

Statists in Libertarian Eagle Feathers, Part 1

By: Matt K.

July 2nd, 2015

Browsing through my Facebook feed, I found the group called *The Liberty Eagle*, and to gauge how much these people proclaim to love liberty through their pictures section I found 22 examples of Statist beliefs prevalent throughout, with undoubtedly more to follow in the future. The point of this article is to call out their contradictory beliefs in Statism, and to welcome any interested people into joining Shane and myself here at Liberty Under Attack as an alternative that's consistent in believing in liberty. Before proceeding into the introduction, I think defining terminology on the key words is a logical necessity. First, [liberty is defined](#) as 'freedom from arbitrary or despotic government or control; freedom from control, interference, obligation, restriction, hampering conditions, etc.; power or right of doing, thinking, speaking, etc., according to choice.' Secondly, the [definition of Statism](#) is 'the principle or policy of concentrating extensive economic, political, and related controls in the state at the cost of individual liberty.' Anyone curious to see the Mission statement of *The Liberty Eagle*, it's available at their ['About'](#) page on Facebook.



Statist Vultures are LINOs (Libertarians In Name Only)

A [libertarian](#) is any individual or group of people that 'advocates maximizing individual rights and minimizing the role of the state.' While I've seen no explicit evidence that *The Liberty Eagle* proclaims to be libertarian, I can't help but rely upon their implicit claims of the posted pictures themselves that present a faux-libertarian perspective that's actually goal is to curry the State in their favor, instead of abolishing it altogether as consistent with liberating individual natural rights to their fullest extent. As an anarchist, that's my objective, short of just watching it crumble under its own weight. Because this group in particular seeks to switch demographics to their favor, and to empower the GOP, clearly

they've no political or anti-political desires to seriously advocate for the liberties of everybody in The States, much less throughout the world. They are power thirsting hypocrites that stomp their feet childishly because the Democrats have held the reigns since 08'. As far as I'm concerned, their all wrong. No political party can EVER increase your liberties, because they seek government as the answer to the woes of the voting charade. These are politically willful pawns, who like playing 'choose your slave-owner' every several years.



As a starting point, I believe it's appropriate to get the oral arguments out of the way first. Then I will focus on presenting my factual case to dismantle the Statist adherence of *The Liberty Eagle*.

#1 - "*The ONLY colors that should be on the White House.*"

I guess in response to the [recent Supreme Court decision on marriage](#), this is TLE's (henceforth called 'STV' for Statist Vultures) response to the White House's rainbow display. The origins of the case seem to trace back towards [Baker v. Nelson \(1971\)](#) which held that, quote: "*The denial of marriage licenses to same-sex couples does not violate provisions of the United States Constitution.*" First and foremost, 'should' implies a rather authoritarian command. This is contradictory to the supposed "*fight for liberty*" that STV claims. If you care for liberty alone, it doesn't matter what colors are displayed on a building. If these people are so upset, they could at least be consistent in selecting the [Supreme Court building](#) instead of the White House in accurately conveying their grievances on who within the Federal government made the decision.

#2 - "*I'm with Bibi.*"

Supporting a separate head of State from a foreign country doesn't make STV's better than those who are unquestionably subservient to whoever the hell is in the office and carries the responsibilities of the U.S. Presidency. There's nothing to indicate that Benjamin Netanyahu is a virtuous individual who's compassionate towards anyone, including Israelis themselves, who don't bow down to the will of the State. If anything, there's plentiful evidence to the contrary. Israelis protested in 2011 against the tyrannical, bureaucratic, [nature of Netanyahu's government](#). Supporting a Theocratic state is against the '*Founding Fathers*' that Republicans seem to adore so much.

Take a tip from [Washington's farewell address](#), you hypocritical vultures: "*Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most*

*baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. **Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests. The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop. Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none; or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government. the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor or caprice? **It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world;** so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them. Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to **temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.** Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest."***

By being "*with Bibi*", you've betrayed the liberties of your fellow Americans in exchange for a foreign ruler to subjugate and control America's political climate to your temporary advantage. Despicable. Making a popularity contest in standing ovations between the residing [U.S. President \(Obama\) and a foreign leader \(Netanyahu\)](#) is offense to the spirit of "*fighting for liberty.*" If anything, it's an infringement upon others who don't share your "*with Bibi*" cult worship.

In the words of [Tony Karon](#), from a 2009 article: "*If Israel's own messianic, apocalyptic cult leader is to be prevented from unleashing a catastrophe, the U.S. will have to effectively restrain him. Given the expectations he has created in his own public, doing so publicly may actually help Netanyahu behave more rationally.*"

As an anarchist, I could honestly give a damned less for either Netanyahu, Obama, or any proposed GOP "*leader.*" They all adhere to [the religion of the State](#). Refusal to believe in any would-be "*authority*" would be a breath of fresh air in STV's proclaimed purpose of "*fighting for liberty.*" At least that would hold some damned integrity.



Even Israelis aren't with Bibi.

#3 - "Our Founding Fathers paid the ultimate price for our freedom. HELP US DEFEND IT."

Aside from the [contradictory nonsense](#) regarding something "free" having a "price" (what a conundrum!), let's examine [who among the 'Founding Fathers'](#) had military experience and "paid the price for freedom" (death? physical injury?). Before starting, I'd also like to recommend the blog *The Wise Sloth*, especially [chapter 7: Critiques of the U.S. Military](#) from a Veteran. It may enlighten a few spirits from STV.

Signers of the [Continental Association \(1774\)](#):

- Peyton Randolph - President of Continental Congress, lawyer.
- Nathaniel Folsom - Merchant, Mj. Gn. of New Hampshire militia. Folsom didn't die in service, he did however become a judge.
- John Sullivan - Mj. Gn. of Continental Army, elected Governor of New Hampshire. Sullivan didn't die in service.
- John Adams - Head of the Board of War after nominating George Washington commander-in-chief, was an ambassador towards European states. Didn't die in service, became 2nd President of U.S.
- Samuel Adams - Tax collector in Boston, governor of Massachusetts, didn't die from military service.
- Thomas Cushing III - Lawyer and merchant, Lt Governor of Massachusetts. No death from military service.
- Robert Treat Paine - Lawyer. No death from military service.
- Stephen Hopkins - Governor of Rhode Island, Chief Justice, slave owner. No death from military service.
- Samuel Ward - Governor of Rhode Island, Chief Justice, no military service or death thereof.
- Silas Deane - Merchant, diplomat to Europe, no military service.
- Eliphalet Dyer - Chief Justice of Connecticut. No military service.
- Roger Sherman - Mayor of New Haven, Senator, lawyer. No military service.
- John Alsop - Merchant, Committee of Sixty member, no death from military service.
- Simon Boerum - Representative of New York in Continental Congress, no military service.
- James Duane - Lawyer, Committee of Sixty member, judge of New York, member of Federalist Party. No military service.
- William Floyd - Member of Democratic-Republican party, no military service.
- John Jay - Governor of New York, Chief Justice, Sec. of foreign affairs, slave owner. No military service.

- Philip Livingston - Merchant, Committee of Sixty member, no military service.
- Isaac Low - Merchant, Committee of Sixty member, no military service.
- Henry Wisner - Representative of New York in Continental Congress, no military service.
- Stephen Crane - Politician from New Jersey, Essex County sheriff, bayoneted by British troops HOWEVER didn't have military service.
- John De Hart - Lawyer, Mayor, no military service.
- James Kinsey - Lawyer, Chief Justice, no military service.
- William Livingston - Governor of New Jersey, no military service.
- Richard Smith - Lawyer, Treasurer, no military service.
- Edward Biddle - Lawyer, soldier but didn't die in service.
- John Dickinson - Presidents of Delaware and Pennsylvania, no military service.
- Joseph Galloway - Congressman, didn't die in loyalist service to the British.
- Charles Humphreys - Congressman, no military service.
- Thomas Mifflin - Congressman, Governor of Pennsylvania. Didn't die in service of the Continental Army.
- John Morton - Appointed Justice in Pennsylvania, chairman for Articles of Confederation. No military service.
- George Ross - Representative of Pennsylvania. No military service.
- Thomas McKean - Lawyer, Chief Justice, Governor, no military service.
- George Read - Lawyer, Congressman, Chief Justice, no military service.
- Caesar Rodney - Lawyer, Congressman, slave owner, no military service.
- Samuel Chase - Supreme Court Justice, member of Federalist Party, no military service.
- Thomas Johnson - Governor, Supreme Court Justice, no military service.
- William Paca - Maryland Governor, no military service.
- Matthew Tilghman - Chairman of committee of safety, no military service.
- Richard Bland - Justice in George County, slave owner, committee of safety member, no military service.
- Benjamin Harrison - Merchant, Governor of Virginia, no military service.
- Patrick Henry - Governor of Virginia, lawyer, no military service.
- Richard Henry Lee - Senator of Virginia, Congressional President, no military service.
- Edmund Pendleton - Lawyer, Chief Justice, no military service.
- ****George Washing - Slave owner, military career, Commander-in-chief, President, died on his plantation.****
- Richard Caswell - Governor of North Carolina, Freemason, lawyer, no military service.
- Joseph Hewes - Sec. of the navy, Freemason, no military service.
- William Hooper - Lawyer, member of Federalist Party, physician, no military service.
- ****Christopher Gadsden - Merchant, founder of Sons of Liberty, didn't die in military service.****
- Thomas Lynch - Member of Continental Congress.
- Henry Middleton - President of Continental Congress.
- Edward Rutledge - Slave owner, Governor of South Carolina, no military service.
- John Rutledge - Chief Justice, Governor of South Carolina, no military service.

Signers of the Declaration of Independence (1776):

- Josiah Bartlett - Physician, Governor of New Hampshire, no military service.

- Carter Braxton - Merchant, Committee of safety member, no military service.
- Charles Carroll III - Maryland Senator, member of Federalist Party, slave owner, no military service.
- Abraham Clark - New Jersey Congressman, no military service.
- George Clymer - Committee of safety member, no military service.
- William Ellery - Chief Justice, lawyer, member of Sons of Liberty, no military service.
- Benjamin Franklin - Postmaster general, Minister to France, Minister to Sweden, Governor of Pennsylvania, no military service.
- Elbridge Thomas Gerry - Governor, Vice President, no military service.
- Button Gwinnett - Congressman, Governor, no military service.
- Lyman Hall - Governor, physician, clergyman, no military service.
- ****John Hancock - Merchant, Governor, President of Continental Congress, no death in military activity.****
- John Hart - Committee of safety member, Congressman, no military service.
- Thomas Heyward, Jr. - Congressman, no military service.
- Francis Hopkinson - New Jersey Congressman, no military service.
- Samuel Huntington - President of Congress, Governor, no military service.
- Thomas Jefferson - President, lawyer, Virginia Governor, Minister to France, Sec. of State, no military service.
- Francis Lightfoot Lee - Senator, no military service.
- Francies Lewis - Merchant, Committee of Sixty member, no military service.
- Thomas Lynch, Jr. - South Carolina representative, no military service.
- Arthur Middleton - Council of Safety member, no military service.
- Lewis Morris - Congressman, Senator, no military service.
- Robert Morris, Jr. - Merchant, Superintendent of Finance, Senator, Federalist Party member, no military service.
- John Morton - Congressman, no military service.
- ****Thomas Nelson, Jr. - Gen. of Virginia militia, didn't die in military service.****
- John Penn - Lawyer, no military service.
- Benjamin Rush - Physician, Sons of Liberty member, University professor, didn't die in revolutionary period.
- James Smith - Lawyer, Congressman, no military service.
- Richard Stockton - Lawyer, Chief Justice, no military service.
- Thomas Stone - Lawyer, President of Congress, no military service.
- George Taylor - Congressman, Supreme councilman, no military service.
- Charles Thomson - Sec. of Continental Congress, no military service.
- Matthew Thornton - Congressman, Committee of safety member, no military service.
- George Walton - Governor, Senator, no military service.
- William Whipple, Jr. - Committee of safety member, judge, Congressman, no military service.
- William Williams - Merchant, Congressman to replace Wolcott, no military service.
- James Wilson - Supreme Court Justice, Congressman, no military service.
- John Knox Witherspoon - Clergyman, University professor, no military service.
- Oliver Wolcott - Governor, Federalist Party member, no military service.
- George Wythe - Lawyer, judge, law professor, no military service.

Signers of the Articles of Confederation (1777):

- ****Henry Laurens - Merchant, Congressional President, slave owner, Lt. Col. didn't die in service.****
- John Wentworth, Jr. - Lawyer, Congressman, no military service.
- Francis Dana - Lawyer, Chief Justice, Ambassador to Russia, no military service.
- James Lovell - Congressman, no military service.
- Samuel Holten - Congressman, no military service.
- Henry Marchant - Lawyer, judge, Attorney General, no military service.
- John Collins - Governor, no military service.
- Titus Hosmer - Congressman, no military service.
- Andrew Adams - Chief Justice, no military service.
- William Duer - Lawyer, Congressman, no military service.
- Gouverneur Morris - Senator, Federalist Party member, no military service.
- Nathaniel Scudder - Physician, Congressman, no military service.
- Daniel Roberdeau - Merchant, Congressman, no military service.
- Jonathan Bayard Smith - Merchant, Congressman, no military service.
- William Clingan - Congressman, no military service.
- ****Joseph Reed - Lawyer, Congressman, didn't die in military service.****
- John Dickinson - Congressman, no military service.
- Nicholas Van Dyke - Lawyer, no military service.
- John Hanson - Merchant, President of Congress, no military service.
- Daniel Carroll - Congressman, no military service.
- ****John Banister - Lawyer, Congressman, Lt. Col. of Virginia militia. Despite military service, didn't die during it.****
- Thomas Adams - Committee of safety member, no military service.
- John Harvie - Lawyer, Congressman, no military service.
- ****Cornelius Harnett - Merchant, Congressman, Sons of Liberty chairman, died of health in British prison.****
- John Williams - Congressman, no military service.
- William Henry Drayton - Lawyer, Congressman, committee of safety member, no military service.
- John Matthews - Lawyer, Congressman, Governor, no military service.
- Richard Hutson - Lawyer, Congressman, no military service.
- Thomas Heyward, Jr. - South Carolina representative, judge, no military service.
- John Walton - Congressman, Governor, no military service.
- Edward Telfair - Governor, Congress, committee of safety member, no military service.
- Edward Langworthy - Congress, committee of safety member, no military service.

Delegates to the 1787 Constitutional Convention:

- Abraham Baldwin - Senator, lawyer, no military service.
- Richard Bassett - Lawyer, Senator, Chief Justice, Governor, no military service.

- Gunning Bedford, Jr. - Lawyer, Congressman, no military service.
- John Blair, Jr. - Associate Justice, Freemason, no military service.
- William Blount - Congressman, Senator, land speculator, no military service.
- David Brearley - Supreme Court Justice, New Jersey militia, no military service.
- Jacob Broom - Businessman, no military service.
- ****Pierce Butler - South Carolina militia, Congressman, Senator, didn't die in service.****
- Daniel Carroll - Senator, no military service.
- Jonathan Dayton - Senator, no military service.
- William Few Jr - Senator, no military service.
- ****Thomas Fitzsimons - Merchant, Congressman, military service but didn't die in it.****
- Nicholas Gilman, Jr. - Merchant, treasurer, didn't die in Continental Army.
- Nathaniel Gorham - Merchant, President of Congress.
- ****Alexander Hamilton - Congress, Sec. of Treasury, Continental Army, didn't die in service.****
- Jared Ingersoll - Lawyer, no military service.
- ****William Jackson - Merchant, Lawyer, lieutenant of South Carolina regiment, didn't die in service.****
- Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer - Justice, no military service.
- William Samuel Johnson - Senator, no military service.
- Rufus King - Lawyer, Minister to Great Britain, Senator, no military service.
- John Langdon - Governor, Senator, no military service.
- James Madison, Jr. - President, Congressman, Sec. of State, no military service.
- James McHenry - Sec. of War, no military service.
- William Paterson - Senator, Governor, Justice, no military service.
- Charles Pinckney - Governor, Minister to Spain, Senator, Lawyer, no military service.
- ****Charles Cotesworth "C. C." Pinckney - Lawyer, Minister to France, slave owner, didn't die in Revolutionary war.****
- Richard Dobbs Spaight - Governor, no military service.
- ****Hugh Williamson - Physician, didn't die in military service.****
- Delegates who left the Convention without signing: George Wythe.
- Convention delegates who refused to sign: Elbridge Gerry.

Out of all the Founding Fathers listed above, and their professional careers, 14 come the closest to "paying the price for freedom" (dying in military service), but NONE qualify. To make matters worse, the STV's [endorse Washington's enforcement of the "whiskey tax"](#), nothing about which has to do ANYTHING with "fighting for liberty." If anything, the 'Founders' can be credited with consolidating the violent monopoly of the State, and that's nothing to be proud of.

In the words of [Samuel Konkin](#):

"When most of humanity settled into peaceful farming communities, with perhaps larger marketplaces (remember the original agora of Greece) in towns, some people discovered a means of surviving parasitically from the productivity of others. They formed robber bands and attacked towns and settlements, plundering, raping, and murdering. Probably the original barbarian hordes were hunters who took to hunting man when their game died out rather than taking to farming, trading, or productive manufacture. These roving groups were a small minority (or their victims would have died out and they as well) but large as compared to a

single town or village. Somewhere along the way, one of them discovered that they could allow the peasants to live with enough to survive on and come back at the next harvest for another raid. Then these raiders had another idea: they would stay in the same towns, steal lightly but regularly, murder enough to keep the peasants and merchants in line, and live well. Other areas, seeing these petty kingdoms arise, decided to submit themselves to their own home-grown warlords so that they would not fall prey to foreign warriors. (The Book of Samuel in the Old Testament describes the anarchist prophet Samuel trying to convince the Israelites that they didn't really want a king but finally giving in to them.) Parasites must remain a minority or kill their hosts. So they discovered religion (and later ideology) as a means to intimidate peasants and win the all-important sanction of the victim (an apt phrase of Ayn Rand's). Brutal thugs became "kings by divine right" and some very powerful statists called Emperors, Pharaohs, or Tsars were said to be divine, the unstoppable choice of gods. And so these barbarian raiders institutionalized plunder (taxation), murder (execution and warfare), and even rape (droit de seigneur, for example). They took control of roads to plunder the caravans (tolls, tariffs), they suppressed all rival criminal gangs with their own (police), and established their own churches, schools, judges, and even philosophers, minstrels, and artists to work in their royal courts. Thus was born the State."

[**] Even the Founding Fathers who served in the Continental military didn't die for anybody's freedom while in the service, the rest were aristocratic draft dodgers. No "price" (life taken during an armed conflict) was paid by the 'Founders' for the cause of freedom, that's a flat out lie.

#4 - "The symbol of American liberty and freedom is under attack. Stand up and defend the flag."

The flag represents the State, NOT freedom. To re-iterate [a point from Shane](#): "If you WORSHIP THE FLAG OF THE STATE, you are WORSHIPING THE STATE." Nobody who consistently cares to "fight for liberty", as STV claims to do, would hold on so tightly to the chains that bind them and just to reassure themselves of their nonexistent liberty, kiss the slave master who bound them in the first place. A people born into a coercive system of slavery have no reason to defend a piece of fabric that represents endangerment to everybody's liberties. For people who adore a flag more than their own liberties, it's almost appropriate that the Federal government enacted the '[Flag Protection Act](#)' (U.S. code: 18 U.S.C. ch. 33 §§ 700-713, Public law: 90-381). Failure to properly adhere to a ceremonious object of the state in a "proper manner" is faced with [varying degrees of penalties](#) upon the liberties of anyone who dares EXERCISE FREEDOM to 'desecrate' the poor not-so-defenseless fabric. Since State laws also adhere to the Federal dictates regarding the flag, it seems freedom is certainly under attack, but not as STV would see it. While Supreme Court decisions should be held with questionable regard as well, being declarations from Statist institutions, it had ruled in Texas v. Johnson (1989) and U.S. v. Eichman (1990) that flag burning is constitutionally protected from federal, state, or municipal prohibition as an act of 'symbolic speech.' It's also quite hypocritical that students throughout the country are expected to say the Pledge of Allegiance in an [OBLIGATORY or MANDATED fashion](#). Freedom of choice would presume the natural right to REFUSE being forced to say anything, including a ridiculous pledge to a Statist flag. It's HYPOCRITICAL to claim you support "liberty for all" (words of the pledge), except when there are those who actually exercise the liberty that you fawn over.

Either you folks over at STV believe in the State, or liberty, but you CANNOT logically claim to be "fighting for liberty" while holding Statist beliefs. You are flat out liars for that one axiom alone. At the end of this article, I think it should be fair to point out the other Statist infringements upon liberty that

The Liberty Eagle has committed. It would make a superb concluding point.

#5 - "As an American, you were born free. You have the Constitutional right to free speech. So, protect it!"

First, there is no such thing as 'Constitutional rights'; all that any Constitution or Bill of Rights can do is simply recognize your preexisting natural liberty.

Secondly, free speech is specifically intended to protect those ideas that would be considered most repugnant to the sensibilities of the people commonly.

Third, native-born citizenship is not prima facie evidence of liberty; consider the reciprocal obligations the federal judiciary mentioned at least one of their court cases where there is a duty of allegiance in exchange for a duty of protection.

In [Luria v. United States](#), it's the "opinion of the Court" that, quote: "**Citizenship is membership in a political society, and implies a duty of allegiance on the part of the member and a duty of protection on the part of the society. These are reciprocal obligations, one being a compensation for the other. Under our Constitution, a naturalized citizen stands on an equal footing with the native citizen in all respects, save that of eligibility to the Presidency. *Minor v. Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162, 165, 22 L. ed. 627; *Elk v. Wilkins*, 112 U.S. 94, 101, 28 L. ed. 643, 645, 5 Sup. Ct. Rep. 41; *Osborn v. Bank of United States*, 9 Wheat. 738, 827, 6 L. ed. 204, 225. Turning to the naturalization laws preceding the act of 1906, being those under which Luria obtained his certificate, we find that they required, first, that the alien, after coming to this country, should declare on oath, before a court or its clerk, that it was bona fide his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign sovereignty; second, that at least two years should elapse between the making of that declaration and his application for admission to citizenship; third, that as a condition to his admission the court should be satisfied, through the testimony of citizens, that he had resided within the United States five years at least, and that during that time he had behaved as a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well-disposed to the good order and happiness of the same; and, fourth, that at the time of his admission he should declare on oath that he would support the Constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounced and abjured all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign sovereignty. These requirements plainly contemplated that the applicant, if admitted, should be a citizen in fact as well as in name, -that he should assume and bear the obligations and duties of that status as well as enjoy its rights and privileges. In other words, it was contemplated that his admission should be mutually beneficial to the government and himself, the proof in respect of his established residence, moral character, and attachment to the principles of the Constitution being exacted because of what they promised for the future, rather than for what they told of the past.**" For those with difficulty in legal parlance, the Court is saying Luria (and other citizens, naturalized or 'foreign') have PRIVILEGES and conditions for their citizenship: Declaring an oath for admission, renounce allegiance to any foreign sovereignties, five years of "proven good character", and declaring an oath to support the U.S. Constitution. Born free? You are conditioned into slavery from cradle to grave!

#6 - "I don't see a single flaw in the Constitution. All I see are failures to obey the Constitution."-Bill Whittle.

My '[Anarchist Odyssey of the Federalist Papers](#)' series has plenty reservations about the Statist nature of the Constitution and the Federalists themselves. It must be pointed out that even if the Constitution was consistently obeyed, that doesn't mean it is infallible. The greatest flaw on part of the STV is that they adhere to 'Constitutional'-based Statism, instead of focusing solely on defending liberty, which cannot be stopped at a piece of parchment. If you are truly vigilant to the cause of freedom for yourselves and others, you DO NOT express consent to anything that infringes upon that freedom. By being a bunch of minarchist daydreamers, instead of realists regarding the dangers of government, even a 'Constitutionally' enforced one, they don't care for defending or fighting for anybody's liberties in any serious manner.

Whittle and his supporters at STV can praise the Constitution all they want, however it won't make Americans any more free.

#7 - "Keep Christ in Christmas."

[I've already devoted an article](#) explaining why I dislike Statist holidays. Being the anarchist I am, I've no problem if people wish to have their 'freedom of religion.' Any violations of self-ownership and the non-aggression principle deserve to be called out for what they are. I think the best way to tackle this subject is by reading the words of somebody *The Liberty Eagle* should have no problems with;

Thomas Jefferson from the [Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom](#): *"An Act for establishing religious Freedom. Whereas, Almighty God hath created the mind free; That all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burthens, or by civil incapacitations tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and therefore are a departure from the plan of the holy author of our religion, who being Lord, both of body and mind yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do, That the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who, being themselves but fallible and uninspired men have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time; That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions, which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical; That even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor, whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the Ministry those temporary rewards, which, proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labors for the instruction of mankind; That our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions any more than our opinions in physics or geometry, That therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence, by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages, to which, in common with his fellow citizens, he has a natural right, That it tends only to corrupt the principles of that very Religion it is meant to encourage, by bribing with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments those who will externally profess and conform to it; That though indeed, these are criminal who do not withstand such temptation, yet neither are those innocent who lay the bait in their way; That to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy which at once destroys all religious liberty because he being of course judge of that tendency will make*

his opinions the rule of judgment and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; That it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government, for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; And finally, that Truth is great, and will prevail if left to herself, that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons free argument and debate, errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them: Be it enacted by General Assembly that **no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of Religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.** And though we well know that this Assembly elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of Legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding Assemblies constituted with powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act irrevocable would be of no effect in law; yet we are free to declare, and do declare that the rights hereby asserted, are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right."

A religious individual or group doesn't have the "right" to forcibly impose their beliefs on others, especially through The State itself. This is against the very liberties that STV proclaims to "defend."

According to [Article 11 of the Treaty of Tripoli](#), quote: "As **the Government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion**; as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion, or tranquility, of Mussulmen [Muslims]; and as the said States never entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mahometan [Muslim] nation, it is declared by the parties that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries."

Lastly, it should be noted that a [good many of the Founders were Deists](#). While they may have held onto a "Christmas tradition" of sorts, that doesn't mean that every other American is obligated to follow their example in following that specific holiday, in a specific religious adherence, or to use the State to "keep Christ" around, whatever the bloody hell that's supposed to mean. If you want to worship Jesus Christ on Christmas, that's fine, just don't expect others "by law" or through the gun of the State at their backs, to follow your example. This is Statism I fear from the "Keep Christ in Christmas" crowd. Pushing Theocratic tendencies is contrary to defend liberty, the supposed 'mission' of *The Liberty Eagle*. Jefferson, Paine, Madison, Washington and Franklin are all recognized as Deists. If you care for "separation of Church and State", than imposing the will of the Church upon the rest of the country via the State is a very Theocratic Statist action.

#8 - "If you're anti police, don't follow us!"

If you believe in defending liberty, making authoritarian dictates about who should and shouldn't follow your Facebook group shows just how Statist 'TheLibertyEagle' really is. It's quite Orwellian for people that happily subdue themselves as slaves to the modern day police state falsely equivocate it to living freely, much less defending liberty itself.

[1984 Excerpt](#): "He tried with a little more success than before to summon up the image of O'Brien. 'We shall meet in the place where there is no darkness,' O'Brien had said to him. He knew what it meant, or

thought he knew. The place where there is no darkness was the imagined future, which one would never see, but which, by foreknowledge, one could mystically share in. But with the voice from the telescreen nagging at his ears he could not follow the train of thought further. He put a cigarette in his mouth. Half the tobacco promptly fell out on to his tongue, a bitter dust which was difficult to spit out again. The face of Big Brother swam into his mind, displacing that of O'Brien. Just as he had done a few days earlier, he slid a coin out of his pocket and looked at it. The face gazed up at him, heavy, calm, protecting: but what kind of smile was hidden beneath the dark moustache? Like a leaden knell the words came back at him: WAR IS PEACE, FREEDOM IS SLAVERY, IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH." (Pages 130-131).

Since STV is so vigorous about Constitutionalism, perhaps they should read Roger Roots' ['Are Cops Constitutional?'](#)

Either you defend liberty, or you defend the State in its infringements upon the liberties of others. So far, *The Liberty Eagle* has brazenly displayed Statist beliefs.

For more on the police state, check out the [6/14/15 edition of LUA radio](#) for damning evidence that we live in a police state and that ISN'T a good thing for our liberties.

#9 - "To live under the American Constitution is the greatest political privilege that was ever accorded to the human race." -Calvin Coolidge.

Liberty, by definition, is NOT defined by Constitutionalism or political privileges. Furthermore, all of humanity was NOT contracted into the U.S. Constitution. If you believe in political privilege and a social contract that's null and void by the violent monopoly of the State, then you are NOT "*defending liberty*" but endangering it. A minarchist State of Constitutionality is no less autocratic than the modern day totalitarian dictatorship America is beholden to, born of that same so-called '*political privilege*' secured in xenophobic nature to '*Americans*' only and the rest of humanity are pulled into the Statist extortion racket that claims to fight "*for freedom*" while endangering it at every damned opportunity. STV really earn their Statist feathers for this atrocious apologetics for Statism.

In the words of Lysander Spooner, it's the [Constitution of no authority](#).

#10 - "A nation is defined by its borders, its culture, and its laws. We have surrendered all three."

["A Proposed Business Model for Defending Texan Ranchers"](#) by Kyle Rearden shows that the border doesn't require government, or State "*laws*" to resolve the Southern border subject. The law is a racket, as Rodell says in "[Woe unto you lawyers!](#)" There has been no '*surrendering*' of Statist laws or the border, and the '*culture war*' nonsense is just an irrelevant meaningless debate for anyone disinterested in a serious defense of liberty. The [Rio Grande](#) is a natural landscape, not an arbitrary political line that requires the failure of the State. The free market opens alternative answers to the Statist border. Rather than surrendering anything, STV has capitulated to Statist ideology over liberty.

Conclusion

In part 2, I will finish dismantling the Statist ideology of *The Liberty Eagle* in 12 final examples.

Things that can be learned from the above ten examples: STV make authoritarian demands, support governments, believe the "*price of freedom*" contradiction in terminology, worship Statist flags, believe in Statist contracts (Constitution), religious/Theocratic control over holidays is Statist, support the police state, believes in arbitrary Statist '*political privilege*' for some human beings over others, lies by a nonexistent surrender of national sovereignty and believes strongly in Statist border enforcement and "*laws*", and they have a cute Fox News ticker on their website -- as if that Washington Consensus rubbish indicates '*defending liberty*'. If this isn't damning objective evidence that *The Liberty Eagle* is inherently Statist, the burden of proof is on them to show otherwise.

For truth and freedom, Matt K
Contact Matt: matt@libertyunderattack.com

