

“License and registration, please”

Can any man, even a man with a badge, lawfully order you to stop in your *travels* if you have done no injury to another person, or haven't damaged property, and if there is no probable cause that you have committed a crime? In view of our state traveling papers, today called “driver's licenses”, we will examine this question and reveal the answer as it relates to the real and only LAW, the law of God Almighty, our Creator. That divine law was, as well, reflected in our early American system of law from which we will additionally be reading in support of this commentary. Although Adam had the right to liberty and freedom of travel in Eden, the first covenant related person recorded in the Scriptures to “come and go” by God's direction (freely travel) was Noah.

*“And Yahweh said unto Noah, **Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation.**”* (Genesis 7:1)

Did God Almighty charge Noah a monetary fee or impose any registered license sanction upon Noah to travel into the ark? No.

*“**Go forth of the ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives with thee.**”* (Genesis 8:16)

Did God Almighty charge Noah a monetary fee or impose any traveling tax sanction upon Noah to travel out from the ark when the flood subsided? No.

Who then was the first recorded person to present a bar to God's people to freely travel according to God's wishes? It was Pharaoh during Israel's captivity, when he placed sanctions upon Noah's descendants, the children of Israel.

*“And afterward Moses and Aaron went in, and told Pharaoh, Thus saith Yahweh God of Israel, **Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness.** And Pharaoh said, Who is Yahweh, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? **I know not Yahweh, neither will I let Israel go.**”*

*“And Pharaoh commanded the same day the taskmasters of the people, and their officers, saying, Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore: **let them go and gather straw for themselves.**”* (Exodus 5:1,2, 6,7)

In other words, Pharaoh would not let the Israel people “freely go” according to God's wishes, but they could “go/travel” according to state sanction with the provision that the state would get some compensation – bricks made in return for the “privilege” to selectively travel. Additionally, since the Israelite people dared to “ask to go freely” (travel) by authority of God, a penalty would now be imposed by the state in that the people would gather their own straw for supplying the state revenue, the bricks.

Contrary to Pharaoh's State decision forbidding free travel for God's people, Jesus Christ our King hold's the exact opposite position, as His all encompassing salvation includes freedom of movement as a basic gift He has bestowed upon us. Note what Jesus says about the order of events within His salvation: "*I am the door: by me if any man enter in, (1) he shall be saved, and (2) shall go in and out, and find pasture*". (John 10:9)

Yes, freedom of locomotion and liberty, whether physically to be about our Father's business, mentally to express our thoughts, or spiritually to seek out various callings, go hand in hand with Christian salvation and liberty.

Now let's compare what the King of Kings has gifted to us, to what the modern corporate States have dictated concerning how one may use a public road to get from point "A" to point "B". Below is from the Commonwealth of Virginia statutes, with all States having similar provisions for driving on a highway.

"Code of Virginia § 46.2-300. - - Driving without license prohibited; penalties."

"No person, except those expressly exempted in §§ 46.2-303 through 46.2-308, shall drive any motor vehicle on any highway in the Commonwealth until such person has applied for a driver's license, as provided in this article, satisfactorily passed the examination required by § 46.2-325, and obtained a driver's license, nor unless the license is valid.

A violation of this section is a Class 2 misdemeanor. A second or subsequent violation of this section is a Class 1 misdemeanor.

Upon conviction under this section, the court may suspend the person's privilege to drive for a period not to exceed 90 days.

(Code 1950, § 46-347; 1958, c. 541, § 46.1-349; 1968, c. 494; 1970, c. 347; 1984, c. 780; 1989, c. 727; 2005, c. 245; 2007, c. 532; 2008, c. 684.)"

[Notice that in the code section above that driving is considered a "**privilege**" granted by the state.]

Is driving a right or a privilege?

This question has been very much in debate within "patriot circles" over the past several decades. Some insist that there is a difference between "operating an automobile" and "driving a motor vehicle", and that therefore "operating an automobile" is not covered under the various State Motor Vehicle Codes. There may be some past associated truth to this technical argument, but as we might have expected the States have now blended so many of their "legaleze" definitions into their codes that this position cannot be used to assert one's right to travel when appearing in a State Court. Presently some State Codes do include an engine propelled "automobile" within their definition of a "motor vehicle".

Between the days of the ancient Israelites and our present times of “Motor Vehicle Codes” a lot has happened in the evolution of laws, regulations, and statutes relative to the discussion of whether driving is a right or a privilege. In fact, a whole lot has happened and it will take some doing to become aware of exactly how we have all been deceived into giving up our free right to “come and go” as originally intended by the divine command. The Scriptures plainly tell us about words, because it is by words that we must communicate our ideas. Misplaced words can cause the worst of events to take place, and spoken deceit can imprison a person:

“Take with you words, and turn to Yahweh: say unto Him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously: so will we render the calves of our lips.” (Hosea 14:2)

“Deliver my soul, O Yahweh, from lying lips, and from a deceitful tongue.” (Psalms 120:2)

Considering this, we must carefully discern what words over which we *are* contending, when it comes to the matter of moving ourselves about in our environment. The real issue is that it matters not whether a person is using a horse, a buggy, a bicycle, or an automobile as their vehicle of choice of locomotion. The question more precisely is this: “Is **traveling** (by any mode) a right? **This** is the issue. A “right” comes from that which is “right-eous” in the Scriptures. To exercise a “right” is to follow after Yahweh God’s will in creation or statutes in government:

*“And (God) said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of Yahweh thy God, and wilt **do** that which is **right** in His sight, and wilt give ear to **His commandments**, and keep all **His statutes**, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am Yahweh that healeth thee.”* (Exodus 15:26)

A “right” is that which is Scripturally defined as being derived from the righteousness found in Yahweh’s people in obedience:

*“The thoughts of the **righteous are right**: but the counsels of the wicked are deceit.”* (Proverbs 12:5)

Life in Christ is therefore a “right” given to the righteous:

“The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life; and he that winneth souls is wise.” (Proverbs 11:30)

“To him that overcometh will I (Jesus) give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.” (Rev.2:7)

Thus Christian law has stated in its historic documents that our “life is a God given right”. Our life here continues into the eternal Kingdom of our King and it is Jesus who gives us this life as a “right” in His right-eousness of His tree of life.

Liberty is also a right since the primary definition of liberty is the unimpeded freedom of locomotion. When it comes to “traveling by right” (i.e. obeying Yahweh’s command to “come and go” freely), we have been deceived by the counsels (and counselors) of the wicked. *“The thoughts of the righteous are right: but the counsels of the wicked are deceit.”* (Proverbs 12:5) Our free right to travel on our very roads has been stolen from us and sold back to us as a ***forced state privilege*** of “driving a motor vehicle” by license and privilege. It has all been done by words intended to deceive, and by the State’s avoidance of the phrase “right to travel” in their Motor Vehicle Codes.

Early American law declared the free right to travel

We are commanded by God to set up governments that reflect His laws and to decree within our social ordinances a repeat of those Divine Laws in order to cover our progressing circumstances not mentioned in the written history of the Scriptures. *“Thou shalt also decree a thing, and it shall be established unto thee: and the light shall shine upon thy ways.”* (Job 22:28) *“Submit yourselves to **every ordinance of man** for Yahweh’s sake: whether it be to (a) king, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by Him (God, and His servant governor) for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.”* (I Pet. 2:13,14)

What “ordinances of man” are to be heeded? Peter clearly says it’s those which are enacted *“for the punishment of evildoers”* and *“for Yahweh’s sake”*. It’s certainly not those regulations of Godless Babylon, nor to bend the knee statutorily to governments of evil men contrary to God, for this same Apostle who gave us I Peter 2:13 teaches us in Acts 5:29 concerning ungodly decrees *“Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, **We ought to obey God rather than men.**”* Desirable “ordinance of men” are those which reflect the will of God in their statutes *“for the punishment of evildoers”*. These include compacts, charters, constitutions, and resulting decrees of courts that historically have championed the cause of advancing Christ’s Kingdom in the Earth. It is a New Testament ***command*** that we are to obey these righteous decrees of man *“for Yahweh’s sake”*. This alone should answer the question as to whether or not we must have Commonwealth Constitutions which codify Yahweh’s basic laws. The answer is in the affirmative to deal with the many arising situations of society through time, not possibly to be altogether written into the Scriptures.

God’s Word teaches that sound “ordinances” of liberty and freedom are to be enumerated by man and upheld as being valid. These have included statements such as found in Magna Charta of 1215, the Constitution’s second amendment provision protecting our possession of firearms, the Article of Confederation’s stipulation for the American States to “enter into a firm league of friendship”, and many such declarations and decrees that ***follow*** after righteousness (Isa.51:1) Precisely how did our early American court decisions (ordinances of man) view the free right to travel on our highways and byways? Did they follow after right-eousness as mentioned in the Scriptures?

Let the following courts of record speak for themselves:

Case law cited from sovereign state court decisions on the *RIGHT* to travel in pursuance of 1 Peter 2:13,14 above. (case references from *The Right To Travel*, C.A. Weisman)

*“A highway is a public road, which every citizen of the state has a **right to use for the purpose of travel.**”* Shelby County Commissioners v. Castetter, 33 N.E. 986,987; 7 Ind. App.309

*“A highway is a road or way upon which all persons have a **right to travel at pleasure.** It is the right of all persons to travel upon a road.”* Gulf & S.I.R. Co. v. Adkinson, 77 So.954, 955; 117 Miss.118

*“The essential feature of a highway is that it is a way over which the public at large has **the right to pass.**”* State v. Pierson, 204 A.2d 838,840; 2 Conn. Cir. 660

*“**Every citizen has an inalienable 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.210,214

*“A highway according to the common law, is a place in which **all the people have a right to pass.** A common street and public highway are the same, and any way which is common to all the people may be called a ‘highway’.”* Skinner v. Town of Weathersfield, 63 A. 142,143; 78Vt.410

*“A highway is a passage, road and street which **every person has a right to use**”* Jewett v. State, Ohio, 22 O.L.A. 37

*“**The public have a right of free and unobstructed transit** over streets, sidewalks and alleys, and this is the primary and appropriate use to which they are generally dedicated.”* Pugh v. City, 176 Iowa 539,599

*“**This right of the people to the use of the public streets** of a city is so well established and so universally recognized in this country, that it has become a part of the alphabet of **fundamental rights of the citizen.**”* Swift v. City of Topeka, 43 Kan. 671, 674

*“Highways are public roads, which **every citizen has a right to use.**”* Wild v. Deig, 43 Ind. 455,458; 13 Am.Rep.399.

*“**The right to travel** over a street or highway is a primary **absolute right** of everyone.”* Foster’s Inc v. Boise City, 118 P.2d 721,728

“There can be no denial of the general proposition that every citizen of the United States, and every citizen of each State of the Union, as an attribute of personal liberty, has the right ordinarily, of free transit from, or through the territory of any State. This freedom of egress or ingress is guaranteed to all by the clearest implications of the Federal, as

well as of the State constitution. It has been said that even in England, whence our system of jurisprudence was derived, the right to personal liberty did not depend on any express statute, but “it was the birthright of every freeman.” – Cooley’s Const.Lim.342. **This right** was said by Sir William Blackstone to consist in “**the power of locomotion, of changing situation, or of moving one’s person to whatsoever place one’s inclination may direct, without imprisonment or restraint, unless by due process of law.**” 1Blackstone .Com.134. Joseph v. Randolph, 71 Ala.499,504,505.

“Stand fast therefore in the **liberty** wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.” (Galatians 5:1, another NT comandment)

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are **endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.**” -- The Declaration of Independence 1776 (note: “men” = “Adam” at Christian law)

“Liberty -- A man enjoys liberty, when no physical force operates to restrain his actions or volitions. - - - A restraint of natural liberty, not necessary or expedient for the public, is tyranny or oppression.” 1828 edition of Webster's American Dictionary of the English Language

“Liberty – The state of being exempt from the domination of others or from restricting circumstances.” Britannica World Language Dictionary, 1956, vol. 1, page 770

Neither the Bible nor early American law limited the mode of free travel. Locomotion in moving about whether by walking, camel, wagons, or automobile is a RIGHT given by God’s righteous command.

“And the children of **Israel took their journeys** out of the wilderness of Sinai; and the cloud rested in the wilderness of Paran. **And they first took their journey according to the commandment of Yahweh** by the hand of Moses.” (Num.10:12,13)

“And Yahweh said unto me, **Arise, take thy journey before the people, that they may go in and possess the land, which I sware unto their fathers to give unto them.**” (Deuteronomy 10:11)

“And Jacob rose up from Beersheba: and **the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father, and their little ones, and their wives, in the wagons** which Pharaoh had sent to carry him.” (Genesis 46:5)

“And Rebekah lifted up her eyes, and when she saw Isaac, **she lighted off the camel.**” (Genesis 24:64)

“For the kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.” (Matthew 25:14)

Both the Old Testament and the New Testament Scriptures set forth the fundamental law upon which true American government is founded, which includes the free right to travel without seeking permission “from Caesar” by paid license to do so. Free travel imposes no fee, license, or random stopping by another (badge or no badge), because the free right to travel is ordained by God Almighty within the jurisdictional rights (righteousness) of His Kingdom.

A major issue and pertinent question at Law

The question we need to ask is **“Does the invention of the automobile change any natural right we have to peacefully move about from place to place”?** That is, even though the word “automobile” is not found in the Bible, when man invented the automobile as a method of locomotion, did Yahweh God abandon the Kingdom free right to travel, which He has given us as heirs to His Kingdom in Christ? The answer is emphatically “No, Yahweh did not (and does not) abandon His righteous gift of liberty to freely travel, which right He has given us as an inheritance handed down from our Saxon Israel ancestors.” It is not Yahweh who forsakes anything by way of inheritance that He has given us. Only man, by his apathy and stubborn rebellion, discards the divine inheritances freely given by The Almighty. Yahweh’s Word is true, and He remains true.

*“For Yahweh will not cast off His people, **neither will He forsake His inheritance.** But judgment shall return unto righteousness: and **all the upright in heart shall follow it.**” (Psalm 94:14,15)*

Rights come from God and He says: *“For I am Yahweh, **I change not**”* (Malachi 3:6)

Did the upright people of early America know about their inherited divine rights and did their judgments return to “righteousness” in their decisions of law? With respect to **traveling by automobile**, did early America view it in the same venue of divine right as traveling by foot, wagon, horse, or any other mode of locomotion? Beyond doubt they most certainly did. Below are quoted just a few early State court decisions that prove the people of early America knew full well that the inherited free right to move about (travel) did not change simply because one may use an automobile instead of a horse to get from “point A” to “point B”.

Traveling by automobile (as by any method) is a **RIGHT**. Early State court “automobile” decisions reflected God’s righteousness for us to freely travel.

*“**Automobiles have the right to use the highways of the State on an equal footing with other vehicles**” Cumberland Telp. & Telegraph Company v. Yeiser, 141 Ky.*

*“**A pedestrian and an automobilist have equal rights in the use of a public highway**” Fulton v. Chouteau County Farmers’ Co., 98 Mont.48,51; Pac. (2d) 1025*

“The right of a citizen to travel upon the public highways - - 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.- - The rights aforesaid, being fundamental, are constitutional rights.” Teche Lines v. Danforth, 12 So.2d 784, 787 (Miss. 1943)

*“The law does not denounce **motor carriages**, as such, on the 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 road superior to the driver of the automobile. Both have **the right** to use the easement.” Indiana Springs Co. v. Brown, 165 Ind.465,468.*

*“ **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 highway as an automobile or any other vehicle.” Hannigan v. Wright, 63 Atl. 234, 236*

*“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 of which the citizen may not be deprived without due process of law.” Berberian v. Lussier, 139 A.2d 869,872; 87 RI 226,231 (1958)*

Many other early court decisions can be cited which prove the beginnings of our nation saw a clear cut frame of mind and heart which lawfully recognized that an individual’s **travel on the roads and highways is a Right** that cannot be infringed upon by anyone, unless that individual was seen with probable cause that they were involved in a crime. A person is breaking no true law for merely freely traveling by automobile, without a State license. Furthermore, since traveling is a right, and **all** rights not listed in the Constitution for the United States of America **are still granted to and retained by the people** (Amendment X, US of A Const.), a State’s charging of a fee for exercising any fundamental right was long ago forbidden by the U.S. Supreme Court. By law, a State **can’t** make you purchase a license to travel on a highway since **traveling by any mode is a right**. This has already been decided, but the State legislatures do it any way, and the people have acquiesced.

“A State may not impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution” Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105 at 113

Good cop, bad cop?

Since fundamental American Christian Constitutional law is based upon God Given Rights, and one of those rights is the right to travel freely upon any road or highway without having to pay a limitation fee of buying a State license, how then can a police officer stop a person for a routine “license check” and worse fine or arrest you if you

don't have a State driver's license? The truth is, *lawfully* the police can't do that as it would be, first of all, against God's Law that we may "come and go" freely within His Kingdom (government jurisdiction); and secondly, such a police stoppage of mere travel would be against the fundamental American law of liberty, which law was and still is based upon God's Law to begin with.

We have reached a sad state of affairs in America. What should be "good cops" hired by the people to be our servants to protect us from those who would rob us of our rights and injure our body, has evolved into an army of "bad cops" paid by the now corporate States to rob you of your right to travel freely upon the public highways. Of course "all cops" aren't bad people, as most have gone into that vocation with some sort of conscience of trying to keep peace in the neighborhood. But due to a gradual chipping away of our rights by politicians who are philosophical statisticians, and a sorrowful apathy on the part of Christians over the course of decades, those who have enlisted to be police officers find themselves having to daily enforce statutory laws whether or not those regulations are repugnant to American liberty and rights.

Although we need honest police to control lawbreakers in society, when it comes to the "driver's license issue" it appears that now police are primarily "out there" to collect fees from drivers so that the State government can pay its bills they have accrued in trying to maintain their presently sinking ship. In reality, a police officer can no more *lawfully* stop a traveler on the highway than you or I could by taking a sign onto the road which reads "all drivers must stop here". Police are delegated by the people and no public official can assume a power that the people themselves did not have to delegate in the first place. ***If you don't have the power to stop peaceful travelers on a highway, then a police officer as your servant does not have that power either.*** This is a maxim of law that falls under the category of "Delegation of Authority", which itself is based on the "servant/master relationship" found in the Bible. "*The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his ruler.*" (Matthew 10:24) However it is ultimately up to the sovereign individual to know what authority can be delegated and what authority cannot be delegated to a public officer in the first place.

"A person who deals with a government official is bound to know the limitations of that official's authority and to govern himself accordingly." D.P.W. v. Harambee, Inc 21 Commonwealth Ct. 430 at 436 (1975 Pa.)

By what authority does a routine traffic stop to "check driver's licenses" take place? From whence was that power ever lawfully delegated? Did Christ abdicate His supremacy as King over this issue? No He did not. The very next blessing after conversion is the maintained right to freely travel within the Divine realm. Jesus said, "*I am the door: by me if any man enter in, (1) he shall be saved, and (2) shall go in and out, and find pasture*". (John 10:9)

Does the Constitution disagree with the King of Kings? No. According to its framers, the Constitution is based upon Christian Biblical foundations. American patriot and Constitutional scholar Noah Webster informs us:

*"The religion which has introduced civil liberty is the religion of Christ and His apostles, which enjoins humility, piety, and benevolence; which acknowledges in every person a brother, or a sister, and a citizen with equal rights. **This is genuine Christianity, and to this we owe our free Constitutions of Government.**"* (Noah Webster, 1832, History of the United States)

Did the early court decisions revoke the fundamental right of travel by an automobile. No.

"Automobiles have the right to use the highways of the State on an equal footing with other vehicles" Cumberland Telp. & Telegraph Company v. Yeiser, 141 Ky.

Police power of a State cannot *lawfully* undermine the authority of either the King of Kings in America, or the compact between the original Christian States – the *original* federal Constitution. The police power of a State has never received lawful delegation of authority from anybody to stop anybody on a highway *from traveling by right*. They have only arbitrarily assumed power to stop drivers of self propelled vehicles on highways and roads by enactment of Motor Vehicle Codes.

But this matter relating to police power was also clearly dealt with by American law. Early American constitutionally authorized courts have already explained that police powers were never meant to transcend a God given right. In agreement with Scripture, good rulers who issue decrees and decisions in alignment with God's Laws and Will are considered to actually be ministers of God. (Rom.13:4). While the past several generations of America have slept, the people have forgotten the Biblical/Constitutional matters that have already been proclaimed in this land. The police cannot lawfully destroy a right, and the courts have wisely confirmed this maxim.

*"The powers of government, under our system, are nowhere absolute. They are but grants of authority from the people, and are limited to their true purposes. **The fundamental rights of the people are inheritent and have not been yielded to government control.** They are not the subjects of government authority. They are the subjects of individual authority. Constitutional powers can never transcend constitutional rights. **The police power is subject to the limitations imposed by the Constitution upon every power of government; and it will not be suffered to invade or impair the fundamental liberties of the citizen,** those natural rights which are the chief concern of the Constitution and for whose protection it was ordained by the people. - - - **It (a Constitutional right) is not a right therefore, over which the police power is paramount. Like every other fundamental liberty, it is a right to which the police power is subordinate.**"* Spann v. City of Dallas, 235 S.W. 513,515; 111 Tex. 350 (1921)

*"Where the ostensible object of an enactment is to secure the public comfort, welfare, or safety, it must appear to be adapted to that end. **It cannot invade the rights of a person and property under the guise of a mere police regulation.**"* City of Mt. Vernon v. Julian, 369 Ill 447, 451 (1938)

American Founding Father John Dickinson was a Constitutional Convention Delegate from the State of Delaware. He signed both the Articles of Confederation and the federal Constitution. Here's what Mr. Dickinson had to say about our unalienable rights:

“Kings or parliaments could not give the rights essential to happiness. . . . We claim them from a higher source – from the King of kings and Lord of all the earth. They are not annexed to us by parchments and seals. They are created in us by the decrees of Providence, which establish the laws of our nature. They are born with us, exist with us, and cannot be taken from us by any human power without taking our lives.” John Dickinson, The Political Writings of John Dickinson (Wilmington: Bonsal and Niles, 1801), Vol. I, p. 111

Plainly, what early American law reflected was a society that demanded its laws to be rooted in Godly justice, that rights were inherent from God, that the Bible was the source of our republic, that government is instituted to protect these rights, and that the police power could not be used to subvert these ends. Since it is well established that traveling on a public highway is a right, and that the police power “is subordinate to a right”, how then do we find ourselves in a position where the modern courts now say that a man with a badge may stop you in your highway travels and ask to see your driver's license and registration? We'll continue to pursue the answer.

Even in the days of the American Revolution of 1776, King George of England never issued a demand of the Colonists that they must submit to pay fees for licensed travel. England itself viewed that right so fundamental that the matter of registration and collecting a fee for traveling on a road would have never come into anybody's mind back then -- neither on the part of the Colonist revolutionaries nor British Loyalists. What a shocking realization that is when we think of it!! Americans have become so desensitized as to the abridgment of liberties they presently endure, that in truth the phrase “land of the free and the home of the brave” has very little meaning today.

Our present freedom is an illusion of controlled privileges handed out to obedient slaves who forgot to challenge “the system” somewhere along the way. Those today who dare mention that the Scriptures warned of divine judgment coming upon a wayward nation, or those who don't want to see our Constitution suspended, are now considered “terrorist suspects” in the eyes of Washington D.C's Department of Homeland Security. (DHS Homeland Environment Threat Analysis, April 7, 2009) How did we get to this point, and why do seemingly upstanding young men who become police officers stop people that are peaceably traveling on a road “for a license check” without any regard to their (the police) oath to protect our Constitutional rights?

The Driver's License: Is it deceit and extortion on the part of the present States?

Definition: Deceit -- a type of fraud , in which facts are withheld, misrepresented or falsely intimated to be true, by which a person is misled to his injury. (Cochran's Law Lexicon, 5th Ed. 1973, pg. 95)

Definition: Extortion – formerly, narrowly defined as the unlawful taking by color of office or of right, of money or anything of value which is nor due. (Cochran's Law Lexicon, 5th Ed. 1973, pg.123)

We have thus far in our study established the fact that God's Word and the original Constitutional case law of early America which reflected God's Word, both translate to a truth that traveling is a right and that any mode of normal travel is included in that right. We have seen the early State background of case law that upholds the God given right to travel as being unalienable and fundamental to liberty. We have seen that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a State may not charge a person a fee for the exercise of a right. (Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105 at 113) We have seen that all police power is subordinate to these rights. (Spann v. City of Dallas, 235 S.W. 513,515; 111 Tex. 350 (1921))

There is primarily one reason as to why the State feels they can intrude upon a person's rights when it comes to what happens on the roads such as making you wear a seatbelt whether or not you wish to, or to be stopped in the middle of your lawful and peaceable travel to a destination for a routine ID and papers check. ***That reason is the matter of licensing.*** The State has assumed that for you to even be on the road traveling by a self propelled machine in the first place, that you must petition a DMV and pay for a driver's license in order to have their permission or as they deem it - - "a privilege". In this the State does err completely showing yet more ignorance of their primary job of protecting our Scripturally proclaimed and Constitutionally protected rights, as well as revealing their ignorance of what a license is and what a license grants.

In Volume 16, American Jurisprudence, 177, we find the following:

"The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed. Such a statute leaves the question that it purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not been enacted.

"Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection, and justifies no acts performed under it. . . .

A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing valid law. Indeed, insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby.

No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it. "

Since the States are acting unlawfully and in contradiction to God Almighty concerning the free right to peaceably travel by any mode, they are in effect, law breakers both Biblically and Constitutionally. Their further dastardly deed enters when they force citizens to become an accomplice to the crime by forcing them to renounce their God given birthright to free travel, and buy a license to drive on the road by State privilege. Say “no” and it’s off to jail you go. Try arguing with a court that you don’t want to be an accomplice to their crime and that you are actually a victim, and it’s still off to jail you go. Legally, how does the State attempt to absolve itself of any wrongdoing in this matter? They have you agree to “voluntarily” sign a license by which you sign away your rights, and contract with them to do something you lawfully aren’t actually permitted to do, namely partake in a scheme whereby *travel* is remanded to an arena of a bought and paid for activity.

First, let’s define exactly what a license is, then we’ll better be able to see how its use has been perverted beyond its meaning with regard to a “driver’s license”.

“License – permission or authority to do something, which would be wrongful or illegal to do, if the permission or authority were not granted.” Cochran’s Law Lexicon, 5th Ed., page 182

All licenses are not bad, and some are even necessary in the course of contact with one’s neighbor in society. A good example of a proper use of a license would be in the case of hunting on another person’s private property. We don’t have a right to trespass onto another’s property and take wild game from it. That would be both unlawful and illegal. However, if the property owner grants you license to come on his property to hunt game, it would be a mutual understanding that you are doing so by privilege and not by right. There would be nothing wrong with this as it is a “good license” to which both sides are part. Your previously unlawful act of trying to hunt by right on another’s property is now made legal by license to do so by permission, and no wrong is done thereby.

“A license is a mere permit to do something that without it would be unlawful.” Littleton v. Burgess, 82 P. 864; Wyo.173

By the original Christian American law upon which this nation was established, is it unlawful to travel? No, it is not. It is a right. *Since it is not unlawful to travel*, and the law of this nation long ago agreed that the right to travel includes a motorized carriage/automobile/vehicle as well as traveling by foot, horse, wagon, or by any other means --- then *one does not need a license to travel* the roads by automobile. Perversion of this most basic concept of liberty has taken place “*while men slept*” (Mat.13:25) and

now men with official State titles force the honest citizen to purchase a license to drive/travel on the roads. Not only is this a perversion of law – it dangerously enters into the definition of coercion since the citizen is given no choice in the matter, and those citizens who do know the law are made to do something they know they should not do.

“Coersion – constraint; compulsion; compelling a person by physical force or by threats to do what he otherwise would not do.” Cochran’s Law Lexicon, 5th Ed., page 67

The fact that “everybody has to get a driver’s license” has no bearing on the case. Liberty, freedom, and justice have been perverted by the State in their forcing people to apply for and obtain a license, pay for a right which can neither lawfully be bought nor sold, convert that right into a privilege, and virtually shut down the public roads for the few who have tried to not comply with this madness. In this the State is forcing the law abiding resident to join a multitude in doing evil.

“Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to turn aside after many to pervert judgment.” (Ex.23:2)

Traveling from “point A” to “point B” peaceably and when no crime is being committed is well established by true American law to be a right for which no license need be purchased. The next time you are stopped in your travels on the highway for a routine “police check point” and the officer demands to see your driver’s license, realize the depth to which our nation has sunk. Pray for a return to liberty in America.

Disclaimer: Please do not use the foregoing article as “legal advice” in any way, as it is not “legal advice”. I felt this disclaimer necessary to add considering the personal experiences a few of us have had surrounding the driver’s license issue in America. The reason I have written this essay is not as a tutorial for being used in court, or for an attempt on the part of the reader to ignore his/her unfortunate license term agreements they made with their particular State. There are many more additional issues involved here than what is presented, before any consideration of a “court challenge” would ensue. This brief article is to merely expose the truth to the reader of yet one more right that we have lost due to our non exercise of them. Claims are always being made for a “silver bullet answer” to this particular deprivation of rights. Caution is the word with respect to what is out there in “cyber land” about taking on the State in view of the DMV codes. There are knowledgeable Christian Patriots who are constantly looking for a successful non violent remedy at law in upholding the free right to travel. If I become aware of any that are presently successful, it will be posted here with an update. We are actively still looking and searching. Thanks and blessings! Liberalism and socialism will fail. Have no doubt about that. When it does be ready to implement good law again, including your freely given right to travel.

Blessings to the remnant in Jesus Christ, Ken Lent

