my Step Dad both long time landlords themselves what they thought. So what did I do? For a lot of reasons, this decision makes no sense. I was well within my rights to raise the rent and the increase was reasonable. In addition, the renters had a poor negotiating position since the end of the lease term was only a month away. Any reasonable person would assume they would not want to do a last minute move, especially with two babies. After thinking about it, I determined that the financial gain was miniscule and inconsequential to me, while it might be significant to the tenants. I guess you could call it a small act of kindness or even an act of charity. So what do you think? Did I make the right choice? Was I too easy? What would you have done? Please share in the comments below.

### Chapter 3 : What is Freedom in America | Soapboxie

*The First Amendment right to freedom of religion was central in deciding the outcome to which of the following trials? a. Engel v. Vitale b. Gideon v.*

The group traveled through Virginia and North Carolina, drawing little public notice. The next day, the group reached Atlanta, Georgia, where some of the riders split off onto a Trailways bus. John Lewis, one of the original group of 13 Freedom Riders, was elected to the U. House of Representatives in November. There, an angry mob of about white people surrounded the bus, causing the driver to continue past the bus station. The mob followed the bus in automobiles, and when the tires on the bus blew out, someone threw a bomb into the bus. The Freedom Riders escaped the bus as it burst into flames, only to be brutally beaten by members of the surrounding mob. The second bus, a Trailways vehicle, traveled to Birmingham, Alabama, and those riders were also beaten by an angry white mob, many of whom brandished metal pipes. Following the widespread violence, CORE officials could not find a bus driver who would agree to transport the integrated group, and they decided to abandon the Freedom Rides. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, brother of President John F. Kennedy, began negotiating with Governor John Patterson of Alabama and the bus companies to secure a driver and state protection for the new group of Freedom Riders. The rides finally resumed, on a Greyhound bus departing Birmingham under police escort, on May 4, 1961. The violence toward the Freedom Riders was not quelled—rather, the police abandoned the Greyhound bus just before it arrived at the Montgomery, Alabama, terminal, where a white mob attacked the riders with baseball bats and clubs as they disembarked. Attorney General Kennedy sent federal marshals to the city to stop the violence. The following night, civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr. A riot ensued outside the church, and King called Robert Kennedy to ask for protection. Kennedy summoned the federal marshals, who used teargas to disperse the white mob. Patterson declared martial law in the city and dispatched the National Guard to restore order. There, several hundred supporters greeted the riders. However, those who attempted to use the whites-only facilities were arrested for trespassing and taken to the maximum-security penitentiary in Parchman, Mississippi. He sentenced the riders to 30 days in jail. Supreme Court, which reversed them. Relief at Last The violence and arrests continued to garner national and international attention, and drew hundreds of new Freedom Riders to the cause. The rides continued over the next several months, and in the fall of 1961, under pressure from the Kennedy administration, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued regulations prohibiting segregation in interstate transit terminals.

### Chapter 4 : How is the U.S. Deciding its Tax Policy? | FreedomWorks

*When Barack Obama works late in the White House until 2am, he has one constant companion: seven almonds. "Not six, not eight," the president's former chef told the New York Times. "Always."*

Deciding its Tax Policy? Tax law changes under Obama are based on petty animus, not logic. But why do we have taxes in the first place? What are they for, and why must they be so certain? It may seem a trivial question, but listening to modern intellectuals and politicians talk about tax rates leads one to wonder whether anyone has bothered to ask it recently. Traditionally, taxes exist for one reason and one reason only: Of course, as taxpayers and advocates of liberty, we have preferences such as fairness, simplicity and a rate that does not extort excessive amounts of our hard earned cash, but government policy makers concerned with paying their own salaries, closing deficits, as well as funding the various programs they keep telling us are necessary, should prefer a rate that yields more revenue to one that yields less. And in fact, some of the more intellectually honest academics out there do this. A new paper from economists Nezhir Guner, Martin Lopez-Daneri, and Gustavo Ventura examines the revenue generating potential of a more progressive tax structure. As Art Laffer demonstrated several decades back, higher tax rates do not always mean higher tax revenues, as the disincentive effects on work overpower the greater percentage of income going to government. The authors of the paper discovered that, indeed, there is not very much room for increasing revenues by taxing the rich more, and that other economic effects would likely overpower such gains even if they were able to be realized. To quote from the conclusion: The message from these findings is clear. There is not much available revenue from revenue-maximising shifts in the burden of taxation towards high earners "despite the substantial changes in tax rates across income levels" and that these changes have non-trivial implications for economic aggregates. The president has already made it quite clear that he does not regard higher taxes as a means to an ultimate end of funding government, but rather as an end in themselves. The following exchange comes from a presidential primary debate, where Barack Obama was confronted by some uncomfortable statistics by moderator Charlie Gibson. And in the s, when the tax was increased to 28 percent, the revenues went down. So why raise it at all, especially given the fact that million people in this country own stock and would be affected? And part of what has happened is that those who are able to work the stock market and amass huge fortunes on capital gains are paying a lower tax rate than their secretaries. There you have it. That is how tax policy is decided in this country now. [Log in or register to post comments.](#)

### Chapter 5 : Freedom Of Choice Quotes ( quotes)

*The First Amendment right to freedom of religion was central in deciding the outcome to which of the following Get the answers you need, now!*

But you must act now if you want to start collecting your checks as early as next month. And, lest you get too hung up on those dates, the ad I saw in early January had the same generic calendar and promised that you had to get in by February 1, as this current ad urges you to get in by March 1. And, of course, copywriters are there to encourage our daydreamsâ€ dreaming about riches makes money for them. So now we know, Badiali is pitching Master Limited Partnerships MLPs â€ best known for owning and operating oil and gas pipelines, though the definition has enlarged to incorporate non-energy-focused publicly traded partnerships, like the giant investment banking group Blackstone BX , MLPs are publicly traded partnerships that work as pass-through businesses, avoiding federal taxes as long as they pass through their profits to shareholders. You buy shares, you get payments that you either take in cash or reinvest in more shares, and you hope that the payments usually quarterly will rise over time, and that the shares will also rise in value. This is how he says he narrows them down: Many of the companies that make it to the top of my list are so profitable they actually increase their payments every year. The dividend growth rate, over the long run, tends to be even more important than the actual current income yieldâ€ you want to make sure that the payments grow faster than inflation, at a minimum, but growing dividends also means that the share price will go up if investors remain happy with the income yield. Your income goes up, and the value of your shares goes upâ€ and if you let those dividends reinvest into new shares, the income compounds fairly rapidly over time as you let your money make more money. The next rule is a bit squishier: Here are the clues he drops for us: Trusts can be a bit odd to understand for stock investors, but they can essentially be thought of as fixed investments in an underlying royalty â€ trusts cannot reinvest or participate in capital projects or really do anything active at all, they just monitor their assets and collect their checks and distribute the income to shareholders of the trust. Income levels depend both on the level of production on their royalty lands, and, of course, on the actual price of the commodity â€ so as natural gas or oil rise, their cash flow should generally accelerate because actual revenue from existing production is more valuable, and because that spurs more drilling. They are, by definition, depleting assets so you want to watch and make sure you understand what level of reserves are still available for production. SJT does pay out distributions monthly, the distribution for January was 6. You can see that history of distributions here. And, of course, those big gold miners have hundreds and thousands of employees. What kind of numbers are we talking about? What about if you invest something more average or normal for a small investor? Those are not guarantees or limitations, of course, the payout could change the long-term tendency for most MLPs and REITs is to increase their distributions or dividends faster than the rate of inflation â€ and if investor expectations about yields or tolerance for risk change, the amount that you might be able to sell your shares for in the future could also certainly change. Sound like your kinda investment? Are you getting our free Daily Update "reveal" emails? If not, just click here Irregulars Quick Take Paid members get a quick summary of the stocks teased and our thoughts here. Join as a Stock Gumshoe Irregular today already a member?

### Chapter 6 : Freedom - Wikiquote

*[PDF]Free Deciding To Sell Your Business The Key To Wealth And Freedom download Book Deciding To Sell Your Business The Key To Wealth And calendrierdelascience.com*

Static code analysis shows the dependency is still there. DI just changes how you ended up with an instance to the object. If your ctor say is expecting objects of a particular class then you have a dependency to that type but you also have strong-coupling to a class which is bad. However if your ctor is expecting types of a certain interface, then you have a dependency to that contract definition but not to the actual implementation lose coupling. As I understand it, interfaces in C can be thought of as a contract or promise that a derived class must follow. This allows different objects to behave in different ways when the an overridden method is called. Yes, but they are also a way to abstract a component by hiding unnecessary details, something say a class cannot. When is it more important to use interfaces for polymorphism or DI when you want complete freedom? Where do you draw the line? Is it ok to use interfaces when you want the structure methods and properties to align among different derived classes and DI when the parameters can be wildly different? DI does not offer any more freedom then a non-DI system. However I think you might be a little confused over terminology or concepts. DI is always good. Injecting interfaces over class types is better as I mentioned above. I can create a contract that says a derived class **MUST** follow these certain guidelines which is restrictive in nature versus DI which allows me to inject dependencies A contract is a contract is a contract whether it is in the form of an interface or abstract class. If the constructor constructor-injection or property property injection is asking for a MySqlConnection then that sets up a requirement as to what can be injected more so than say just expecting a MySqlConnection. I think you may have it wrong with regards to what DI does. DI does not always inject classes and interfaces are not just for polymorphism. The latter is a common mistake. DI has nothing to do with being "restrictive". That is up to you as to the type you are expecting to have injected. In fact expecting a concrete class object or something derived by abstract class to be injected is more "restrictive" than injecting an interface by the very nature of how interfaces can be reused across more scenarios.

**Chapter 7 : My Rental Condo - Deciding to Raise the Rent - Freedom40Plan**

*Huck and Jim both yearn for freedom. Huck wants to be free of petty manners and societal values. Huck wants to be free of petty manners and societal values. He wants to be free of his abusive father, who goes so far as to literally imprison Huck in a cabin.*

Know ye not Who would be free themselves must strike the blow? Lord Byron , The Giaour , line Inner freedom demands the rejection of any imposition that injures our dignity. Brian Morris, Quotes we cherish. Quotations from Fausto Cercignani , p. Brian Morris, Simply Transcribed. Quotations from Fausto Cercignani,, p. I call that mind free, which sets no bounds to its love, which is not imprisoned in itself or in a sect, which recognises in all human beings the image of God and the rights of his children, which delights in virtue and sympathizes with suffering wherever they are seen, which conquers pride, anger, and sloth, and offers itself up a willing victim to the cause of mankind. William Ellery Channing , Spiritual Freedom Controversy may rage as long as it adheres to the presuppositions that define the consensus of elites, and it should furthermore be encouraged within these bounds, thus helping to establish these doctrines as the very condition of thinkable thought while reinforcing the belief that freedom reigns. Noam Chomsky , Necessary Illusions The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrumâ€”even encourage the more critical and dissident views. Noam Chomsky , The Common Good Fatherland without freedom and merit is a large word with little meaning. But what is Freedom? Rightly understood, A universal license to be good. Hartley Coleridge , Liberty Excepting those who see only a boisterous celebration, this macabre work [El entierro de la sardina] makes people uncomfortable. Malraux comments that the figures are not men and women in fancy dress, they are butterflies hatched for one brief moment from a larval world, the revelation of freedom. You might think ironsmiths, bricklayers, stable hands, knife grinders, peasants, chambermaids, and others with little to lose would protest the heavy hand of El Deseado. Spaniards trapped at birth at the bottom of the heap were fiercely conservative. As Klingender explains, the more these people suffered, "the more fanatical did they become in their loyalty to Church and crown, which they associated with their memories of a better life in the past. Connell, Francisco Goya p. He is the freeman whom the truth makes free, And all are slaves besides. William Cowper , The Task , Book V, line D[ edit ] I think that the sweetest freedom for a man on earth consists in being able to live, if he likes, without having the need to work. You can only be free if I am free. Clarence Darrow Address to the court in People v. Lloyd While there is a soul in prison, I am not free. Debs , Federal Court statement For so long as but a hundred of us remain alive, we will in no way yield ourselves to the dominion of the English. For it is not for glory, nor riches, nor honour that we fight, but for Freedom, which no good man lays down but with his life. From the Declaration of Arbroath , The Times Book of Quotations Once a man has tasted freedom he will never be content to be a slave. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters. Albert Einstein , "Moral Decay" ; later published in Out of My Later Years Everything that is really great and inspiring is created by the individual who can labor in freedom. When technique enters into the realm of social life, it collides ceaselessly with the human being to the degree that the combination of man and technique is unavoidable, and that technical action necessarily results in a determined result. Technique requires predictability and, no less, exactness of prediction. It is necessary, then, that technique prevail over the human being. For technique, this is a matter of life or death. Technique must reduce man to a technical animal, the king of the slaves of technique. Human caprice crumbles before this necessity; there can be no human autonomy in the face of technical autonomy. The individual must be fashioned by techniques, either negatively by the techniques of understanding man or positively by the adaptation of man to the technical framework , in order to wipe out the blots his personal determination introduces into the perfect design of the organization. Jacques Ellul , The Technological Society , p. Jacques Ellul , The Betrayal by Technology The only difference as compared with the old, outspoken slavery is this, that the worker of today seems to be free because he is not sold once for all, but piecemeal by the day, the week, the year, and because no one owner sells him to another, but he is forced

to sell himself in this way instead, being the slave of no particular person, but of the whole property-holding class. Friedrich Engels , *The Condition of the Working Class in England* Freedom does not consist in any dreamt-of independence from natural laws , but in the knowledge of these laws , and in the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends. F[ edit ] *The Age of Empty Freedom* It has this great advantage over the Age of Science, that it knows all things without having learned anything; and can pass judgment upon whatever comes before it at once and without hesitation,â€”without needing any preliminary evidence: The society that puts freedom before equality will end up with a great measure of both. He will ask rather "What can I and my compatriots do through government" to help us discharge our individual responsibilities, to achieve our several goals and purposes, and above all, to protect our freedom? And he will accompany this question with another: How can we keep the government we create from becoming a Frankenstein that will destroy the very freedom we establish it to protect? Freedom is a rare and delicate plant. Our minds tell us, and history confirms, that the great threat to freedom is the concentration of power. Government is necessary to preserve our freedom, it is an instrument through which we can exercise our freedom; yet by concentrating power in political hands, it is also a threat to freedom. Even though the men who wield this power initially be of good will and even though they be not corrupted by the power they exercise, the power will both attract and form men of a different stamp. Milton Friedman , *Capitalism and Freedom* , Introduction Political freedom means the absence of coercion of a man by his fellow men. The fundamental threat to freedom is power to coerce, be it in the hands of a monarch, a dictator, an oligarchy, or a momentary majority. The preservation of freedom requires the elimination of such concentration of power to the fullest possible extent and the dispersal and distribution of whatever power cannot be eliminated â€” a system of checks and balances. Milton Friedman , *Capitalism and Freedom* , Ch. None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe , Bk. *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*, Hamburger Ausgabe, Bd. To evolve we must be free, and we cannot have freedom if we are not rebels, because no tyrant whatsoever has respected passive people. Friedrich Hayek , *Economic Freedom and Representative Government* A society that does not recognise that each individual has values of his own which he is entitled to follow can have no respect for the dignity of the individual and cannot really know freedom. Friedrich Hayek , as quoted in *The Market*: Friedrich Hayek , *The Constitution of Liberty* The case for individual freedom rests chiefly on the recognition of the inevitable and universal ignorance of all of us concerning a great many of the factors on which the achievement of our ends and welfare depend. Friedrich Hayek , *The Constitution of Liberty* , p. Or you can have freedom. Heinlein , *Time Enough for Love* The opposite of freedom is not determinism, but hardness of heart. Freedom presupposes openness of heart, of mind, of eye and ear. Those in whom viciousness becomes second-nature, those in whom brutality is linked with haughtiness, forfeit their ability and therefore their right to receive that gift. Hardening of the heart is the suspension of freedom. The desire for freedom is an attribute of a "have" type of self. Eric Hoffer , *Working and Thinking on the Waterfront*: June May , Journal entry 28 March Freedom gives us a chance to realize our human and individual uniqueness. June May , Journal entry 28 March Those who lack the capacity to achieve much in an atmosphere of freedom will clamor for power. Freedom cannot be bestowed â€” it must be achieved. Elbert Hubbard , in his essay on Booker T. Washington in *Little Journeys For* , p. Roosevelt later used this line on the occasion of the 74th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation: I[ edit ] The most effective way of gaining our freedom is not through violence. Cited in *The British Empire*, ed. Oxford University Press , , P. Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free. Jesus of Nazareth as quoted in John 8: Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

### Chapter 8 : First Amendment to the United States Constitution - Wikipedia

*Join the Fight for Freedom. Government goes to those who show up. FreedomWorks makes it easy to hold your elected officials accountable in our fully interactive Action Center.*

There is a blood lust about Barack Obama as this blog has noted. When he killed that blow fly his eyes dilate to shining lumps of coal size, take on a wild frenzied look. He has that look anytime he is around dead Soldiers or living Cadets at West Point. Obama slaughtered over Americans in Afnamistan and Fort Hood, deliberately, as a dithering foreign policy which is on a time table equal to the current Obamacare sham time table that does not move by hook and crook, but on some pagan scale of the stars as the eminent events of the Winter Solstice is the death of American Soldiers and the rationed death of the American Citizen. What I am laying the basis for is what has been noted previously in this blog. Either Barack Hussein Obama is clinically insane destroying even his own party or Barack Hussein Obama is linked to a new order which he will publish or bring to life again which is protecting him now, and will protect and promote all those zealot Democrats falling on their swords as martyrs now. Is the term Obama jihad really that far from the mentality which suicide bombers are implementing for Islam? I have a quote from a Chinese finance minister and it is noteworthy. Recall how Germany and China both scolded Obama in public in re creating these financial bubbles in auto and now again in toxic home buying to give a false sense the US economy was actually recovering. With all this information known, and with China being stuck with 2 trillion dollars in debt, review the statement by the Chicoms. Most of our foreign reserves are in U. Siwei is a top Chicom party member. Note he states that the Chinese are locked into US bonds which are very difficult to get out of. Note he is stating the US Dollar is going to reach massive inflation by and the Obama 30 cent dollar is going to fall again hard. That would mean a US Dollar worth around 15 cents on the dollar. Note he is stating that the Chicoms are moving their investments into European and Japanese currency. The word "monetize" has been cropping up, mostly from Jerome Corsi, which basically means the US Obama group is printing money to cover debt it is creating. This is akin to you using your printer to print money to pay your will bills with nothing backing it. People doing this go to prison for counterfeiting and Obama just calls it monetizing. Remember now that Obama has dumped trillions of dollars into the European cartel banks to underwrite this European socialist hegemony or one world order run out of Europe, in exchange for the vassalization of the United States so he can become a sort of Robert Mugabe for life of America. Obama believes he is to be President of the world, as these people promised Bill Clinton the same job to get him to progress this cause, same thing to Tony Blair who just got booted out by the Europeans. This Ponzi Scheme is noted already happening in Europe, so is it such a far reaching scam that Obama created a Ponzi Scheme for Asians and they are just middle men taking a fee in looking like buying American debt, when Obama is repurchasing that massive debt sticking to Americans three times over Rockefeller printing gets a cut, the bond debt is another cut and a Ponzi repurchase is the third time roll over this debt for a triple mortgage Americans are being stuck with to pay this, all off the books. This would be insanity as all things Obama is progressing on if he was loyal to America, but remember he fully stated he mandates to change America by the same revolutionary forces of Saul Alinski and Karl Marx. Barack Hussein Obama is an Obamastein. He is a melding of all of these factions as the Muslim Mafia has degraded to. He is the progenitor the Obamanazi movement coming out of the European elite to rule the world from their order. Americans would never accept a dictator for life, but learn the Joseph principle in Egypt for the Pharaoh in he hoarded all the reserves in 7 years of plenty, buying up things cheap. When the 7 years of famine arrived, the Egyptians eventually to survive after losing their savings, homes, lands and assets were forced to sell even themselves to the state in order to survive. That is what is behind Obamacare in the legal title to each America is being set and if they do not accept it, they will be enemies of the state. Obama, Pelosi and Reid can all be exiles in Albania when this arrives in the implosion the Chicoms spokes of, because they will have the American system destroyed from within and incapable of rising for a generation. So it does not matter if Gov. There are forces for good battling this. It was no accident that someone hacked into the Al Gore global warming fraud emails and outed that huge debt implosion for the western peoples, but it is not

going to stop what Obama is at the forefront of in this phase. I warn the DailyKos types that they are not going to win a thing in this, as Obama is kicking them to the side of this burning bus, as this is like an Apollo moon shot, in Democrats start out with a full Saturn V rocket, but along the way the Democrats keep being tossed over as extra weight, abandoned in space, abandoned on the moon, and just like the great German Nazi physicist designed the NASA program, the only thing which returns as the space rocket is the man Someone had better start checking out the real debt reserves in US bonds being held by China and Japan in the coming year, as there is no way China or Japan are going to be suckered into holding trillions in debt again which will be worth just billions and then millions. The old order is renewing and the deciding factor in freedom in these United States is being degraded and sabotaged of slave status. That is the fact and when the facts start surfacing, one has to start looking at this not as Obama policy for America, but Obama policy against America

### Chapter 9 : Press Freedom Is Declining in the US | Al Jazeera America

*Freedom to Decide on Marriage The 15 th Assembly of the Uniting Church in Australia has agreed to hold two equal and distinct views on marriage to honour the diversity of Christian belief among its members.*

Founding Fathers What is freedom The concept of freedom means different things to different people, depending on the level of freedom that you have in your life. Most people, when they think of the definition of freedom, they think of Liberty, which includes freedom of speech. Most rational people would agree that this is the way that a society should function. American Freedom The American founding fathers felt that this concept was of utmost importance when they were deciding what the United States Of America would be, and how it would function. This is what sets the U. Apart from all other countries in the world. If you understand what this means, you know that the U. Government is now trying to take control of many of the areas of our life, and taking away our liberty, and our freedom to make our own decisions. The Obama administration is not taking their powers from the consent of the governed, they are telling us that we are not smart enough to debate the issues of health care, global warming, etc. They are telling us that they know better than we do, what is best for us. They want to take away your freedom to do what what you want. Many think it would be beneficial if the earth was a few degrees warmer. The health care issue should be debated, we should fix the problems with the health care system, we should not start over from scratch. Regardless of what many people think, much of the success of the rest of the world is tied to the success of America. America helped defeat the enemy in two world wars, and continue to help protect most of Europe to this day. We helped rebuild Europe and Asia after world war 2. The American people on their own give hundreds of millions of dollars in charity, outside of the government to help people anywhere it is needed, just because we can and want to. The buying power of the American people, because we are prosperous, greatly helps the rest of the world from our consumption. We buy enough products produced in other parts of the world that the loss of that buying power, would greatly effect the economy of all of those places. Freedom quote Freedom prospers when religion is vibrant and the rule of law under God is acknowledged. Ronald Reagan Why we need Freedom If they take away our opportunity to be successful and to have extra money to give to people who need help, that will have a huge effect on the needy people around the world. If you look at where government aid and charity donations come from, you will see that nothing comes from China, Russia, or any other communist governments, this is the result of government control. The wealth and prosperity that comes with the freedom to be the best we can be, and to be as wealthy as we can, by being able to succeed to our fullest potential, that is what makes it all work. It does appear that several European governments are moving more to a capitalistic form of governing while we are trying to move away from it. America moving to a more socialist form of government will hurt the whole world economy, and will damage the system that has created the most prosperous and freest nation ever. That is not a good thing. It also will take away from the basic rights of all Americans, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The need to preserve freedom This is not a rant, I am truly worried about our great country. I am proud to be an American, and happy that we can help the less fortunate throughout the world. It is something that Americans have always done, from the very beginning. The Mayflower compact was the first real government document of America. It was written by the people of the Mayflower. When the pilgrims came to America, they set up a system of government that was like a commune. Everyone got a piece of land. They would all farm their land, raise animals, make shoes, etc. Everyone would then split up what the community had evenly. They kept this system for only 2 years. The problem they found was, if one family grew say bushels of grain, and another grew 50, they would each get There was no incentive to be better. After the 2 years, they changed and allowed people to grow what they could, and produce what they could, then trade for what they need. They produced much much more, because they could trade for extra things that they wanted by being better and growing more, or by producing more products that were worth trading for such as milk, meat, or shoes, or whatever. That was the start of capitalism. If someone was having a hard time, everyone would help them if they needed it. They did it because it worked. The incentive to be more successful and create something that people want and need, will

make you a success and create wealth, this is the real American dream. Is capitalism better than socialism? The next generation will not have freedom in the way the founding fathers wanted us to have freedom. They really knew what they were talking about.