

***POLICY DOCUMENT:
FREEDOM LAW SCHOOL APPROACH TOWARDS
CITIZENSHIP***

A promotional graphic for Freedom Law School. The background is a collage of historical and legal imagery, including a scroll with the words 'ALL THE PEOPLE', a quill pen, a gavel, and a book. In the center is a portrait of a smiling man in a suit. The text 'FREEDOM LAW SCHOOL' is written in large, bold, serif font at the top. Below it is the website 'www.LiveFreeNow.Org' and the phone number '(813) 444-4800'. At the bottom, it says 'Weekly Conference Call' and 'Get Your Questions Answered' followed by the URL 'http://www.LiveFreeNow.Org/weekly-calls'.

FREEDOM LAW SCHOOL
www.LiveFreeNow.Org (813) 444-4800

Weekly Conference Call
Get Your Questions Answered
<http://www.LiveFreeNow.Org/weekly-calls>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	2
1 Introduction	5
2 Freedom Law School Policy on State Citizenship	5
2.1 Where did citizenship come from?	6
2.2 How about citizenship in America?	6
2.3 Did the U.S. Constitution change anything?	7
2.4 Didn't the 14th Amendment change anything?	8
2.5 Form our own "Jural Society", "Township" or "Common Law Court" to have them leave us alone?	9
2.6 So, what can I do now to live free?	9
3 Rebuttal to FLS citizenship policy	10
3.1 Summary of objections to article	10
3.2 Do SEDM advocate "state citizenship" that he describes?	13
3.3 Does SEDM advocate the components of "state citizenship" fallacies he describes?	13
3.4 False statement: Every human is a "person"	14
3.5 What does SEDM agree with about the article	15
4 Resources for further Research and Rebuttal	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions

13th amendment	8
14th amendment	5, 8
14th Amendment	8, 9, 13
Article 2, Section 1, Paragraph 5	8
Articles of Confederation	6
Bill of Rights	11, 12
Citizenship and Sovereignty Course, Form #12.001	16
First Amendment	12, 13
King of England	6, 7
Massachusetts Bill of Rights	6
The Federalist No. 15, p. 108	6
Why the Fourteenth Amendment is Not a Threat to Your Freedom Course, Form #08.015	15

Statutes

26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10)	13
26 U.S.C. §911(d)	13
California Revenue and Taxation Code sections 6017 and 17018	14
U.C.C. 1-207	10
U.C.C. 1-308	10

Regulations

26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3)	13
---------------------------------	----

Cases

Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936)	12
Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857)	7
Electric Co. v. Dow, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088	12
Gardina v. Board of Registrars of Jefferson County, 48 So. 788, 160 Ala. 155	7
Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527	11
Lane County v. Oregon, 7 Wall at 76	7
Lansing v. Smith, 21 D. 89	8
Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R. Co., 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108	12
Magill v. Browne, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408	12
Pierce v. Somerset Ry., 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316	12
Read New York v. U.S. 505 U.S. 144 (1992) on page 163	6
St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast Construction Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351	11
Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407, 411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229	11

Other Authorities

‘Sovereign Citizen’ Bruce Doucette Sentenced To 38 years	5
6 Words and Phrases, 5583, 5584	12
A J. Lien, “Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States,” in Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. 54, p. 31	12
Abraham Lincoln	8
Are you a “United States Citizen” who is required to pay Income Tax?, Freedom Law School	15
Are you a Sovereign, State Citizen, US Citizen, or American National?, Freedom Law School	15
Are You a Sovereign, State or U.S. Citizen, or U.S. National?, Freedom Law School	15
Are you, as a sovereign, state citizen, or U.S. national, a Non-Resident Alien who must pay income tax?, Freedom Law School	15
Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856	10
Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Family Guardian Fellowship	15
Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Form #10.011, Section 1	14
Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status Options, Form #10.003	13
Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001	10
Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007	11
Family Guardian Forums, Forum 6.1.4: Citizenship Questions, Confusion, and Disinformation	15
Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004, Section 8.16, 8.17, and 9.15	15
George Washington	8
Government Franchises Course, Form #12.012	15
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030	14, 15
Money Laundering Enforcement Scam, Form #05.044	13
Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020	15
Policy Document: Rebutted false Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018, Section 5.9	13
Proof That There is a “Straw Man”, Form #05.042	12, 14
SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4	10
SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4.20	11
Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025	14
State vs. U.S. Citizenship Theory Reconsidered, Freedom Law School	5, 15
The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001	15
The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10	12
Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine	12
Who’s Who in the Freedom Community, Form #08.009	5, 16
Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002	15
Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 11.14	14

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 11.17	14
Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037	11, 13
Why You are a Political Citizen but Civil Non-Citizen, National, and Nonresident Alien, Form #05.006	13, 16
Why You are a Political Citizen but Civil Non-Citizen, National, and Nonresident Alien, Form #05.006, Section 2: Political Citizens (Citizens*) v. Civil Citizens (Citizens**+D)	11

1 Introduction

This policy document deals specifically with the approach towards citizenship advanced by Peymon Mottahedeh of Freedom Law School. His position has evolved over the years, as evidenced by the article we respond to here.

The author has been a student of Peymon Mottahedeh for many years. The author has attended several of his annual Freedom Rallies in Irvine, California, attended his course on citizenship in Phalen, California in approximately 2002, and has several Freedom Law School publications. The author has also participated in Bob Schulz events in combination with Peymon and is friends with Peymon. This document is not intended as a personal attack on Peymon, but upon the accuracy of his claims about citizenship. We like Peymon as a person.

If you would like more information about our view of Freedom Law School, See:

Who's Who in the Freedom Community, Form #08.009
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2 Freedom Law School Policy on State Citizenship

The following subsections after the horizontal line derive from the following source, downloaded on 9/29/2022:

State vs. U.S. Citizenship Theory Reconsidered, Freedom Law School
<https://livefreenow.org/state-vs-u-s-citizenship-theory-reconsidered/>

1. Are you either a sovereign **state citizen** or a slave 14th amendment **U.S. citizen**?
2. The Federal Gov. has absolutely **no power** over a state citizen **in the Union**.
3. Have **you read** the court cases that the state citizenship proponents rely on to find out if their quotes from court cases are correct?

The answer to all of the above is a solid **NO!**

Please read this very short essay by Peymon M., a former proponent of state vs. U.S. citizenship theory and how a bad misunderstanding of the citizenship issue got this man 38 years in prison.

[‘Sovereign Citizen’ Bruce Doucette Sentenced To 38 years](http://www.cpr.org/news/story/sovereign-citizen-bruce-doucette-sentenced-38-years-for-racketeering-tax-evasion-other)
<http://www.cpr.org/news/story/sovereign-citizen-bruce-doucette-sentenced-38-years-for-racketeering-tax-evasion-other>

Many of us are fed up with the oppressive taxation and control that we are suffering at the hands of government at all levels. Back in 1993, I was persuaded to believe that I had unknowingly allowed myself to become a U.S. citizen/slave by trading in my “sovereign state citizen status” to that of a “U.S. citizen/subject/slave” created by the 14th Amendment of the Constitution for the United States of America.

I used to teach “state citizenship.” I studied with some of the most renowned “state citizenship” experts in America. Not knowing how to look up a court case in the law library, I never read the full court cases, which I previously quoted from the law digest books.

Eventually, when I learned how to find a court case in the law library, and upon the insistence of some good friends, I pulled out and read the full text of each court case from which I was quoting. I did not like what I read. I was wrong about this whole thing. **But hey, better to stand corrected than to keep my head in the sand.**

Do yourself a favor and **read the full court cases, which I quote**. Make sure for yourself that your position is the correct one. **If you don’t know how to find the court cases in the law library, you may get them through me.** Happy reading.

2.1 Where did citizenship come from?

In the beginning, people were created free, independent, and sovereign and no one could force them to do anything unless they were overpowered. This is exactly what happened. Evil people formed gangs that attacked, raped, robbed, and murdered other free, independent, and sovereign men, women and children, one by one.

This went on for a while until the good people “wised up” and started forming their own good gangs and tribes mutually to protect each other from the evil gangs and thereby created a gang, tribe, jural society or a state. **The fundamental purpose of any gang, tribe, jural society, or state is to protect the life, liberty, and property of its individual members. Members of these groups are also called citizens.**

The Massachusetts Bill of Rights is explicit regarding how this takes place:

“The body politic is formed by a voluntary association of individuals; it is a social compact by which the whole people covenants with each citizen and each citizen with the whole people that all shall be governed by certain laws for a common good.”

Each group outlined a **territory or turf**, which they called collectively theirs. The borders of this area are the **borders of the state**. To assure the continued existence of this collective entity, which is needed to protect each of its individual members, each member in addition to his or her rights had privileges; immunities and **duties (such as jury duty, service in the militia...)**. This way the shared contribution of everyone assured the future protection of all members and their posterity (children). This is a classical “all for one and one for all” kind of a situation.

By now, you realize that in the political sense, **the terms gang, tribe, jural society and state are synonymous. The word “member” (of a gang or tribe) is the same as a “citizen of a state”**. I know this might sound distasteful for some people to accept that their state is just a collection or group of people (albeit a good one with good purposes in mind), but I never promised you that reality is always sweet; did your parents?

2.2 How about citizenship in America?

In 1776, after the American people kicked the sovereign King of England out of the colonies by the use of force, the American people once again became sovereigns. As mentioned above, to protect themselves from control and abuse by the power hungry criminal gangs (the mobsters of the time), they organized themselves into 13 distinct and separate groups/gangs (states).

Under the Articles of Confederation, these states joined in a voluntary association for their mutual benefit much like how most (not all) countries of the world are members of a confederacy called the United Nations. The confederate government (the United States) supposedly had limited powers over its member nations much like the way the U.N. has limited powers over its member states.

Read *New York v. U.S.* 505 U.S. 144 (1992) on page 163 which states:

*“Alexander Hamilton observed: ‘The great and radical vice in the **construction of the existing confederation** is in the principle of **LEGISLATION for STATES or GOVERNMENTS**, in their CORPORATE or COLLECTIVE CAPACITIES, and as contra distinguished from the INDIVIDUALS of whom they consist.’ “*
[The Federalist No. 15, p. 108.]

The confederate U.S., like the U.N. of today, had no power over the individual citizens of its member states and was totally dependent upon the whim of the clear and strong majority of its members to pressure the members who are behind in paying their membership dues to pay up; otherwise the U.N. and the confederate U.S. are both powerless to do anything about their lack of funds.

In the same US Supreme Court case, *New York v. U.S.*, on page 163, we read:

“Under the Articles of Confederation, Congress lacked the authority in most respects to govern the people directly. In practice, Congress could not directly tax or legislate upon individuals; it had no explicit ‘legislative’ or ‘governmental’ power to make binding ‘law’ enforceable as such.”

2.3 Did the U.S. Constitution change anything?

The American people were told in 1789 that in order for them to be better served by their gangs/groups (states) they ought to approve the creation of a new and empowered super gang (the U.S. government), which will exercise certain functions (powers) delegated from the states to this new super gang or super state. Furthermore, the states would no longer be under the power of the U.S. (which could not be enforced anyway), and retain their sovereignty. They would just be prohibited from exercising those functions (powers) now delegated to the U.S. government.

The US Supreme Court went on in *New York v. U.S.* pages 165 and 166 to quote various Constitutional Convention delegates. Charles Pinckney explained:

"The necessity of having a government which should at once operate on the people, and not upon the states, was conceived to be indispensable by every delegation present. '...Laws to be effective must not be laid on states, but upon individuals.'...And the laws of the Confederation were binding on the states in their political capacities, but now the thing is entirely different. The laws of Congress will be binding on individuals." "...In providing for a stronger central government, therefore, the framers explicitly chose a constitution that confers upon Congress the power to regulate individuals, not States. As we have seen, the Court has consistently respected this choice."

However, now the individual members (**citizens**) of these states, in the areas delegated to the U.S. government came directly under its powers and **thereby became members/citizens of the super state called the United States** (U.S. for short). This was a proposal which the anti-federalists like Patrick Henry strongly opposed and argued as an opening window to a new central government which will eventually come to oppress the people much like the King of England (How right they were is too obvious now.)

Nevertheless, the anti-federalists lost the argument and the people of the several states allegedly approved the Constitution of the United States of America, which created a new U.S. government and our dual system of government.

In *New York v. United States*, on page 162 the court states:

"Both the States and the United States existed before that instrument established a more perfect union by substituting a national government, acting with ample power, directly over citizens, instead of the confederate government which acted with powers, greatly restricted, only upon the states." Lane County v. Oregon, 7 Wall at 76

This is to say that, if a bunch of street gangs, like the Crips and the Bloods (famous L.A. gangs) came together to form a Union in which they delegated powers to a Super Gang authority, and in the areas delegated, their members also became members of this Super Gang.

By becoming a member (citizen) of the Super Gang (the U.S.) you become eligible to become the member (citizen) of the gang (state) of which you lived in its turf (the state in which you live): a **U.S. and State citizen at the same time**.

In *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 60 U.S. 393 (1857), the U.S. Supreme court stated:

"It is true, every person, and every class and descriptions, of persons, who were at the time of the adoption of the constitution recognized as citizens in the several states, became also citizens of this new political body [The United States of America]."

When I was getting into "state citizenship", I was shown by a law digest quote which stated:

"(Ala. 1909) there are two classes of citizens, citizens of the United States and of the state; and one may be a citizen of the former without being a citizen of the latter. Gardina v. Board of Registrars of Jefferson County, 48 So. 788, 160 Ala. 155."

This statement appeared to indicate a case of 14th Amendment U.S. citizen, which was held not to be a state citizen. But if you read the actual court case, you will get a very different picture.

The court actually said:

1 *"There is, then, under our republican form of government, two classes of citizens, one of the United States and*
2 *one of the state. Once class of citizenship may exist in a person without the other, as in the case of a resident of*
3 *the District of Columbia; but both classes usually exist in the same person. The federal government by this*
4 *amendment (the 14th amendment) has undertaken to say who shall be citizen of both of the states and United*
5 *States."*

6 **2.4 Didn't the 14th Amendment change anything?**

7 Yes. The alleged **14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution** changed some things. For example, it allowed the former black
8 and oriental slaves who were supposedly freed by the alleged 13th amendment to become U.S. and State citizens in a
9 wholesale way. It also brought state legislation under the scrutiny of the U.S. government in many ways never intended by
10 the founding fathers...

11 However, **it did not create a new class of citizenship as suggested by some.** Remember, by ratification of the U.S.
12 Constitution, each citizen of the state was also made a citizen of the United States.

13 Can you disprove the state citizenship proponent's arguments?

14 The state citizenship theory claims many other things such as:

- 15 1. A "state citizen" is not a "person."
- 16 2. "Resident" means only a temporary place of living, and is for U.S. citizens, not state citizens.
- 17 3. A state citizen is individually sovereign.
- 18 4. A state citizen is not subject to state and federal legislation.
- 19 5. Income taxation is primarily based on your status as a 14th Amendment U.S. citizen.
- 20 6. The word "United States" means only Washington D.C. and federal territories.

21 To clearly and unequivocally disprove the above I will mostly refer to the very court cases that they refer to and pre-14th
22 Amendment (1868) court cases and dictionaries.

23 **The words 1) "person," 2) "resident" and 6) "United States:"**

24 The 1867 Bouvier's Law Dictionary states "Persons are also divided into citizens and aliens when viewed with regard to their
25 political rights." The U.S. Constitution in Article 2, Section 1, Paragraph 5 states:

26 *"No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at this of the Adoption of this*
27 *Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office... and*
28 *been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States."*

29 Obviously, "citizens" are included in the meaning of the word "person". George Washington and Abraham Lincoln were
30 Citizens of the United States "residing" in the **"United States" (states of the Union).**

31 **3) A state citizen is individually a sovereign:**

32 I was originally convinced that state citizens are sovereign when I read this quotation from a law digest:

33 *"People of a state are entitled to all rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative. Lansing v.*
34 *Smith, 21 D. 89."*

35 Wow! I was so excited to get confirmation that I am truly free and independent as a sovereign. I went about teaching this to
36 many others, until I learned how to look up a court case in the law library and dug up this *hard-to-find* case of **Lansing v.**
37 **Smith**, of which no one I knew had seen a copy.

38 The Supreme Court of New York in 1829 did say the above, but what it said immediately after gave it a totally different
39 meaning. The sentence in Lansing continued;

40 *"Through the medium of the legislature they may exercise all the powers which previous to the revolution, could*
41 *have been exercised by the King alone..."*

This case was about the right to navigate in the waters of New York. Further down the same page the court continues: “The right to navigate the public waters of the state, to fish therein, and the right to use the public highways, are all **public rights belonging to the people at large**. They are **not the private inalienable rights of each individual**.” Reading the rest of the story does draw a different picture, doesn’t it?

4) The “state citizen” is not subject to State or Federal legislation:

The 1867 Bouvier’s Law Dictionary under the definition of “person” states:

“When the word ‘persons’ is spoken of in legislative acts, natural persons will be intended, unless something appears in the context to show that it applies to artificial persons. 2 III. 178. “It describes Natural persons as: “Natural persons are divided into males, or men, and females or women.”

Clearly **if you are a man or woman**, you are a “natural person” and a “person”, and you are the “person” in the state and federal legislatures acts to which they are subjecting the laws.

5) Income taxation is primarily based upon your status as a 14th Amendment U.S. citizen.

The definition of “United States” applying to most of the Internal Revenue Code (Title 26 of the US Codes) is much different than the definition of “United States” in the code dealing with citizenship, the Nationality and Immigration Code (Title 8, Chapter 12). Citizens of the 50 states are only liable to the extent they have income effectively connected with the performance of the functions of a [federal] **public office**.

For a full explanation of “Who IS required to file and pay income tax”, see our April 9, 2020 Freedom Hour video at <https://youtu.be/-0bOXfdOOuQ>, and the follow-up Freedom Hour video on June 18, 2020, “Are you, as a sovereign, state citizen or US National, a Non-Resident Alien who must pay income tax?” at <https://youtu.be/SjK1oVREaVk>.

2.5 Form our own “Jural Society”, “Township” or “Common Law Court” to have them leave us alone?

Yes, you may; but remember, they **claim** that **they** are the **only** lawful authority around. If your group starts to get too big or successful they may simply crush you and portray you as the “extremist nut” like they did in the Waco massacre. **If** they did not let the South secede (separate) from the American Union back in 1861, what makes **you think** they will let you and your friends secede now?

2.6 So, what can I do now to live free?

There is a lot that you can do to regain your freedoms. The hated income tax is voluntary; “income” legally refers to privileged activities and not to compensation for your labor. The primary purpose of government is still to protect your life, liberty, and property.

You will find the “silver bullet” within the following quotes:

“Freedom is not free.” American idiom

“If a nation expects to be ignorant and free ... it wants something which never was and never will be.” Thomas Jefferson

“Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.” John 8:32, New Testament, King James version

Click [here \(http://livefreenow.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/State-v-US-Citizenship-rediscovered-Court-Cases.pdf\)](http://livefreenow.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/State-v-US-Citizenship-rediscovered-Court-Cases.pdf) to obtain the court cases and cites mentioned in this article.

3 Rebuttal to FLS citizenship policy

3.1 Summary of objections to article

We don't doubt Peymon's sincerity. Most if the inaccuracies in his article are a product of over-generalization. The hazard of doing this is recognized in the following maxim of law:

"Dolus versatur generalibus. A deceiver deals in generals. 2 Co. 34."

"Fraus latet in generalibus. Fraud lies hid in general expressions."

Generale nihil certum implicat. A general expression implies nothing certain. 2 Co. 34.

Ubi quid generaliter conceditur, in est haec exceptio, si non aliquid sit contra jus fasque. Where a thing is concealed generally, this exception arises, that there shall be nothing contrary to law and right. 10 Co. 78.

[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856; SOURCE:

<https://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMaxims.htm>]

Peymon's article suffers several defects:

1. The article doesn't define what it means by "sovereign". This sets the stage for needless arguments about the possibility of sovereignty. We define it in our SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4 to mean the following:

SEDM Disclaimer
Section 4: Meaning of Words
4.20 Sovereign

The word "sovereign" when referring to humans or governments means all the following:

1. A human being and NOT a "government". Only human beings are "sovereign" and only when they are acting in strict obedience to the laws of their religion. All powers of government are delegated from the PEOPLE and are NOT "divine rights". Those powers in turn are only operative when government PREVENTS the conversion of PRIVATE rights into PUBLIC rights. When that goal is avoided or undermined or when law is used to accomplish involuntary conversion, we cease to have a government and instead end up with a private, de facto for profit corporation that has no sovereign immunity and cannot abuse sovereign immunity to protect its criminal thefts from the people.

2. EQUAL in every respect to any and every government or actor in government. All governments are legal "persons" and under our Constitutional system, ALL "persons" are equal and can only become UNEQUAL in relation to each other WITH their EXPRESS and NOT IMPLIED consent. Since our Constitutional rights are unalienable per the Declaration of Independence, then we can't become unequal in relation to any government, INCLUDING through our consent.

3. Not superior in any way to any human being within the jurisdiction of the courts of any country.

4. Possessing the EQUAL right to acquire rights over others by the same mechanisms as the government uses. For instance, if the government encourages the filing of FALSE information returns that essentially "elect" people into public office without their consent, then we have an EQUAL right to elect any and every government or officer within government into our PERSONAL service as our PERSONAL officer without THEIR consent. See:



[Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001.](#)

5. Subject to the criminal laws of the jurisdiction they are physically situated in, just like everyone else. This provision excludes "quasi criminal provisions" within civil franchises, such as tax crimes.

6. The origin of all authority delegated to the government per the Declaration of Independence.

7. Reserving all rights and delegating NONE to any and every government or government actor. U.C.C. 1-308 and its predecessor, U.C.C. 1-207.

8. Not consenting to any and every civil franchise offered by any government.

9. Possessing the same sovereign immunity as any government. Hence, like the government, any government actor asserting a liability or obligation has the burden of proving on the record of any court proceeding EXPRESS WRITTEN consent to be sued before the obligation becomes enforceable.

10. Claiming no civil or franchise status under any statutory franchise, including but not limited to "citizen", "resident", "driver" (under the vehicle code), "spouse" (under the family code), "taxpayer" (under the tax code). Any attempt to associate a statutory status and the public rights it represents against a non-consenting party is THEFT and SLAVERY and INJUSTICE.

11. Acting as a fiduciary, agent, and trustee on behalf of God 24 hours a day, seven days a week as an ambassador of a legislatively foreign jurisdiction and as a public officer of "Heaven, Inc.", a private foreign corporation. God is the ONLY "sovereign" and the source of all sovereignty. We must be acting as His agent and fiduciary before we can exercise any sovereignty at all. Any attempt by so-called "government" to interfere with our ability to act as His fiduciaries is a direct interference with our right to contract and the free exercise of religion. See:



[Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007](#)

12. Capable of being civilly sued ONLY under the common law and equity and not under any statutory civil law. All statutory civil laws are law for government and public officers, and NOT for private human beings. They are civil franchises that only acquire the "force of law" with the consent of the subject. See:



[Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037](#)

13. Protected from the civil statutory law by the First Amendment requirement for separation of church and state because we Christians are the church and our physical body is the "temple" of the church. See: [1 Cor. 6:19](#).

14. Responsible for all the injuries they cause to every other person under equity and common law ONLY, and not under civil statutory law.

[SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4.20; SOURCE: <https://sedm.org/disclaimer.htm#4>. MEANINGS OF WORDS]

Based on the above definition of "sovereign", he doesn't explain why it is impossible, even though he suggests that it is. It seems absurd to us to suggest that the above type of "sovereignty" is a legal impossibility, because the Bill of Rights guarantees it.

2. The article doesn't clarify that there are TWO contexts for the term "citizen" and "person", which are STATUTORY and CONSTITUTIONAL. Hence, he needlessly confuses the two and misleads the reader by engaging in "equivocation as a form of legal deception. See:

[Why You are a Political Citizen but Civil Non-Citizen, National, and Nonresident Alien](#), Form #05.006, Section 2: Political Citizens (Citizens*) v. Civil Citizens (Citizens**+D)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. The article refuses to acknowledge the TWO types of protection afforded by "gangs" as he calls them: Civil and Criminal.

- 3.1. You can receive CRIMINAL protection WITHOUT being a member of any kind.
- 3.2. Common law protection ALSO does not require membership, but mere physical presence on the territory.
- 3.3. The only type of protection that is contingent on membership is CIVIL STATUTORY protection.
- 3.4. The ONLY people who can lawfully invoke civil statutory protection are agents and officers of the government. PRIVATE human beings CANNOT. See:

[Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons](#), Form #05.037
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 3.5. Those who invoke civil statutory protections automatically and implicitly surrender ALL of their constitutional rights AND the protections of the common law. Only a FOOL would do that! Since the Freedom Law School invokes the I.R.C. statutes on behalf of their clients for tax purposes, then they must be such a fool:

The Court developed, for its own governance in the cases confessedly within its jurisdiction, a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision. They are:

[. . .]

6. The Court will not pass upon the constitutionality of a statute at the instance of one who has availed himself of its benefits. [FN7 Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General](#), 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527; [Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co.](#), 244 U.S. 407, 411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229; [St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast Construction Co.](#), 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351.

FOOTNOTES:

FN7 Compare *Electric Co. v. Dow*, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088; *Pierce v. Somerset Ry.*, 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316; *Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R. Co.*, 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108.

[*Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936)]

"The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar right or private law conceded to particular persons or places **whereby a certain individual or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law.** Privilege or immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim to the exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular advantage or exemption."

[*The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship*, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10;

SOURCE:

http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_immunities_of_state_c.pdf

FOOTNOTES:

See *Magill v. Browne*, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408; 6 Words and Phrases, 5583, 5584; A J. Lien, "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," in *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*, vol. 54, p. 31.

4. The article refuses to acknowledge the TWO separate geographical jurisdictions that the national government legislates for and WHICH specific jurisdiction applies by default in the case of federal statutes and even state revenue statutes, which is the first:
 - 4.1. Territories/possessions.
 - 4.2. States of the Union.
5. The article doesn't acknowledge the TWO components of citizenship: nationality (political status) v. domicile (civil status).
 - 5.1. Civil status is the origin of civil statutory authority.
 - 5.2. You can have nationality and a political status WITHOUT a civil domicile or a civil status, and be protected by the Bill of Rights WITHOUT being protected by the civil statutes.
6. It doesn't acknowledge the VOLUNTARY nature of membership in a jural society for EACH of the two components above.
 - 6.1. All just powers of government derive from the consent of the governed.
 - 6.2. Anything not expressly consensual is UNJUST, by implication.
 - 6.3. An act of birth is NOT an act of consent. Nationality is a product of BIRTH, and therefore, cannot confer any CIVIL statutory jurisdiction upon a government or civil status upon the human being. Therefore, it CANNOT constitute the type of voluntary "membership" he refers to.
 - 6.4. If the First Amendment and the common law mean anything at all, they must mean that you have a right NOT to receive or pay for any "benefit" associated with either of the two components of citizenship. This is the origin of the notion of consent on the subject of citizenship.
7. The article doesn't acknowledge the common law right to NOT receive or pay for the "benefit" in SPECIFIC circumstances.
 - 7.1. For instance, being a "citizen" while abroad but not at home, or being a citizen for one title of code but not for another. The essence of sovereignty is CHOICE, and we should have a CHOICE whether we want to accept EACH SPECIFIC type of protection.
 - 7.2. Each title of code is and should be independent and receiving the "benefit" of one should not mean you are obligated to receive the benefit and pay for ALL civil statutes or franchises. That violates the Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine of the U.S. Supreme Court.
8. It doesn't acknowledge the nature of membership as a public office. Anything that conveys or transfers otherwise PRIVATE rights or control over rights to the government MUST involve a public office or government agency of some kind. See:
 - 8.1. *Proof That There is a "Straw Man"*, Form #05.042

<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

8.2. *Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons*, Form #05.037

<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

9. It refuses to acknowledge that the right to legislate for individuals is limited to territories/possessions and NOT states of the Union. THIS is what the founders were talking about in the quotes he cites. The enumerated powers listed in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution place NO obligations or authority over the individual in a state of the Union UNLESS they are public officers within the government. Otherwise, they are PRIVATE and beyond the legislative authority of government. This even includes federal criminal statutes. Case in point is the money laundering statutes and crimes. See:

Money Laundering Enforcement Scam, Form #05.044

<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

10. It doesn't recognize WHICH "individual" he is talking about.

10.1. The "individual" in the tax code, for instance, is an ALIEN. See 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3).

10.2. STATUTORY "citizens" under the Internal Revenue Code, meaning human beings born on federal territory and domiciled there, ONLY become "individuals" while ABROAD under 26 U.S.C. §911(d). They CANNOT be "individuals" while physically present or domiciled ANYWHERE in the geographical "United States" defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10). That "United States" is defined ONLY to expressly include the District of Columbia.

10.3. The reason for the above restrictions is jurisdiction over FOREIGN affairs ONLY. Aliens at home and citizens abroad are an exclusively foreign affairs function. Those born and domiciled in a constitutional state is NOT a foreign affairs function.

As usual, Peymon's understanding of the law on citizenship is incomplete and overly general. The subjects listed above constitutes an injury to both himself and his clients if he takes his position in court.

Finally, those wishing to explore the above nuances of citizenship should read the following:

1. *Why You are a Political Citizen but Civil Non-Citizen, National, and Nonresident Alien*, Form #05.006

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyANational.pdf>

2. *Citizenship Status v. Tax Status*, Form #10.011

<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm>

3. *Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status Options*, Form #10.003 -explanation of the above useful for filing in court

<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitDomTaxStatusOptions.pdf>

3.2 Do SEDM advocate "state citizenship" that he describes?

We don't advocate ANY kind of statutory citizenship. We simply want to be left alone civilly by the government, NOT be protected by civil statutes, and be protected ONLY by the Constitution and the common law and equity. If we can't be equal to the government in court and don't have the SAME sovereign immunity that they have, then government has become a pagan religion that compels us to worship possessing an unconstitutional "Title of Nobility". It is also our right to do so under the First Amendment. It is an oxymoron to call yourself "sovereign" and at the same time, claim ANY civil status under any statute or civil franchise, INCLUDING but not limited to "citizen". We cover this in the following:

Policy Document: Rebutted false Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018, Section 5.9

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3.3 Does SEDM advocate the components of "state citizenship" fallacies he describes?

For the record, we DON'T claim any of the following in relation to state citizenship:

1. A "state citizen" is not a "person."
2. "Resident" means only a temporary place of living, and is for U.S. citizens, not state citizens.
3. A state citizen is individually sovereign.
4. Income taxation is primarily based on your status as a 14th Amendment U.S. citizen.
5. The word "United States" means only Washington D.C. and federal territories.

1 Instead, we claim that:

2 1. Whether one is a civil statutory “person” is determined by the DOMICILE, and not their NATIONALITY. See:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 11.17
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3 2. Word “resident”

4 2.1. “resident” Means EITHER of the following.

5 2.1.1. An ALIEN or...

6 2.1.2. A government contractor who has accepted privileges.

7 For details, see:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 11.14
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

8 2.2. Someone who claims to be a “resident” in relation to any government or on a government form is
9 SURRENDERING what he calls the “privileges and immunities” of a citizen in exchange for franchises and
10 benefits. See:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

11 3. Sovereignty is achieved by NOT being a statutory citizen.

12 3.1. The civil statutory status of “citizen” has domicile as a prerequisite.

13 3.2. You can’t be a statutory “citizen” WITHOUT a domicile.

14 3.3. You can’t be “sovereign” and be a STATUTORY “state citizen” with a domicile “in this state” as defined in
15 California Revenue and Taxation Code sections 6017 and 17018.

16 4. The word “United States” has at least FOUR different meanings, three of which are geographical and one of which
17 means the federal corporation. See:

Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Form #10.011, Section 1
<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm>

18 **3.4 False statement: Every human is a “person”**

19 Peymon makes the following false statement:

20 *Clearly if you are a man or woman, you are a “natural person” and a “person”, and you are the “person” in*
21 *the state and federal legislatures acts to which they are subjecting the laws.*

22 This is completely false. If it were true, there would be no need for a Bill of Rights to begin with! If Congress can pass ANY
23 statute they want or regulate or control any property they want with statutes, then why even BOTHER with a Bill of Rights?
24 The only way out of the “doublethink” and dichotomy between the Bill of Rights on the one hand, and the Civil Statutes on
25 the other hand is a straw man that you must volunteer for. Then everything makes sense. The existence of that “straw man”
26 is exhaustively proven in the following document:

Proof That There is a “Straw Man”, Form #05.042
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

27 Peymon, on the one hand claims:

28 *“The primary purpose of government is still to protect your life, liberty, and property.”*

29 ..but on the other hand, refuses to explain how PRIVATE property gets LAWFULLY converted to PUBLIC property that
30 can be regulated, controlled, legislated for, or taxed by the STATUTES he describes. That cognitive dissonance is described
31 in:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

32 For more details on the false claim that ALL human beings are civils statutory “persons”, see:

1. Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002-proves that civil statuses such as "person" have domicile as a prerequisite, which MUST be voluntary.
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020-proof that there is such a thing as a STATUTORY "non-person"
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3. Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004, Section 8.16, 8.17, and 9.15-rebuttal to the argument that all human beings are statutory "persons"
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3.5 What does SEDM agree with about the article

We agree with the following statement:

"There is a lot that you can do to regain your freedoms. The hated income tax is voluntary; "income" legally refers to privileged activities and not to compensation for your labor. The primary purpose of government is still to protect your life, liberty, and property."

For proof of the above, see:

The "Trade or Business" Scam, Form #05.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Peymon doesn't seem to really understand the true significance of the word "privilege". Those wishing to learn more on this subject should study the following:

1. Government Franchises Course, Form #12.012
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4 Resources for further Research and Rebuttal

If you would like to study the subjects described herein further, we highly recommend the following resources:

1. Freedom Law School
 - 1.1. Main Site: <http://livefreenow.org>
 - 1.2. State vs. U.S. Citizenship Theory Reconsidered, Freedom Law School
<https://livefreenow.org/state-vs-u-s-citizenship-theory-reconsidered/>
 - 1.3. Are You a Sovereign, State or U.S. Citizen, or U.S. National?, Freedom Law School
<https://odysee.com/@freedomlawschool:8/are-you-a-sovereign,-state-or-us-citizen:b>
 - 1.4. Are you, as a sovereign, state citizen, or U.S. national, a Non-Resident Alien who must pay income tax?, Freedom Law School
<https://odysee.com/@freedomlawschool:8/are-you,-as-a-sovereign,-state-citizen:1>
 - 1.5. Are you a "United States Citizen" who is required to pay Income Tax?, Freedom Law School
<https://odysee.com/@freedomlawschool:8/are-you-a-united-states-citizen'-who-is:1>
 - 1.6. Are you a Sovereign, State Citizen, US Citizen, or American National?, Freedom Law School
<https://odysee.com/@freedomlawschool:8/are-you-a-sovereign,-state-citizen,-us:0>
2. Family Guardian
 - 2.1. Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Citizenship/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm>
 - 2.2. Family Guardian Forums, Forum 6.1.4: Citizenship Questions, Confusion, and Disinformation (OFFSITE LINK)
<https://famguardian.org/forums/forums/topic/state-vs-u-s-citizenship-theory-reconsidered/#post-21944>
3. Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry (SEDM)
 - 3.1. Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Form #10.011-summary of citizenship information described herein
<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm>
 - 3.2. Why the Fourteenth Amendment is Not a Threat to Your Freedom Course, Form #08.015
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 1 3.3. *Citizenship and Sovereignty Course*, Form #12.001
2 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3 3.4. *Why You are a Political Citizen but Civil Non-Citizen, National, and Nonresident Alien*, Form #05.006-detailed
4 research on citizenship that proves everything stated about citizenship herein
5 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
6 3.5. *Who's Who in the Freedom Community*, Form #08.009-discusses the history Freedom Law School, Peymon
7 Mottahedeh, and other freedom personalities and how their positions relate to ours on important legal subjects.
8 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>