

MOORISH NATIONAL REPUBLIC OF PEACE  
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS  
950 NO HEAD HOLLOW RD  
MUSCLE SHOALS, PROVINCE OF ALABAMA  
Non-Domestic, Without United States  
PHONE: 256-214-9994  
EMAIL: [province.ala.ag1@gmail.com](mailto:province.ala.ag1@gmail.com)  
[www.moorishnationalrepublicofpeace.com](http://www.moorishnationalrepublicofpeace.com)  
"To Uplift Fallen Humanity"



## Consul of Moorish National Republic of Peace, Right to Travel!

Dear De Facto Public Peace Officer,

I am a National of the United States, non-citizen, nonresident, non-subject, native Moorish \_\_\_\_\_, Foreign National exercising my religious freedom to travel the earth without any form of restraint protected by the 1<sup>st</sup> amendment of the U.S. Constitution. My religious duty requires me to convey all vessels to Moorish National republic of Peace and to carry the "Moorish National Republic of Peace" Identifications and plates while operating vessels of Moorish National republic of Peace. This Vessel is considered to be church property- Within constitutional exemption from taxation it means property used principally for religious worship and instruction. Church of the Holy Faith v. State Tax Commission, 39 N.M. 403, 48 P.2d 777, 784

Personal Liberty- The right or power of locomotion; of changing situation, or moving one's person to whatsoever place one's own inclination may direct, without imprisonment or restraint, unless by due course of law. Civil rights cases, 109 U.S. 3, 3 S. Ct. 42, 27 L.Ed. 835.

If you are receiving this documentation, then you are in violation of the First Amendment of the United States constitution by using statutes and codes of the State to prohibit the free exercise of religion. Also, in violations of Amendment 5 of the U.S. Constitution by depriving me of my personal, natural, and religious liberty.

Can you prove there is an injured party for your emergency stop? Can you prove I had willful intent to disobey a statute while fully exercising my religious liberty protected by the U.S. Constitution? Can you prove I have violated a Article of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Empire of Morocco and the United

States while I am fully exercising Article 4 of the Treaty protected by article 6 of the U.S. Constitution, as all treaties are the Supreme law of the land?

If you choose to take any “church property” belonging to the People of Moorish National Republic of Peace without due process of law, then you will be unlawfully operating your official capacity and lose all immunities of the constitutions. A high prerogative writ of Quo warranto will be issued from the Consul of Moorish National Republic of Peace against you and the Municipality you work for. I request your Bond number and proof of identification.

“public officials are not immune from suit when they transcend their lawful authority by invading Rights” \_Alecio vs. Woodward, 406 F2d 137t

**“The people, or sovereign are not bound by *general words in statutes*, restrictive of prerogative right, title or interest, unless expressly named. Acts of limitation do not bind the King or the people. The people have been ceded all the rights of the King, the former sovereign ... It is a maxim of the common law, that when an act is made for the common good and to prevent injury, the King shall be bound, though not named, but when a statute is general and prerogative right would be divested or taken from the King (or the People) he shall not be bound.” -- *The People v. Herkimer*, 4 Cowen (NY) 345, 348 (1825): "In the United States, sovereignty resides in people." --*Perry v. U.S.* (**294 US 330**). "A Sovereign is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal Right as against the authority that makes the law on which the Right depends." --*Kawananakoa v. Polyblank*, 205 U.S. 349, 353, 27 S. Ct. 526, 527, 51 L. Ed. 834 (1907).**

**Despite Actions Of Police And Local Courts, Higher Courts Have Ruled That American Citizens Have A Right To Travel Without State Permits**

## **RIGHT TO TRAVEL- SUPREME COURT DECISIONS**

“The right of a citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon in the ordinary course of life and business is a common right which he has under his right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety. It includes the right in so doing to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day; and under the existing modes of travel includes the right to drive a horse-drawn carriage or wagon thereon, or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purposes of life and business. It is not a mere privilege, like the privilege of moving a house in the street, operating a business stand in the street, or transporting persons or property for hire along the street, which a city may permit or prohibit at will.” – *Thompson v. Smith*, 155 Va. 367, 154 SE 579 (1930)

“The right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment.” – Kent v. Dulles, 357 U.S. 116, 125 (1958)

“The right to travel, to go from place to place as the means of transportation permit, is a natural right subject to the rights of others and to reasonable regulation under law. A restraint imposed by the Government of the United States upon this liberty, therefore, must conform with the provision of the Fifth Amendment that ‘No person shall be . . . deprived of . . . liberty . . . without due process of law’.” – Schactman v. Dulles, 96 App DC 287, 225 F.2d 938, at 941

In *Hertado v. California*, 110 US 516, the U.S Supreme Court states very plainly: “The state cannot diminish rights of the people.”

And in *Bennett v. Boggs*, 1 Baldw 60, “Statutes that violate the plain and obvious principles of common right and common reason are null and void.

The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot thus be converted into a crime.” – *Miller v. U.S.*, 230 F.2d 486, at 489 (1956)

.there can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of constitutional rights.” – *Sherar v. Cullen*, 481 F.2d 946 (1973)