

⚖️ Common-Law – Part III: De Jure and De Facto

March 5, 2026



□ Two Realities, One Environment

Howard Freeman frequently emphasized that much confusion in modern life comes from failing to distinguish between **what exists in law** and **what operates in practice**.

These two conditions are known as **de jure** and **de facto**.

- *De jure* refers to what is lawful, rightful, and established by proper authority.
- *De facto* refers to what functions in fact, often through

habit, appearance, or acceptance – regardless of whether it is lawful.

Wolf country operates comfortably in the de facto. Sheep often assume it is de jure.

⚖️ **Lawful Authority vs Operational Control**

Freeman warned that control does not always equal authority.

Many systems exercise power not because they possess lawful standing, but because they are **accepted, participated in, and unchallenged.**

De facto control persists through:

- Routine
- Convenience
- Fear of consequence
- Lack of understanding

De jure authority, by contrast, rests on legitimacy, jurisdiction, and consent properly obtained.

Confusing the two places a man or woman at a disadvantage before they even speak.

□ Appearance Is Often Mistaken for Law

Modern systems are carefully designed to *appear* lawful.

Uniforms, titles, buildings, seals, and procedures create an atmosphere of legitimacy. Over time, appearance becomes mistaken for authority itself.

Freeman cautioned that sheep often submit not because authority has been proven, but because it has been **performed convincingly**.

De facto power relies on compliance. De jure authority relies on right.

□ Participation Sustains De Facto Systems

Freeman repeatedly returned to a difficult truth:

Systems persist because people participate in them.

Participation may be active or passive:

- Signing without reading
- Speaking without understanding
- Remaining silent where clarity is required
- Assuming procedures are mandatory

None of this requires malice. It requires only habit.

A sheep that understands this does not rebel – it becomes deliberate.

□ Jurisdiction Is the Bridge Between Them

The boundary between de jure and de facto is often **jurisdiction**.

Jurisdiction determines:

- Which rules apply
- Who has authority
- What obligations exist

Freeman taught that many conflicts arise because individuals step unknowingly into de facto jurisdictions and then expect de jure protections.

Lawful standing requires knowing *where* one is standing.

□□ Calm Awareness Changes Posture

Recognizing de facto conditions does not require confrontation.

Freeman did not encourage people to deny reality or provoke systems. He encouraged **awareness**.

A calm man or woman:

- Distinguishes practice from right
- Observes before acting
- Avoids unnecessary participation
- Preserves dignity without argument

Awareness alone often alters outcomes.

□ **Why This Distinction Matters**

Without understanding de jure and de facto, sheep may:

- Argue law in forums that do not recognize it
- Expect fairness from procedures designed for efficiency
- Mistake enforcement for legitimacy

Freeman taught that wisdom lies in knowing which reality is operating – and adjusting conduct accordingly.

□ **Setting the Stage for Lawful Standing**

This part clarifies why good intentions are not enough.

Understanding de jure and de facto prepares the reader for what follows:

- Standing
- Capacity

- Jurisdictional choice
- Lawful posture without conflict

Only when a sheep understands the difference between what *should be* and what *is*, can it move through wolf country with clarity.

Right without awareness is easily overridden.

□□ What This Understanding Reveals

Once the difference between *de jure* and *de facto* is understood, another question naturally arises. If power can operate without right, then where does **true authority** actually originate? It cannot be sustained by enforcement alone, nor created by appearance or habit. Authority, if it is to be lawful, must follow a proper order.

Part IV – *The Proper Order of Sovereignty* examines that order, returning sovereignty to responsibility, self-governance, and conduct – rather than assertion or control.