

Open Letter Notice:

To the 1871 corporate municipal federal government for the District of Colombia "aka" UNITED STATES, whose power and authority is legislative and constitutionally "restricted" to the "10 square miles" geographical area of the District of Columbia; and not beyond this designated District. (see 1787 Constitution for United States of America, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17; The Residency Act of 1790; The District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871; The Organic Act of 1878)

And the

Corporate municipal **Governors Actors** of the "*de facto STATE OF*" **federal zones**" of the corporate municipal federal government for the **District of Columbia**.

Especially, **North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada...**on 1663 Proprietary Charter of Carolina Land grant and Exodus 19:5 territory.

*** * * * NOTICE * * * ***

Official Notification and Certification to all Nations, States and Countries of the World.

This is the International notification that I, **Rechayahu Ben Harvey**, an international protected person, (*Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, 1035 U.N.T.S. 167, 13 I.L.M. 41, entered into force Feb. 20, 1977 (Article 1)*); one of the pre-European Invasion/pre-Colonial/pre-America Indigenous "Copper color descendants/Biblical Paleo Semitic Afro Asiatic Hebrew Israelites", the "true owners/stewards of the Americas", (whose family still hold holds a few hundred of pre-America "Fee Simple" acres of the family's perpetual homestead/estate); and March 24,1663, LORD PROPRIETARY CHARTER OF CAROLINA's TREATY/LAND GRANT AGREEMENT (private property) heir, assign and successor; which has come forth; and accepted his biblical Indigenous and Proprietary inheritance of Sovereign Land Claim/Patent and Land Grant, upon the continent of North America; and will now exercise and enforce his inheritance claim/patent, as prescribed under biblical covenant and international customary (Maxims of Law), Sovereign treaty/grant, contract, law.

...NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT...NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL...

I, **Rechayahu Ben Harvey**, is one of the awaking, living, heir, assign, successor of an international Land Grant Treaty Agreement, known as the **1663 CHARTER OF CAROLINA**, granted by **SOVEREIGN KING CHARLES II, "aka" Black Boy** of England, France, Ireland and Scotland, (grandson of King James I).

This Land Grant and my family's pre-America homestead, is my inheritance upon geographical territory which was already my biblical Holy Paleo Semitic Afro Asiatic Hebrew ancestors sovereign indigenous lands, for several millenniums, as God's Chosen People, stewards of his land, as defined in **Exodus 19:5**.

Written in this **International Land Grant Treaty Agreement**, it is stated that this agreement is binding on King Charles's heirs, assigns and successors; including future successors Monarchs of his Dominions (**Queen Elizabeth II, his 1st cousin 9th time removed**), **THE CROWN CORPORATION and TRADING COMPANIES**; including the future to be created 1776 united States of America and municipal corporation of the 1781 UNITED STATES, INC., for the District of Columbia.

Paragraph 14/15, of 1663 CHARTER OF CAROLINA, grants me, **Rechayahu Ben Harvey**, as heir, assign and successor; **FULL, and ABSOLUTE POWER and AUTHORITY to establish Legislative, Judicial and Police Power; in addition to, appointment of officers; civil and military, upon land grant territory.**

European Immigrants have come upon these shores and stole land that did not belong to them...plus purchased land from others (squatters) and organic native pretenders that did not have **1st Land Title (Genesis 13:14-15)**...this is fraud...all subsequent property transactions, since 1492, are void.

Contrary to the false history of this American Nation and fraudulent land grabs, no land lawfully, legally or morally on this continent, truly belongs to **the "de jure" or "de facto" American Government, State, National or Municipal Federal**, nor anyone or descendants who were not domiciled on this continent prior to 1492.

MY AUTHORITY

True Biblical Hebrew Israelites (My biological Brethren) are Semitic Afro-Asiatic descendants of a family/tribe led by Jacob (Israel) the grandson of Abraham; and his wives (his cousins, and they are sisters) Leah and Rachel; and Leah's and Rachel's half-sisters Bilhah and Zilpah. These two sets of sisters bore Jacob thirteen children. Plus the mitochondrial DNA of Joseph's wife, Asenath. Therefore, this Semitic Afro-Asiatic blood type and mitochondrial DNA of these women, will exist in every legitimate biological descendent to this day.

Hebrew Israelite Tribes are biological descendent of Semitic Afro-asiatic people, that spoke an Afro-asiatic language, from an Afro-asiatic from Middle Eastern region, with Afro-asiatic blood and DNA; that settled North America. The same Afro-Asiatic blood and DNA, as I.

Jacob took his tribe of 70-75 souls to Egypt, according to **Genesis "(Genesis 46:26-27)**; His sons took wives among **Egyptians, Ethiopians, Nubians, Somalians and Libyans**. Within two centuries Jacob's tribe grew into a multitude of millions, now due to offspring from the women of Africa, the Hebrews were now Afro Asiatic, and indistinguishable from Africans, (**Egyptians, Ethiopians, Nubians etc.**), murals and hieroglyphics in pyramids visually portrays the Hebrews of various hues of brown skin, with hair styles in afros, cornrows or dreadlocks; all before the exodus into the land that would be known as Israel.

I am descendant and heir of Semitic Copper Color Afro Asiatic People that are known in history as the Biblical Hebrew Israelites; that spoke the Afro Asiatic language of Hebrew, that traveled from the Afro Asiatic region of the Middle East to claimed the Americas, with an stone marker during the reign of King Solomon with our 10 commandments land claim marker, on a stone boulder in southwest North America; and was later joined after the fall of Jerusalem, by other Hebrew Israelites, as written in the **Old Testament: Book of Ezra (2 Esdras 13:39-49).** **The Americas/Arzareth/Turtle Island** is our second homeland, and we lived under our Grand Constitution - The Holy Torah/Bible.

I belong Yahweh, the Most High God/Creator of the Holy Torah/Bible, one of his "chosen People" and his possessions (**Deuteronomy 14:2, 1 Kings 8:53, Psalm 135:4, Jeremiah 31:1-4**) stewards of his lands, as define in **Exodus 19:5**; none of you sit before him, and are over me.

You did not and cannot create me, I am not a not an citizen" or "creature of statues" or "do not consent to be citizens" of your municipal state or federal governments, which means that all "color of law" codes, statutes, rules, regulations, ordinances, etc., decreed by your municipal governments are invalid and does not apply to an Human beings as me, which is endowed with Human Sovereignty, Human Rights and Unalienable Rights of their "creator/God"., that has not committed a crime under God's Laws of the Holy Torah/Bible. I am one of the highest "awaken" ranking sovereigns upon this hemisphere.

1663 LORD PROPRIETOR CHARTER OF CAROLINA

A copy of my **Indigenous and Proprietor Certificate of Acceptance and Declaration of Land Patent Grant Treaty**, and un rebutted Affidavits are In the **Miscellaneous Book 14 pages 369-429**, filed and recorded @ Clerk Superior Court, Gwinnett County, Lawrenceville, Georgia State, Jun 18, 2012; with additional supporting notarized and Apostille documents.

* An un rebutted Affidavit stands as **Truth in Commerce**

* An un rebutted Affidavit becomes the judgement in commerce, and is "Prima Facie Evidence that the above is true.

The **"de jure" United States or United States of America** did not exist in 1663; and did not come into legal existence until 1776; therefore, the **"de jure" United States of America**, cannot alter or extinguish this previous established sovereign treaty contract agreement (Proprietary 1663 Charter of Carolina); and the private municipal federal government corporation of the **"de facto" 1871 UNITED STATES, INC., is not a party to this international agreement either.**

Therefore, since I am heir and descendant of Pre-America "land holding homesteading inhabitants" of North America, this make me indigenous to state and federal governments, that were established later in history. I have Rights, as expressed in **United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People.** Here are a few Articles of this International Declaration.

Article 1

Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law.

Article 2

Indigenous peoples and individuals are free and equal to all other peoples and individuals and have the right to be free from any kind of discrimination, in the exercise of their rights, in particular that based on their indigenous origin or identity.

Article 3

Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

Article 4

Indigenous peoples, in exercising their right to self-determination, have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous

Article 6

Every indigenous individual has the right to a nationality.

Article 7

1. Indigenous individuals have the rights to life, physical and mental integrity, liberty and security of person.
2. Indigenous peoples have the collective right to live in freedom, peace and security as distinct peoples and shall not be subjected to any act of genocide or any other act of violence, including forcibly removing children of the group to another group.

Article 8

1. Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subjected to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture.

However, I am also an **native non-Citizen Negro/Afro Descendant National of the "de jure" United States of America**, under **Title 8 United States Code §1101(a) (21)**...

I am not, and do not wish to be, or consent to be, a citizen of the "de facto" state or federal municipal governments. **In fact, it is a legal and lawful establish fact that:**

Negro/Afro Descendants, cannot be state or federal citizens according to the "de jure" Constitutional Supreme Court, under Articles III and IV, argued by the "**de jure**" **United States of America Supreme Court Chief Justice, Roger B. Taney (pronounced Tawney)**, the highest court in the "**de jure**" **these united States of America**; sent down the "Landmark" verdict that **Afro-Descendants/Negros** (free or slave descendants cannot be Citizens of these united States of America (State nor Federal))(**DRED SCOTT v. SANDFORD, 60 U.S. 393 (1856) 60 U.S. 393 (How.)**)

The political bands with the municipal corporate federal government of the **1871 UNITED STATES, INC.** has been dissolved according Human Sovereignty of Human Beings, and ideas submitted in the **1776 Declaration of Independence**.

In 2011, a **Declaration of Independence** was issued, with Apostilles and recorded and filed in Courthouse Records in **Lawrenceville, Gwinnett County, Georgia State, in 2012**. This declaration has been delivered to the depository of the **Organization of American States**.

According to **United State Code › Title 18 › Part I › Chapter 1 › § 11 › = Foreign government defined**. The term "foreign government", as used in this title except in sections 112, 878, 970, 1116, and 1201, includes any government, faction, or body of insurgents within a country with which the United States is at peace, irrespective of recognition by the **United States**. The Government of the Principality is and foreign government, according to this **United State Code › Title 18 › Part I › Chapter 1 › § 11 ›**.

I, Rechayahu Ben Harvey, indigenous/native heir and descendant Indigenous peoples, in exercising their right to self-determination, have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, as well as ways and means for financing their autonomous functions.

Therefore, the **Government of the Principality of Granville** is an self-determination, autonomous nation based on "**God's Laws**" of the Holy Torah/Bible, is being establish for the Human & Unalienable Rights protection for the political **UNREPRESENTED native Hebrew/Moor/Negro/Afro Descendants non-Citizen Nationals of the "de jure" Republic of the United States of America**, under the **Dred Scott landmark decision**; for those that do not consent

to be govern by the "de facto" corporate municipal federal government of the **United States**, nor the municipal sub-corporation "federal zone" zip code Impostor "de facto" States, which are masquerading as the "de jure" sovereign states of the constitutional American Republic", of the "true owners/stewards of the Americas", (whose family still hold holds a few hundred of pre-America "Fee Simple" acres of the family's perpetual homestead/estate); and **March 24,1663, LORD PROPRIETARY CHARTER OF CAROLINA's TREATY/LAND GRANT AGREEMENT (private property)** heir, assign and successor; which has come forth; and accepted his biblical Indigenous and Proprietary inheritance of Sovereign Land Claim, and Land Grant, upon the continent of North America; and will now exercise and enforce his inheritance claim, as prescribed under biblical covenant and international customary (**Maxims of Law**), Sovereign treaty/grant, contract, law.

Government of the Principality of Granville is a foreign government, as defined in **United State Code › Title 18 › Part I › Chapter 1 › § 11** ›, which meaning under international and customary law, it has the Right of Self Defense for its "Nationals" and the UNREPRESENTED non-Citizen Nationals" of the dormant "de jure" United States of America, which do not consent to be "citizens" of the corporate municipal federal government for the District of Columbia.

Please note....that the **Government and Nation of the Principality of Granville** subscribes to the definition of self-defense used by **Article 51** of the **Charter of the United Nations**, which states that sovereign nations may fend off an armed attack until the Security Council has adopted measures under **Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter**.

It has been rendered in the American court system that Government cannot break the law, by definition, for in **Brookfield Co. v Stuart, 234 F. Supp. 94, United States District of Columbia, Washington, DC**, it was recognized that "an...officer who acts in violation of the Constitution ceases to represent the government."

Thereby, such ("constitutional oath breaking") officials operating outside "legitimate" constitutional government authority will be deem pirates, terrorist, mercenaries and traitors, in costume, by the non-citizen Negro/Afro Descendants, out to do harm to the Afro descendants...

These pirates, terrorist, mercenaries and traitors, in costume; committing crimes of **Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law (Title 18 United States Code 242)** or **Conspire to violate Human or Unalienable Rights or Constitutions of "de jure" or corporate municipal federal governments (Title 18 United States Code § 241)** or felony crimes under **Title 5 United States Code 3331, Title 5 United States Code 3333, Title 5 United States Code 7311**, ignoring remedy of **Title 18 United States Code 1918 (I)**; operating as uniform costume impostors under **Title 18 United States Code Chapter 13, Section 241**; will be considered an Imminent Threat, described as being "instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation under international law.

Appropriate action will be taken to protect **Nationals of The Government of the Principality Granville**, and the **UNREPRESENTED non-Citizen Nationals** of the dormant **"de jure" United States of America**, which do not consent to be "citizens" of the corporate municipal federal government for the **District of Columbia**, which are **Dual Nationals of the Government of the Principality of Granville also**.

...after all, if these "constitutional oath breaking" officers are not representing the constitutional government, who are they representing??? **They seem to ignore LEGISLATIVE & COURT establish laws.**

OFFICIALS IGNORING CONSTITUTION AND ESTABLISHED LAWS ON RECORD

"If [state] officials construe a vague statute unconstitutionally, the citizen may take them at their word, and act on the assumption that the statute is void." - **Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham 394 U.S. 147 (1969). (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

Colander v. Lawson (461 U.S. 352, 1983) in which the United States Supreme Court ruled that a police officer could not arrest a citizen merely for refusing to present identification. **(U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"With regard particularly to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that a Right secured or protected by that document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority." **Connolly vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co., 184 US 540; Lafarier vs. Grand Trunk R.R. Co., 24 A. 848; O'Neil vs. Providence Amusement Co., 108 A. 887. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The police power of the state must be exercised in subordination to the provisions of the U.S. Constitution." **Bacahanan vs. Wanley, 245 US 60; Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. vs. State Highway Commission, 294 US 613 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"It is well settled that the Constitutional Rights protected from invasion by the police power, include Rights safeguarded both by express and implied prohibitions in the Constitutions." **Tiche vs. Osborne, 131 A. 60 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them." **Miranda vs. Arizona, 384 US 436, 491 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional Right cannot be converted into a crime." **Miller vs. U.S., 230 F. 486, 489 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional Rights." **Snerer vs. Cullen, 481 F. 946 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

No state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it, and attach a fee to it." **Murdock v. Penn., 319 US 105 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"If the state converts a liberty into a privilege, the citizen can engage in the right with impunity." **Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 373 US 262 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"Traffic infractions are not a crime." **People v. Battle, 50 Cal. App. 3, step 1, 123 Cal. Rptr. 636, 639. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"Speeding, driving without a license, wrong plates or no plates, no registration, no tags, etc., have been held to be "non-arrestable offenses" **Cal V. Farley, 98 Cal. Rep. 89, 20 CA 3d 1032. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The right of a citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, by horse drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile, is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but a common right which he has under his right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Under this constitutional guaranty one may, therefore, under normal conditions, travel at his inclination along the public highways or in public places, and while conducting himself in an orderly and decent manner, neither interfering with nor disturbing another's rights, he will be protected, not only in his person, but in his safe conduct." **(Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 579, 11 American Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, section 329, page 1135) (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The right of the 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 the 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 purpose of life and business." -Thompson vs. Smith, supra.; **Teche Lines vs. Danforth, Miss., 12 S.2d 784 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"... the right of the citizen to drive on a public street with freedom from police interference... is a fundamental constitutional right" - **White, 97 Cal.App.3d.141, 158 Cal. Rptr. 562, 566-67 (1979) (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"citizens have a right to drive upon the public streets of the District of Columbia or any other city absent a constitutionally sound reason for limiting their access." **Caneisha Mills v. D.C. 2009 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The use of the automobile as a necessary adjunct to the earning of a livelihood in modern life requires us in the interest of realism to conclude that the RIGHT to use an automobile on the public highways partakes of the nature of a liberty within the meaning of the Constitutional guarantees. . ." **Berberian v. Lussier (1958) 139 A2d 869, 872, See also: Schecter v. Killingsworth, 380 P.2d 136, 140; 93 Ariz. 273 (1963). (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The right to operate a motor vehicle [an automobile] upon the public streets and highways is not a mere privilege. It is a right of liberty, the enjoyment of which is protected by the guarantees of the federal and state constitutions." **Adams v. City of Pocatello, 416 P.2d 46, 48; 91 Idaho 99 (1966). (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"A traveler has an equal right to employ an automobile as a means of transportation and to occupy the public highways with other vehicles in common use." **Campbell v. Walker, 78 Atl. 601, 603, 2 Boyce (Del.) 41. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The owner of an automobile has the same right as the owner of other vehicles to use the highway,* * * A traveler on foot has the same right to the use of the public highways as an automobile or any other vehicle." **Simeone v. Lindsay, 65 Atl. 778, 779; Hannigan v. Wright, 63 Atl. 234, 236. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The RIGHT of the citizen to DRIVE on the public street with freedom from police interference, unless he is engaged in suspicious conduct associated in some manner with criminality is a FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT which must be protected by the courts." **People v. Horton 14 Cal. App. 3rd 667 (1971) (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The right to make use of an automobile as a vehicle of travel long the highways of the state, is no longer an open question. The owners thereof have the same rights in the roads and streets as the drivers of horses or those riding a bicycle or traveling in some other vehicle." **House v. Cramer, 112 N.W. 3; 134 Iowa 374; Farnsworth v. Tampa Electric Co. 57 So. 233, 237, 62 Fla. 166. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The automobile may be used with safety to others users of the highway, and in its proper use upon the highways there is an equal right with the users of other vehicles properly upon the highways. The law recognizes such right of use upon general principles. **Brinkman v Pacholike, 84 N.E. 762, 764, 41 Ind. App. 662, 666. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The law does not denounce motor carriages, as such, on public ways. They have an equal right with other vehicles in common use to occupy the streets and roads. It is improper to say that the driver of the horse has rights in the roads superior to the driver of the automobile. Both have the right to use the easement." **Indiana Springs Co. v. Brown, 165 Ind. 465, 468. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"A highway is a public way open and free to anyone who has occasion to pass along it on foot or with any kind of vehicle." **Schlesinger v. City of Atlanta, 129 S.E. 861, 867, 161 Ga. 148, 159; Holland v. Shackelford, 137 S.E. 2d 298, 304, 220 Ga.104; Stavola v. Palmer, 73 A.2d 831, 838, 136 Conn. 670 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"There can be no question of the right of automobile owners to occupy and use the public streets of cities, or highways in the rural districts." **Liebrecht v. Crandall, 126 N.W. 69, 110 Minn. 454, 456 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The word 'automobile' connotes a pleasure vehicle designed for the transportation of persons on highways." - **American Mutual Liability Ins. Co., vs. Chaput, 60 A.2d 118, 120; 95 NH 200 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

Motor Vehicle: **Title 18 United States Code Part 1 Chapter 2 section 31** definitions:

"(6) Motor vehicle. - The term "motor vehicle" means every description of carriage or other contrivance propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used for commercial purposes on the highways..." 10) The term "used for commercial purposes" means the carriage of persons or property for any fare, fee, rate, charge or other consideration, or directly or indirectly in connection with any business, or other undertaking intended for profit. **(U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"A motor vehicle or automobile for hire is a motor vehicle, other than an automobile stage, used for the transportation of persons for which remuneration is received." - **International Motor Transit Co. vs. Seattle, 251 P. 120 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

The term 'motor vehicle' is different and broader than the word 'automobile.'" - **City of Dayton vs. DeBrosse, 23 NE.2d 647, 650; 62 Ohio App. 232 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"Thus self-driven vehicles are classified according to the use to which they are put rather than according to the means by which they are propelled" - **Ex Parte Hoffert, 148 NW 20 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The Supreme Court, in Arthur v. Morgan, 112 U.S. 495, 5 S.Ct. 241, 28 L.Ed. 825, held that carriages were properly classified as household effects, and we see no reason that automobiles should not be similarly disposed of." **Hillhouse v United States, 152 F. 163, 164 (2nd Cir. 1907). (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"...a citizen has the right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon..." **State vs. Johnson, 243 P. 1073; Cummins vs. Homes, 155 P. 171; Packard vs. Banton, 44 S.Ct. 256; Hadfield vs. Lundin, 98 Wash 516, Willis vs. Buck, 263 P. 1 982; Barney vs. Board of Railroad Commissioners, 17 P.2d 82 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and fundamental Right of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived." **Chicago Motor Coach vs. Chicago, 169 NE 22; Ligare vs. Chicago, 28 NE 934; Boon vs. Clark, 214 SSW 607; 25 Am.Jur. (1st) Highways Sect.163 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"the right of the Citizen to travel upon the highway and to transport his property thereon in the ordinary course of life and business... is the usual and ordinary right of the Citizen, a right common to all." - **Ex Parte Dickey, (Dickey vs. Davis), 85 SE 781 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"Every Citizen has an unalienable RIGHT to make use of the public highways of the state; every Citizen has full freedom to travel from place to place in the enjoyment of life and liberty." **People v. Nothaus, 147 Colo. 210. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"No State government entity has the power to allow or deny passage on the highways, byways, nor waterways... transporting his vehicles and personal property for either recreation or business, but by being subject only to local regulation i.e., safety, caution, traffic lights, speed limits, etc. Travel is not a privilege requiring licensing, vehicle registration, or forced insurances." **Chicago Coach Co. v. City of Chicago, 337 Ill. 200, 169 N.E. 22. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"Highways are for the use of the traveling public, and all have the right to use them in a reasonable and proper manner; the use thereof is an inalienable right of every citizen." **Escobedo v. State 35 C2d 870 in 8 Cal Jur 3d p.27 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"RIGHT -- A legal RIGHT, a constitutional RIGHT means a RIGHT protected by the law, by the constitution, but government does not create the idea of RIGHT or original RIGHTS; it acknowledges them. . . " **Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1914, p. 2961. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"Those who have the right to do something cannot be licensed for what they already have right to do as such license would be meaningless." **City of Chicago v Collins 51 NE 907, 910. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"A license means leave to do a thing which the licensor could prevent." **Blatz Brewing Co. v. Collins, 160 P.2d 37, 39; 69 Cal. A. 2d 639. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The object of a license is to confer a right or power, which does not exist without it." **Payne v. Massey (19__) 196 SW 2nd 493, 145 Tex 273. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The court makes it clear that a license relates to qualifications to engage in profession, business, trade or calling; thus, when merely traveling without compensation or profit, outside of business enterprise or adventure with the corporate state, no license is required of the natural individual traveling for personal business, pleasure and transportation." **Wingfield v. Fielder 2d Ca. 3d 213 (1972). (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"With regard particularly to the U.S. Constitution, it is elementary that Right secured or protected by that document cannot be overthrown or impaired by any state police authority." **Donnolly vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co., 184 US 540; Lafarier vs. Grand Trunk R.R. Co., 24 A. 848; O'Neil vs. Providence Amusement Co., 108 A. 887. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"The right to travel (called the right of free ingress to other states, and egress from them) is so fundamental that it appears in the Articles of Confederation, which governed our society before the Constitution." **(Paul v. Virginia). (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"[T]he right to travel freely from State to State ... is a right broadly assertable against private interference as well as governmental action. Like the right of association, it is a virtually unconditional personal right, guaranteed by the Constitution to us all." **(U.S. Supreme Court, Shapiro v. Thompson). (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

EDGERTON, Chief Judge: "Iron curtains have no place in a free world. ...'Undoubtedly the right of locomotion, the right to remove from one place to another according to inclination, is an attribute of personal liberty, and the right, ordinarily, of free transit from or through the territory of any State is a right secured by the Constitution.' **Williams v. Fears, 179 U.S. 270, 274, 21 S.Ct. 128, 45 L.Ed. 186. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

"Our nation has thrived on the principle that, outside areas of plainly harmful conduct, every American is left to shape his own life as he thinks best, do what he pleases, go where he pleases." **Id., at 197. Kent vs. Dulles see Vestal, Freedom of Movement, 41 Iowa L.Rev. 6, 13—14. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

“The validity of restrictions on the freedom of movement of particular individuals, both substantively and procedurally, is precisely the sort of matter that is the peculiar domain of the courts.” Comment, **61 Yale Law Journal at page 187.**

“a person detained for an investigatory stop can be questioned but is “not obliged to answer, answers may not be compelled, and refusal to answer furnishes no basis for an arrest.” **Justice White, Hiibel (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

“Automobiles have the right to use the highways of the State on an equal footing with other vehicles.” **Cumberland Telephone. & Telegraph Co. v Yeiser 141 Kentucky 15. (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

“Each citizen has the absolute right to choose for himself the mode of conveyance he desires, whether it be by wagon or carriage, by horse, motor or electric car, or by bicycle, or astride of a horse, subject to the sole condition that he will observe all those requirements that are known as the law of the road.” **Swift v City of Topeka, 43 (U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

The Supreme Court said in **U.S. v Mersky (1960) 361 U.S. 431**: An administrative regulation, of course, is not a "statute." **(U.S. DOMESTIC LAW)**

IGNORANCE OF THE LAWIS NO EXCUSE!

THESE ARE THE LAWS ON THE BOOKS THAT LAW ENFORCEMENT/POLICE ROUTINELY IGNORE...AND COMMIT CRIMES UNDER "COLOR OF LAW" AGAINST PEOPLE "NOT CITIZENS" THAT ARE LAWFUL OUTSIDE THEIR JURISDICTION.....

Allow me to make this perfectly clear....Native Negro/Afro Descendants of Principality of Granville and non-citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America are "not an citizen" or "creature of statues" or "do not consent to be citizens" of these municipal state or federal governments, which means that all "color of law" codes, statutes, rules, regulations, ordinances, etc., decreed by these municipal governments are invalid and does not apply to these Human beings which are endowed with superior Human Sovereignty, Human Rights and Unalienable Rights of their "creator/God".

Trying to extend "**Color of Law**" jurisdiction and committing crimes of **Deprivation of Rights under Color of Law (Title 18 United States Code 242)** or **Conspire to violate Human or Unalienable Rights or Constitutions of "de jure" or corporate municipal federal governments (Title 18 United States Code § 241)** or **felony crimes** under **Title 5 United States Code 3331, Title 5 United States Code 3333, Title 5 United States Code 7311**, ignoring remedy of **Title 18 United States Code 1918 (I)**; operating as uniform costume impostors under **Title 18 United States Code Chapter 13, Section 241**; violating **Human Sovereignty, Human Rights and Unalienable Rights of Dual Nationals of the Principality of Granville or non-Citizen Nationals of "de jure" of the United States of America**, which are not "consenting municipal citizens", **will have dire consequences.**

Kidnapping

The crime of unlawfully ("color of law Detention & Arrest") seizing and carrying away a person by force or Fraud, or seizing and detaining a person against his or her will with an intent to carry that person away at a later time. Includes false imprisonment. **Penalty will be enforced. (Exodus 21:16)**

What is COLOR OF LAW?

The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right. **McCain v. Des Moines, 174 U. S. 108, 19 Sup. Ct. (H4, 43 L. Ed. 936**

Assault = compensation = weight in .999 Troy oz. gold of assailant or assailants (Exodus 21:18-19)

Murder = Death for all involved in this crime (Exodus 21:12-14)

"Whoever sheds man's blood, by man his blood shall be shed, for in the image of God He made man" (Genesis 9:6)

Kidnapping = Death (Exodus 21:16)

Includes Death to those guarding kidnap victim(s)

Includes Death to those holding kidnap victim(s) for compensation or profit

HUMAN SOVEREIGNTY

I. The Ultimate Sovereignty of Yahweh/God. Only the Creator is irrevocably, eternally and universally sovereign. All human sovereignty of whatever kind or degree derives directly or indirectly only from the God of the universe, and has no validity whatsoever except insofar as it relates to Him. Only He grants direct sovereignty and only He may revoke it.

II. The Sovereignty of the Person under the Sovereignty of Yahweh/God. Every individual, of whatever age, degree of competence, state of health or development, degree of dependence, or size of fortune is from the moment of conception individually created by Yahweh/God to exercise free will, responsibility and personal sovereignty. No human agency may, by whatever means, deny, ignore, raise barriers to, refuse or destroy this sovereignty.

III. The Family as the Foundation of Society. The family is the basic unit of society and should be the primary school of true love. In this basic institution, created by Yahweh/God, individuals should be able to develop four great realms of the heart:

First, true child's love: Beyond the natural love of children for their parents, every child should be taught filial piety and reverence for each of his or her parents and God, the source of all true love. Under true child's love, the child's conduct is guided, not by fear, coercion or the desire for personal reward, but by the deep love and empathy the child feels toward each parent and toward God and to avoid the unbearable pain of knowing that he has hurt or betrayed his parent's love.

Second, true sibling love: All children should share their love with their brothers and sisters and other family members, and, by extension, with all members of the community. To express this love, every child should be taught to live for others.

Third, true conjugal love: Every child should be taught the responsibilities of true marriage, where both spouses subordinate themselves voluntarily to the sovereignty and dignity of the other, and both give total loyalty and commitment to the well-being, development and happiness of the other.

Fourth, true parental love: Just as Yahweh/God offers absolute love to each human as a child of God, every parent should provide unconditional love to each child and raise each one to become a responsible and loving citizen, with a true parental heart beyond the family toward all others and all of creation.

United by common spiritual values and mutual dedication to a culture of life and heart, individuals who are more responsible, mature and loving will come forward from widely diverse backgrounds and cultures to work together in solidarity for building a more just and peaceful world for generations to come.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Article 1.

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2.

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3.

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4.

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5.

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6.

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 7.

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8.

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10.

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11.

(1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12.

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13.

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14.

(1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15.

(1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16.

(1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17.

(1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18.

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19.

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20.

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21.

(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22.

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23.

(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24.

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25.

(1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26.

(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27.

(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28.

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29.

(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

UNALIENABLE RIGHTS - YAHWEH/GOD

"... endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights..." (**Declaration of Independence**)

The Principle

1. The traditional American philosophy teaches that Man, The Individual, is endowed at birth with rights which are unalienable because given by his Creator.

The Only Moral Basis

2. This governmental philosophy is uniquely American. The concept of Man's rights being unalienable is based solely upon the belief in their Divine origin. Lacking this belief, there is no moral basis for any claim that they are unalienable or for any claim to the great benefits flowing from this concept. God-given rights are sometimes called Natural Rights--those possessed by Man under the Laws of Nature, meaning under the laws of God's creation and therefore by gift of God. Man has no power to alienate--to dispose of, by surrender, barter or gift--his God-given rights, according to the American philosophy. This is the meaning of "unalienable."

One underlying consideration is that for every such right there is a correlative, inseparable duty--for every aspect of freedom there is a corresponding responsibility; so that it is always Right-Duty and Freedom-Responsibility, or Liberty-Responsibility. There is a duty, or responsibility, to God as the giver of these unalienable rights: a moral duty--to keep secure and use soundly these gifts, with due respect for the equal rights of others and for the right of Posterity to their just heritage of liberty. Since this moral duty cannot be surrendered, bartered, given away, abandoned, delegated or otherwise alienated, so is the inseparable right likewise unalienable. This concept of rights being unalienable is thus dependent upon belief in God as the giver. This indicates the basis and the soundness of Jefferson's statement (1796 letter to John Adams): "If ever the morals of a people could be made the basis of their own government it is our case . . ."

Right, Reason, and Capacity to Be Self-governing

3. For the security and enjoyment by Man of his Divinely created rights, it follows implicitly that Man is endowed by his Creator not only with the right to be self-governing but also with the capacity to reason and, therefore, with the capacity to be self-governing. This is implicit in the philosophy proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence. Otherwise, Man's unalienable rights would be of little or no use or benefit to him. Faith in Man--in his capacity to be self-governing--is thus related to faith in God as his Creator, as the giver of these unalienable rights and this capacity.

Rights--as Prohibitions Against Government

4. Certain specific rights of The Individual are protected in the original Constitution but this is by way of statements "in reverse"--by way of express prohibitions against government. The word "right" does not appear in the original instrument. This is because it was designed to express the grant by the people of specific, limited powers to the central government--created by them through this basic law--as well as certain specific limitations on its powers, and on the preexisting powers of the State governments, expressed as prohibitions of things forbidden. Every provision in it pertains to power.

The Constitution's first eight (Bill of Rights) amendments list certain rights of The Individual and prohibit the doing of certain things by the central, or Federal, government which, if done, would violate these rights. These amendments were intended by their Framers and Adopters merely to make express a few of the already-existing, implied prohibitions against the Federal government only--supplementing the prohibitions previously specified expressly in the original Constitution and supplementing and confirming its general, over-all, implied, prohibition as to all things concerning which it withheld power from this government. Merely confirming expressly some of the already-existing, implied prohibitions, these amendments did not create any new ones. They are, therefore, more properly referred to as a partial list of limitations--or a partial Bill of Prohibitions--as was indicated by

Hamilton in The Federalist number 84. This hinges upon the uniquely American concepts stated in the Declaration of Independence: that Men, created of God, in turn create their governments and grant to them only "just" (limited) powers--primarily to make and keep secure their God-given, unalienable rights including, in part, the right to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. As Hamilton stated, under the American philosophy and system of constitutionally limited government, "the people surrender nothing;" instead, they merely delegate to government--to public servants as public trustees--limited powers and therefore, he added, "they have no need of particular reservations" (in a Bill of Rights). This is the basic reason why the Framing Convention omitted from the Constitution anything in the nature of a separate Bill of Rights, as being unnecessary.

An Endless List of Rights

5. To attempt to name all of these rights--starting with "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" mentioned in the Declaration of Independence--would be to start an endless list which would add up to the whole of Man's Freedom (Freedom from Government-over-Man). They would add up to the entirety of Individual Liberty (Liberty against Government-over-Man). Innumerable rights of The Individual are embraced in the Ninth Amendment, which states: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." (Here "Constitution" includes the amendments.) Some idea of how vast the list would be is indicated by just one general freedom which leads into almost all of Free Man's activities of daily living throughout life: freedom of choice. This term stands for the right to do--and equally not to do--this or that, as conscience, whim or judgement, taste or desire, of The Individual may prompt from moment to moment, day by day, for as long as life lasts; but always, of course, with due regard for the equal rights of others and for the just laws expressive of the above-mentioned "just powers" of government designed to help safeguard the equal rights of all Individuals. Spelled out in detail, this single freedom--freedom of choice--is almost all-embracing.

Right To Be Let Alone

6. In one sense, such freedom to choose involves Man's right to be let alone, which is possessed by The Individual in keeping with the Declaration and Constitution as against government: in enjoyment of his unalienable rights, while respecting the equal rights of others and just laws (as defined in Paragraph 5 above). This right to be let alone is the most comprehensive of rights and the right most prized by civilized men. This right is, of course, also possessed as against all other Individuals, all obligated to act strictly within the limits of their own equal rights. Consequently any infringement of any Individual's rights is precluded.

Rights Inviolable by Government or by Others

7. Neither government nor any Individuals--acting singly, or in groups, or in organizations--could possibly possess any "just power" (to use again the significant term of the Declaration) to violate any Individual's God-given, unalienable rights or the supporting rights. No government can abolish or destroy--nor can it rightfully, or constitutionally, violate--Man's God-given rights. Government cannot justly interfere with Man's deserved enjoyment of any of these rights. No public official, nor all such officials combined, could possibly have any such power morally. Government can, to be sure, unjustly and unconstitutionally interfere by force with the deserved enjoyment of Man's unalienable rights. It is, however, completely powerless to abolish or destroy them. It is in defense of these rights of all Individuals, in last analysis, that the self-governing people--acting in accordance with, and in support of, the Constitution--oppose any and all violators, whether public officials or usurpers, or others (par. 9 below).

Each Individual Consents to Some Limitations

8. In creating governments as their tools, or instruments, and equally in continuing to maintain them--for the purpose primarily of making and keeping their unalienable rights--all Individuals composing the self-governing people impliedly and in effect consent to some degree of limitation of their freedom to exercise some of their rights. This does not involve the surrender, or the alienation, of any of these rights but only the partial, conditional and limited relinquishment of freedom to exercise a few of them and solely for the purpose of insuring the greater security and enjoyment of all of them; and, moreover, such relinquishment is always upon condition that public officials, as public servants and trustees, faithfully use the limited powers delegated to government strictly in keeping with their prescribed limits and with this limited purpose at all times. It was in this sense that George Washington, as President of the Framing Convention in September, 1787, wrote to the Congress of the Confederation--in transmitting to it, for consideration, the draft of the proposed Constitution: ". . . Individuals entering into society, must give up a share of liberty to preserve the rest." Here he meant merely conditional relinquishment of liberty of action in the exercise of certain aspects of unalienable rights--not the surrender of any unalienable rights, which would be impossible because a nullity, a void act.

An Offender's Just Punishment

9. Whenever Man violates either the equal rights of others or the above-mentioned just laws, he thereby forfeits his immunity in this regard; by his misconduct, he destroys the moral and legal basis for his immunity and opens the door to just reprisal against himself, by government. This means that any person, as such offender, may justly be punished by the people's proper instrumentality--the government, including the courts--under a sound system of equal justice under equal laws; that is, under Rule-by-Law (basically the people's fundamental law, the Constitution). Such punishment is justified morally because of the duty of all Individuals--in keeping with Individual Liberty-Responsibility--to cooperate, through their instrumentality, government, for the mutual protection of the unalienable rights of all Individuals. The offender is also justly answerable to the aggrieved Individual, acting properly through duly-established machinery of government, including courts, designed for the protection of the equal rights of all Individuals.

It is the offender's breach of the duty aspect of Individual Liberty-Responsibility which makes just, proper and necessary government's punitive action and deprives him of any moral basis for protest. By such breach he forfeits his moral claim to the inviolability of his rights and makes himself vulnerable to reprisal by the people, through government, in defense of their own unalienable rights. By this lack of self-discipline required by that duty, he invites and makes necessary his being disciplined by government.

The Conclusion

10. Man's unalienable rights are sacred for the same reason that they are unalienable--because of their Divine origin, according to the traditional American philosophy.

Although, Native Negro/Afro Descendants are not party to the Constitutions, they are non-Citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America, with the Bill of Rights and Articles of Confederation's Article "free inhabitants" provisions, with superior Humanity Sovereignty, Human Rights and Unalienable Rights.

The Government of Principality of Granville will grant advance notice to the corporate municipal state and federal governments for the *District of Columbia* that there are Dual Nationals ("Native Foreign Nationals of the Principality of Granville and Negro/Afro Descendant non-citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America), that do not consent to be governed or citizens of corporate municipal state and federal governments

for the *District of Columbia*; but have consented to, and affirmed allegiance to the **Nation and Government of the Principality of Granville**.

So that there are no incidents that are perceived as Imminent Threats against our Nationals that will require Self Defense action under international Law.

It is recommended that corporate municipal governments operating covertly, outside your jurisdictions inform your agencies (Revenue, Labor, Health, Banking, Education, Law Enforcement, Motor Vehicles) and personnel of such agencies; of the changes or corrections that are currently been taken place; and that mistaking **Dual Nationals ("Native Foreign Nationals of the Principality of Granville and Negro/Afro Descendant non-citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America)** for "consenting citizens" of the corporate municipal state and federal governments for the *District of Columbia*, will have consequences from the date this notification letter is sent via certified mail.

NO CONSENT

Native Negro/Afro Descendant dual non-citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America and newly acquire Nationals of the Government of the Principality, do not consent to being citizens of the 1871 "de facto" corporate municipal federal government "*United States*", for the *District of Columbia* (see *The District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871; The Organic Act of 1878*)

These **Native Negro/Afro Descendants of Principality of Granville and non-citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America**, are not 14th Amendment citizens of the 1871 "de facto" corporate municipal federal government "*United States*", for the *District of Columbia*; nor are they citizens of sub corporation, municipal State of *****, "federal zones" of the municipal federal government, masquerading as "de facto" States overlaid upon sovereign "de jure" State territory.

This means **Native Negro/Afro Descendants of Principality of Granville and non-citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America** are "not an citizen" or "creature of statues" or "do not consent to be citizens" of these municipal state or federal governments, which means that all "color of law" codes, statutes, rules, regulations, ordinances, etc., decreed by these municipal governments are invalid and does not apply to these Human beings which are endowed with Human Sovereignty, Human Rights and Unalienable Rights of their "creator/God".

NATIONALITY

Many **Native Negro/Afro Descendant non-Citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America** are wishing to establish their rightful status as "*Nationals*" of the *United States of America*, which was establish by the **Supreme Court of the United States of America, in the "landmark decision" (DRED SCOTT v. SANDFORD, 60 U.S. 393 (1856) 60 U.S. 393 (How.))**, that **Negros/Afro Descendants** cannot be a citizen of the state or federal government's, thereby making native **Negros/Afro Descendants non-Citizen Nationals of the United States of America**.

Therefore, "citizen's" passports for *the United States of America* are not an valid lawful option for **Negro/Afro Descendant non-Citizen Nationals**, since it has been ruled by the "**de jure**" **United States of America Supreme Court, that Negro/Afro Descendants** cannot be citizens. Any recording of an **Negro/Afro Descendant** being a "U.S. citizen" is in error, and must promptly be corrected pursuant to the **Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. 552 a(d)(2)**,

Freedom of Information Act 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(2), Federal Tort Claims Act 28 U.S.C. 1346, 2671-2680 and the Administrative Procedures Act. 5 U.S.C. 551-559; and for those **Negro/Afro Descendants that are Nationals of the United States of America** that mistakenly have already acquired citizen's passports.

"Nationals" passport for the United States of America would be more appropriate, since **Negro/Afro Descendants** are legally and lawfully not citizens, but "nationals" of the "de jure" United States of America, under Title 8 United States Code §1101(a)(21)...born upon and are domiciled upon a "de jure" state of the Union, as indicated in Title 8 United States Code §Section 1408 - (Nationals, but not citizens of the United States of America at birth); also Negro/Afro Descendants are also descendants of Article 4, "free inhabitants" of the Article of Confederation of the United States of America.

U.S Supreme Court declared that a **Title 8 United States Code §1401** "national and citizen of the United States of America at birth", is NOT a Fourteenth Amendment citizen. (See Rogers v. Belle I, 401 U.S. 815 (1971).

Therefore, is requested that the **U.S. Department of State** issued a **"Certificate of non-Citizen National Status"**, for native born/domiciled **Negro/Afro Descendants non-citizen Nationals**, that request **United States of America** passport identification, as **"Nationals"** for proper and lawful documentation, that will verify the rightful status of **Negro/Afro Descendants non-citizen Nationals of the United States of America**, to your municipal state and federal agencies.

Or modify the **United States of America** passport application to allow **Negro/Afro Descendants non-citizen Nationals of the United States of America** to apply for passport as a **"National"**, since **Negro/Afro Descendants** legally and lawfully cannot be a "citizens" of the state of federal government's. Therefore, passports for **Negro/Afro Descendants** must be stamped "Non-Citizen National" and endorsement in passport stating that the holder/bearer is a U.S.A. national, and not a U.S. citizen.

Therefore, "citizen's" passports for the United States of America are not a valid lawful option for Negro/Afro Descendant non-Citizen Nationals, since it has been ruled by the United States of America Supreme Court, that Negro/Afro Descendants cannot be citizens.

The Government of the Principality of Granville recommend that the **U.S. Department of State** assign an liaison or committee to assist **Principality of Granville's non-citizen Nationals USA passport liaison** or committee in processing request for **"Certificate of non-Citizen National Status"**, and obtaining **USA Nationals passport** for those native **Negro/Afro Descendants** born and domiciled upon the **"de jure" territory of these United States of America**; in addition to, clearing up mistaking "consenting citizen status" on files in your **Revenue, Labor, Health, Banking, Education, Law Enforcement, Motor Vehicles departments**, out of the error....

Showing that **non-citizen National status** made clear, by the **"de jure" Supreme Court of the United States of America**, in the "landmark decision" (**DRED SCOTT v. SANDFORD, 60 U.S. 393 (1856) 60 U.S. 393 (How.)**), that **Negros/Afro Descendants** cannot be a citizen of the state or federal government's, thereby making native Negro/Afro Descendants non-Citizen Nationals of the "de jure" United States of America.

Therefore, "citizen's" passports for the **United States of America** are not a valid lawful option for **Negro/Afro Descendant non-Citizen Nationals**, since it has been ruled by the **United States of America Supreme Court**, that **Negro/Afro Descendants** cannot be citizens.

LAW OF THE FLAG DOCTRINE

All automobiles, watercraft, aircraft, spacecraft registered to the **Government of the Principality of Granville**, will display our flag emblem or actual flag, giving notice to all agents, pirates, terrorist, mercenaries and traitors, that these crafts are under the Laws under the **Government of the Principality of Granville** and does not submit to your operation or not contract with representatives or agents at all. Failure to adhere to this notice upon the lands of our **King Yahweh**, over his lands defined in **Exodus 19:5**, will have immediate consequences.

PLEASE MAKE SURE YOUR MINIONS ARE AWARE OF THIS OR THEY WILL BE PERCEIVED AS AN IMMINENT THREAT, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW REMEDY WILL BE APPLIED.

Pursuant to the "**Law of the Flag**", a military flag does result in jurisdictional implication when flown. The Plaintiff cites the following: "Under what is called international law, the law of the flag, a ship owner who sends his vessel into a foreign port gives notice by his flag to all who enter into contracts with the shipmaster that he intends the law of the flag to regulate those contracts with the shipmaster that he either submit to its operation or not contract with him or his agent at all." - **Ruhrstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41, 45, 185 ILL. 133, 49 LRA 181, 76 AM.**

**The Indigenous Government and Nation of the Principality of Granville
Rechayahu Ben Harvey, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Post Office Box 451321 (Northlake Station)
Atlanta, Georgia Republic [31145], Continental North America
678-243-0079. <http://pgranvillegov.net>**