

The “Story” of Treason

By Matthew Lyon, May 16, 2026

“In the 18th century, one overthrew a government by seizing its forts and capital. In the 21st century, one overthrows a government by seizing its **vote-counting apparatus**. The instrument has changed, but the **constitutional injury**, forcibly displacing the sovereign’s will, is identical.”
“Levying war against the United States” by **non-kinetic, software-mediated means**.

The Argument:

In a scenario where it is conclusively proven, using official government data and forensic evidence, that an organized group has deliberately and successfully manipulated the vote-counting systems of the United States so as to determine the outcome of a federal election, the conduct can be characterized as “levying war against [the United States]” within the meaning of Article III, Section 3.

The United States, as a constitutional sovereign, exists only *insofar* as the people are able to choose their rulers through free and fair elections; a scheme that subverts that process at scale is the functional equivalent of overthrowing the government by non-kinetic means.

Although classical treason doctrine has emphasized armed force and physical assemblages, the relevant constitutional injury is the forcible displacement of the sovereign will. Where software-mediated manipulation of election results achieves that same treasonable object, installing or maintaining a government not lawfully chosen by the people, a prosecutor can plausibly argue that it constitutes “levying war,” or, where foreign adversaries are involved, “adhering to [the United States’] enemies, giving them aid and comfort,” even as this application would represent an extension of prior case law.

Data scientists, computer software engineers, and mathematicians have **conclusively proven** that:

- (i) Election software executed specific **math functions/algorithms**;
- (ii) Those functions **systematically manipulated results**;
- (iii) Cross-checks against official data confirm **decisive outcome changes**.

1. **Any person or entity who knowingly participated in designing, deploying, or operating the manipulation functions with intent to subvert U.S. election outcomes**, once identified, should be treated as a **traitor**; and
2. The **systemic national security risk** is so high that:
 - (i) All systems using this software must be **immediately terminated**, and

(ii) The nation must **revert to paper ballots with voter ID**.

The evidence is mathematically incontrovertible, and the Republic's survival plainly depends on drawing a bright line, then a prosecutor could rationally conclude: **Treason is not only permissible but necessary** to name the gravity of the offense.

Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law:

The provided documents outline a formal **criminal complaint and evidentiary submission** documenting a coordinated scheme of **software-enabled fraud** across three interconnected domains:

**property taxation,
municipal bonds, and
election systems.**

The author, Mitchell Vexler, contends that **manipulated property valuations** are used to artificially inflate the tax base, thereby justifying excessive **school district bond debt** that creates massive financial exposure. Parallel forensic analyses suggest that similar **software vulnerabilities** allow for the **synthetic engineering of election outcomes** through statistically impossible data patterns. The text further accuses the **Texas judiciary of depriving citizens of their constitutional rights** by refusing to adjudicate these findings, characterizing the situation as a **national security risk**. Ultimately, the sources call for a **federal investigation** into the underlying software architectures that allegedly permit data transformation while maintaining an appearance of legitimacy.

This comprehensive overview coalesces the evidence, expert analysis, and legal arguments, establishing the "bridge" between software-enabled manipulation and the subversion of the American Republic's sovereignty.

Story of "Treason" 1776

In **1776**, "treason" is best understood in two overlapping contexts:

1. British / Loyalist view

- › The American colonies were still, in Britain's view, under the authority of **King George III** and Parliament.
- › When colonial leaders signed the **Declaration of Independence** (July 4, 1776) and took up arms, they were, in strict British legal terms, **traitors**.
- › The standard idea: they had **"levied war" against their lawful sovereign** and "adhered to his enemies," which fit the long-standing English definition of treason.

2. Patriot / American view

- › The Patriots argued that the King and Parliament had **violated the colonists' rights** (taxation without representation, dissolving local legislatures, use of troops, etc.).
- › Because the Crown had broken the social compact, Americans claimed the right to **withdraw allegiance** and form new governments.
- › From this perspective, **loyalty to liberty and natural rights** was higher than loyalty to the King. So, in their own eyes, they were **not traitors**, but defenders of rightful government.

So, in 1776, whether an act was “treason” depended on **which side’s legitimacy you accepted**: the British state or the new American polity.

Legal Definition of Treason Around 1776: Under British / English Law (the law in force in the colonies before independence), The core definition came from the **Treason Act of 1351** (25 Edw. III), still operative in the 18th century. Relevant parts **High treason** included: **“Compassing or imagining the death of the king”, “Levying war against the king in his realm”, “Adhering to the king’s enemies, giving them aid and comfort in his realm or elsewhere”**

In 1776, the American rebels clearly fit the second and third parts from the British point of view: they **levied war** and **aided the king’s enemies** (e.g., France, later on).

So, in **legal terms in 1776**: The **American revolutionaries**, from Britain’s viewpoint, were: (i) **Levying war against the king** (open, armed rebellion); (ii) Potentially **adhering to the king’s enemies** once foreign alliances came into play.

That was the **operative definition at the moment of the Declaration**, because the colonists were still formally British subjects in British law.

Under Early American Thought (and later the U.S. Constitution): The framers were deeply wary of how broadly European monarchies used “treason” to crush dissent. So, when they later wrote the **U.S. Constitution (1787)**, they deliberately **narrowed** the definition:

“Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.” — U.S. Const., Art. III, § 3, cl. 1

This is post-1776, but it captures the **same core idea** as English law, while carefully limiting abuse.

What definition applied in 1776 itself? In 1776, there was **no separate American national treason law yet**. The operative law was: **English / British treason law**, especially the **Treason Act of 1351 (25 Edw. III)**, still in force in the colonies; and **Colonial/state treason laws**, which began to be passed **after** states declared independence but **before** the U.S. Constitution.

From English practice and early U.S. cases (e.g., **Whiskey Rebellion trials, Fries’s Rebellion, Aaron Burr’s trial**), the understanding was: To “levy war” you needed:

1. **An actual assemblage of people:** A group **gathered together**, not just talking or planning. Mere conspiracy, writing, or speech was **not enough**; there had to be some **physical force** marshaled.
2. **With intent to use force against the sovereign or its authority:** The purpose had to be to **overthrow, resist, or obstruct** the **government in its public capacity**, not just commit private crime.

Examples: Trying to **overthrow the government**; Trying to **prevent the execution of a federal or state law** by force on a general scale.

Private riots or local crimes, even violent, generally **did not qualify** unless clearly aimed at the **government's authority as such**.

3. **An "insurrectionary" or "war-like" character:** Armed, organized, or militarized in some way. Using weapons or military formations or otherwise behaving as if in military operation.

So "war," in "**levying war against them**", meant:

Not international war in the modern sense (nation vs. nation), but:

Internal war-like force against the **United States as a political entity**, an insurrection, rebellion, or armed resistance to law on a public scale.

Doctrinal bridge from classical "levying war" to non-kinetic constitutional subversion

Verbatim - U.S. Constitution, Article III, Section 3

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort.

No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court."

Verbatim - 18 U.S.C. § 2381 (Treason)

"Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort, shall be punished by death or by imprisonment for not less than five years and a fine under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States."

Black's Law Dictionary: "War"

A state of **armed conflict** between **political bodies** or **sovereign entities**, especially between **nations or states**, carried on by **force of arms**. It implies a condition in which the **normal relations of peace are suspended** and replaced by operations of **hostilities** pursuant to the use of **organized military force**.

Key elements embedded in this definition:

1. **Armed conflict:** not just tension or hostility; there must be **use of force**.

2. **Between political bodies / sovereigns:** typically states/nations or organized political entities (in some usages can include organized belligerent groups recognized as such).
3. **Conducted by organized forces:** armies, navies, air forces, or organized armed groups acting in that role.
4. **Peace-time relations are suspended:** diplomatic, commercial, and normal legal relations give way to rules of **war and belligerency**.

In U.S. constitutional and statutory practice: **“War”** in the phrase **“levies war against them”** (Art. III §3) is understood through this classical law-of-nations sense: an **organized, armed, insurrectionary conflict** against the sovereign (here, the United States), not merely personal violence or sporadic riots.

Is it **conceptually treasonous**? Many would say yes.

Is it **doctrinally established as treason**? No. It would be a **first-of-its-kind** expansion.

Expanding “levying war” beyond anything courts have squarely endorsed.

Turning treason into a category that now covers some forms of **non-kinetic political/electoral subversion**.

Doctrinal novelty: No controlling Supreme Court precedent has **yet** declared election manipulation or cyberwarfare as “levying war” for treason purposes.

- › This would be **new law**, likely to be reviewed at the highest level.

Prudential reluctance: Courts and prosecutors have **historically avoided** treason charges except in **clear war-like contexts**, to prevent: Political misuse, or Chilling political controversy.

Historical gloss (Bollman, Burr):

- › Treason is limited to:
 - › *“Assemblage for the purpose of effecting by force a treasonable object.”*
 - › The target must be the **government in its public capacity**, not just private rights.

Modern legal context:

- › The **sovereign state’s core function** is its **constitutional decision-making structure**;
- › In U.S. constitutional design, that structure is **elections**.

Classical Treason Standard (Art. III §3):

“Levying war against [the United States]” or “Adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.”

Modern Application (Analytical Position, Not Yet Adjudicated):

Levying war (non-kinetic): Organized design, deployment, and use of manipulative code to **override the sovereign will** can be framed as **war-like action against the state's core mechanism**.

Adhering to enemies (if foreign actors): Coordinated use of these tools with or for foreign adversaries **materially aids their strategic objective** of destabilizing or controlling U.S. governance.

Treason (for individuals/entities): Any actor who **knowingly** participated in the design, deployment, or operation of algorithms that manipulated election outcomes with the intent to **subvert the sovereign will** has:

- › **Levying-war-by-non-kinetic-means exposure**, and/or
- › If foreign adversaries are involved, **adhering-to-enemies exposure**.

Textual core (Article III §3): "Levying war against [the United States]" =

Organized hostile action aimed at the existence or functioning of the sovereign state.

What "United States" means here

For purposes of treason, "**the United States**" is not just a physical territory; it is the **sovereign political entity** defined by the Constitution:

- Sovereignty **resides in the people**;
- The **structure of government** (President, Congress, etc.) is **constituted solely through law-governed elections**;
- The **election system** is the **mechanism by which the sovereign acts**.

Thus, **attacking that mechanism itself** at scale can be characterized as **attacking the sovereign United States**.

Functional definition of "war" (non-kinetic extension)

Using Black's and classical public-law definitions, we can define "**war**" functionally:

A **state of organized hostilities** against a sovereign, carried out by coordinated forces, aimed at **overthrowing, subverting, or disabling** that sovereign's ability to govern.

Existing doctrine (Bollman, Burr, Cramer) has consistently read "*levying war*" to require:

- **Assemblage** of persons,
- **War-like, insurrectionary conduct**,
- Historically tied to **physical or at least obviously forceful acts**.

Cyber / election manipulation is:

- **Covert, not openly insurrectionary** in the classic sense;
- Lacking obvious "armed force," even if the effect is equivalent.

"Levying war against them" Classical reading (Bollman/Burr): Requires **assemblage of persons** and **War-like or insurrectionary acts** against the government in its public capacity.

1. An **assemblage** of people acting together (not mere planning or verbal conspiracy);
2. **War-like or insurrectionary conduct** aimed at resisting or overthrowing U.S. governmental authority (an objective targeting the government's public capacity);
3. **Overt acts** demonstrating that assemblage and intent (force/armed action or equivalent organized force).

Assemblage:

- › The conspirators form a **coordinated, ongoing organization** (even if distributed digitally) with a command structure, funding, planning, and roles.
- › This satisfies the "assemblage" requirement; they have simply **assembled in cyberspace**.

War-like / insurrectionary objective:

- › The **objective** is not private gain alone: it is to **subvert the U.S. constitutional order by installing a government that does not actually have the people's mandate**.
- › That objective **replaces the sovereign's will with the conspirators' will**.
Functionally, that is equivalent to what an armed coup seeks.

Overt Acts:

- › **Deploying and operating the software** that changes, deletes, or fabricates votes;
- › **Accessing and manipulating official election systems; Coordinating operational steps** that result in a falsified certified outcome.

Each such act is:

- (i) **Public in effect**, because it alters the official acts of state;
- (ii) **Directed at the U.S. in its sovereign capacity**, not merely at private property.

Functional equivalence principle:

- › If **guns and troops** seizing Congress to install a ruler = **levying war**,
- › Then **software and servers** seizing the electoral mechanism to install a ruler = **levying war**,
- › if both:
 - › Aim at the **same treasonable object** (usurping sovereign authority), and
 - › Have **comparable systemic effect**.

In the **21st century**, "force of arms" is not the only way to wage war; **software and systems control** can be as or more destructive to sovereign capacity than physical occupation;

Therefore, **non-kinetic operations** that:

- Organize actors,
- Directly **usurp the core sovereign function** (choosing rulers),
- And *succeed* in doing so,

can be treated as the **functional equivalent** of "levying war."

Systemic election subversion:

- › **Directly determines who exercises all federal power;**
- › Is **nationwide in effect**, not local;
- › Permanently **reconfigures the state** based on lies.

Structural terms:

- › The **vote-fraud scenario** is **more central** to the destruction of the Republic than an assault on a single building.
- › The Republic is built on the premise that **“We the People” choose their rulers**. If that choice is systematically falsified, **the sovereign has effectively been deposed**, even if no shot is fired.

Forensic Findings:

Forensic analysis of **official election data** and systems shows **systematic, algorithmic manipulation of vote totals**.

This is not isolated fraud; it is a **software-engineered subversion** of the electoral mechanism that constitutes a **direct threat to the Republic’s legitimacy**.

Data-Based Anomalies (Unassailable):

- Vote counts in multiple jurisdictions exceed **total residents** and **voting-age population**.
- Patterns recur across states and cycles, **statistically impossible** as random variation.

Reverse-Engineered Code:

- Identified **built-in functions** that:
 - (i) Reallocate votes,
 - (ii) Inflate specific tallies,
 - (iii) Inject votes not traceable to valid voters.

These functions are **incompatible** with a system whose sole role is to **count ballots**.

Cross-Verification:

Findings corroborated against:

- › Voter rolls,
- › Census/demographic data,
- › Official precinct returns.

The United States exists as a **Republic** only if **“We the People”** can:

- › Cast votes freely,
- › Have those votes **counted accurately**.

Nature of the Breach:

The manipulation is:

1. **Systemic**, not incidental;

2. **Outcome-determinative**, not marginal;
3. **Non-kinetic**, but **strategic** in effect.

Overt acts are: **(i) Deploying and operating the software** that changes, deletes, or fabricates votes; **(ii) Accessing and manipulating official election systems**; **(iii) Coordinating operational steps** that result in a falsified certified outcome.

The objective: it is to **subvert the U.S. constitutional order by installing a government that does not actually have the people's mandate**. That objective **replaces the sovereign's will with the conspirators' will**. Functionally, that is equivalent to what an armed coup seeks.

Functional Equivalence: Software that **decides outcomes independent of the electorate** is a **non-kinetic mechanism of regime control**; it is the modern equivalent of **seizing the ballot boxes and rewriting the results**.

System-level constitutional response: Because the same software can be **reused or hidden**, and because it **directly targets the foundational mechanism of sovereignty**, the proper national security response is:

(i) Immediate decertification and termination of all election systems using that code, and

(ii) Mandatory reversion to:

- › **Paper ballots**, and
- › **Robust voter-ID verification**,
as the **minimum standard** consistent with maintaining a legitimate Republic.

Why this is not merely a policy preference, but a constitutional imperative in this case: If elections remain under the control of **proven weaponized software**, then:

- › The **possibility of repeated treason** remains built into the system itself;
- › The **people's ability to exercise sovereignty** is hostage to unseen code.

Thus, **system redesign** (paper + ID) is not as a partisan or administrative tweak, but is a **constitutional safeguard**, analogous to correcting a fundamental defect in succession or apportionment.

Strategic Conclusion:

If the evidence stands as presented, **mathematically irrefutable and based solely on official data**, then we face not an ordinary administrative failure, but a **direct assault on the mechanism of sovereignty itself**.

The **sovereign authority of the United States** rests on **constitutional elections**:

- › A deliberate, organized scheme that **wholly subverts or nullifies** that process is **functionally equivalent to overthrowing the government** by non-kinetic means;
- › If it's done by an **organized group, with intent** to change or to usurp lawful government, that is an **insurrectionary, war-like attack on the state itself**;
- › Therefore, it's "**levying war**", just without guns and tanks.

To do less than **remove the compromised systems** and **mandate auditable, identity-verified balloting** would be to accept a permanent, invisible veto over the people's will by those who control the code. That is **incompatible with the continued existence of the United States as a constitutional Republic**.

"The legally relevant element is not **how** the sovereign is overthrown (bullets vs. bytes), but **that** the sovereign's lawful will is forcibly nullified. On that dimension, this conduct is war."

"Deliberately falsifying the sovereign's decision at scale is equivalent to overthrowing the government by non-kinetic means."

Criminal exposure, but under **other statutes**, such as: **18 U.S.C. § 371** (conspiracy to defraud the United States); **18 U.S.C. § 241 / § 242** (conspiracy against rights, deprivation of rights under color of law); **18 U.S.C. § 1030** (Computer Fraud and Abuse); **52 U.S.C.** election-specific crimes; Possibly **seeditious conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 2384)**; Espionage or foreign-agent charges if a foreign power is involved.

National security response: decertification and reversion to paper + ID

Because the software has been **forensically proven** to manipulate outcomes, the entire class of systems that **use or depend on that code** becomes a **national security threat**.

From a **constitutional + national security** standpoint, the argument:

1. The Republic's legitimacy depends on credible elections:

If the **mechanism of choosing rulers** is compromised, **all downstream acts of government are in doubt**.

Thus, an exploited election system is not just an administrative flaw; it's a **direct threat to constitutional order**.

2. Once systemic compromise is proven, "trust but verify" is no longer sufficient:

If code is shown to: Contain **manipulative algorithms**, and those algorithms have **actually been used to alter results**, then every **future use** of that code is an **ongoing risk** of treason-level injury.

3. National security doctrine: remove compromised systems:

In other domains (nuclear command, crypto, classified networks), when compromise is proven:

- › Systems are **taken offline**,
- › Keys are **rotated**,
- › Architectures are **redesigned**.

Extending that logic: an **election system proven to be weaponized** must be **decommissioned**.

4. Reversion to paper ballots + voter ID as a constitutional safeguard:

Decertify & Terminate Compromised Systems and Revert to Physical, Auditable Processes:

Immediately **remove from service** all election systems that: Use the identified software or depend on its code/derivatives.

Paper ballots: (as the primary record of each vote)

- › Create a **physical, auditable trail**,
- › Are not susceptible to **remote code manipulation**,
- › Allow re-counts and forensic re-checks independent of any software.

Strong voter-identity verification (voter ID with safeguards):

- › Seeks to ensure that **each ballot = one qualified individual**,
- › Reduces the attack surface for **identity-based fraud**.

5. Treat Election Infrastructure as Critical National Security Infrastructure:

- › Independent **code audits and mathematical anomaly detection** as standard.
- › Severe criminal consequences, calibrated at **highest national security levels**, for any future intentional subversion.

Once software-mediated subversion is proven at scale, **continued reliance on that software is itself negligent to the point of endangering the Republic**.

The only constitutionally adequate remedy is to **remove the attack surface** by terminating use of those systems and returning to **auditable, physical ballots** with **strong identity verification**.

National Security Memorandum: *Election System Compromise and Sovereign Integrity*

To: Senior National Security Leadership

Subject: Proven Election Software Manipulation as a Sovereign-Level National Security Threat and Required Constitutional Safeguards

I. Executive Assessment

Using **official government records and voter rolls**, independent computer scientists, data analysts, and mathematicians have produced **unassailable forensic proof** that the current election software ecosystem has been used to **systematically manipulate vote totals**. The findings show:

Mathematically impossible turnout patterns:

- › In multiple jurisdictions, the recorded “votes cast” exceed **all recorded residents**, and in some cases far exceed **the total voting-age population**.
- › These are not edge-case anomalies; they are **repeating patterns** consistent with deterministic code, not natural human behavior.

Reverse-engineered algorithmic manipulation:

- › The software has been **reverse-engineered** to reveal **built-in functions** that:
 - (i) Reallocate votes between candidates,
 - (ii) Inflate specific totals, and
 - (iii) Inject “synthetic” votes not traceable to valid voters.

These functions **cannot be reconciled** with a system whose sole legitimate purpose is to **count ballots**.

If the intent were purely tabulation, the code **would not require, and would not contain, logic to alter or fabricate vote outcomes**.

Cross-corroboration with official data:

- › These algorithmic behaviors have been **verified against independent data sets**:
 - (i) Official voter registration rolls,
 - (ii) Demographic and census data,
 - (iii) Recorded vote totals by precinct.
- › The result is a **mathematical impossibility** under any model of legitimate voting.

Conclusion: The evidence establishes not mere irregularities, but an **engineered system of outcome manipulation**. The exploitation of this system has already **subverted the accurate expression of the sovereign will** in at least one national election.

This is not simply an election-administration failure. It is a **sovereign-level security breach** that strikes at the **foundational mechanism by which the United States exists as a Republic**.

II. Sovereign-Level Framing

1. The United States as a constitutional sovereign

The United States exists as a **constitutional sovereign** only insofar as:

“We the People” can choose their rulers by **free, fair, and accurately counted elections**; and

Public power is exercised by officials who genuinely derive authority from **lawful electoral mandates**.

If the mechanism that aggregates and records the people's will is **structurally compromised**, the **legitimacy of the entire political order** is put at risk. Under such conditions, formal continuity of institutions **does not guarantee substantive continuity of the Republic**.

2. Why this is more than ordinary fraud

Election irregularities are not new; what is **categorically different here** is that:

The breach is **systemic, not incidental**:

- › It arises from **core software logic**, not human error at the margins.

The impact is **sovereign, not local**:

- › Mathematical analysis demonstrates effects at the **aggregate, outcome-determinative level**, not isolated precinct-level noise.

The toolset is **non-kinetic but war-scale**:

- › The attack does not use physical force, yet it achieves what armed coups historically sought: **controlling who holds power**.

In functional terms, **weaponized code within the election system** is a **non-kinetic instrument of regime control**. It allows an attacker to **select leaders without the consent of the governed**, while preserving the **appearance** of lawful process.

3. Implications for treason and national security

On traditional doctrine, treason consists in:

- › **Levying war against the United States**, or
- › **Adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort**.

In the 18th century, one **levied war** by seizing forts and capitals. In the 21st century, one can achieve the **same constitutional injury** by seizing the **vote-counting apparatus** through software:

- › The **object** is identical: to **displace the sovereign will** with the will of a conspiracy.
- › The **effect** is equivalent to a coup: the **de facto selection of rulers** by extra-constitutional means.

On that basis:

Any actor, once identified, who knowingly designed, deployed, or operated these manipulative functions with intent to change outcomes has engaged in conduct that can be **plausibly argued** to constitute:

- › **"Levying war" by non-kinetic means**, and/or

- › Where foreign adversaries are involved, “**adhering to [U.S.] enemies, giving them aid and comfort.**”

Even where treason is not immediately charged, the **gravity of the act** must be calibrated at that level of **harm to the Republic**.

III. Systemic Risk and Immediate Security Imperatives

Given that the **mathematical and code-level evidence is unassailable**, the continued use of this software (or any system that embeds its logic) presents an **unacceptable national security risk**:

1. Persistent attack surface. The same algorithms can be:

- (i) Reused,
- (ii) Hidden inside updates,
- (iii) Re-deployed under different branding.

As long as these systems remain in operational use, the **capacity for silent regime manipulation** persists.

2. Irrecoverable trust deficit.

Once such manipulation is **proven**, public trust in any outcome mediated by these systems is **rationaly undermined**.

The Republic cannot function long-term if **large segments of the population reasonably doubt** that their votes are actually counted as cast.

3. Duty to remove compromised infrastructure

In every other high-risk domain (nuclear command, secure communications, classified networks), when a platform is shown to be compromised at the root:

- › Systems are **taken offline**,
- › Keys are **rotated**,
- › Architectures are **redesigned**.

By parity of reasoning, the election infrastructure, arguably **the most critical national system**, cannot be held to a lower standard.

IV. Sovereign-Level Remediation

In light of the above, the **minimum constitutionally adequate response** is:

1. Immediate decertification and termination of compromised systems:

All election systems using, embedding, or dependent on the identified software or its derived code should be:

- › **Immediately removed from service;**

- › **Formally decertified**, pending a complete rebuild from first principles under independent oversight.

2. Reversion to robust, auditable physical processes:

Until a new verifiably secure architecture is designed and tested, all federal and state elections should:

- › Use **paper ballots** as the primary recording medium, and
- › Implement **strong voter-identity verification** (e.g., voter ID with appropriate safeguards) to ensure:
 - (i) Each ballot corresponds to a **unique, eligible voter**, and
 - (ii) Physical ballots can be **recounted and audited** independent of any software.

3. Establishment of a sovereign election security standard:

A national framework should be developed that treats election infrastructure as **critical national security infrastructure**, including:

- (i) Regular **independent code audits**,
- (ii) Continuous **mathematical anomaly detection**,
- (iii) Legal consequences for any future **intentional subversion**, calibrated at the **treason / high national security offense** level.
- (iv) Commission a **sovereign election security task force**: Cross-disciplinary (security, legal, constitutional, technical), Mandated to propose a **new, verifiable election architecture** within a fixed timeline.
- (v) **Strategic communications plan**: Transparently explain the evidence and remedies to the public; Frame this as a **defense of the Republic**, not a partisan maneuver.

4. Strategic Conclusion:

If the evidence stands as presented, **mathematically irrefutable and based solely on official data**, then we face not an ordinary administrative failure, but a **direct assault on the mechanism of sovereignty itself**.

To do less than **remove the compromised systems** and **mandate auditable, identity-verified balloting** would be to accept a permanent, invisible veto over the people's will by those who control the code. That is **incompatible with the continued existence of the United States as a constitutional Republic**.

If We Act (Decertify + Paper/ID):

- **Restore structural integrity** of the electoral mechanism.
- Begin to rebuild **domestic and international confidence** in U.S. elections.
- Establish a **clear doctrinal boundary**: Manipulating elections at scale is treated on par with **high national security offenses**.

If We Do Not Act:

- Ongoing **exposure to repeat manipulation** by any actor controlling the code.
- Long-term **erosion of public legitimacy** of government.
- De facto acceptance that the **sovereign's will is subordinate to opaque software behavior**, a condition incompatible with a constitutional Republic.

Continued enforcement actions taken in disregard of these rights may constitute actionable constitutional violations and subject the responsible officers and supervisory officials to injunctive relief and damages under 42 U.S.C. §1983.

This comprehensive overview coalesces the evidence, expert analysis, and legal arguments presented in the provided documentation, establishing the "bridge" between software-enabled manipulation and the subversion of the American Republic's sovereignty.

I. The Nexus of Systemic Fraud

The sources define a "**Triad of Systemic Moral Hazard**" that links three distinct but interrelated domains through a common software-enabled mechanism:

1. **Electoral Subversion:** The use of **Hidden Vote Distortion Logic (HVDL)** to install predetermined officials.
2. **Asset Extraction:** The manipulation of property valuations by **Central Appraisal Districts (CADs)** using "renegade software" to artificially inflate the tax base.
3. **Financial Embezzlement:** The issuance of mathematically unpayable **municipal bonds** (\$5.1 trillion outstanding) based on these inflated valuations, creating an unregulated wealth transfer mechanism.

II. Forensic Proof: Rule of Algorithm over the Rule of Law

The argument for systemic manipulation rests on unassailable mathematical evidence provided by top-level experts:

- › **Edward Solomon & Lockstep Parallel Motion (LPM):** Solomon identifies patterns in certified Cast Vote Records (CVR) where opposing voter groups change their minds in **perfect mathematical synchrony**. He describes a "**Flip Function**", a weighted algorithm applied uniformly across a jurisdiction that probabilistically alters "No" votes to "Yes" votes while maintaining the appearance of organic variation. Statistical deviations reaching **12-sigma**

significance (effectively zero probability of random occurrence) have been identified in jurisdictions like Clark County, NV, and Arapahoe County, CO.

- › **Dr. Andrew Paquette & Algorithmic Voter IDs:** Paquette discovered that voter ID assignment in counties like Harris County, TX, follows a **Base8 modular algorithm** rather than chronological sequence, enabling a covert tagging system. Furthermore, his reconstruction of the "**Weston Algorithm**" in Bexar County demonstrates the injection of **4,110 synthetic, fractional voter records** into poll books during early voting, which were then deleted within 78 seconds to reconcile fraudulent ballots while evading audits.
- › **Roger Fuller & Certification Failures:** Fuller provides evidence that no voting machines were properly certified for the 2018 or 2020 elections due to expired laboratory authorizations. His analysis also shows that certified numbers in Maricopa County **never appeared in the actual counting process**.

III. The Legal Bridge: From Fraud to Treason

The sources argue that while historical "levying of war" required kinetic force (seizing forts or capitals), 21st-century treason can be accomplished by **seizing the vote-counting apparatus through software**.

- **The Constitutional Injury:** The Republic exists only insofar as "We the People" can choose rulers through free and fair elections. Systematically falsifying this choice is the **functional equivalent of an armed coup**, as it achieves the same result: the de facto selection of rulers by extra-constitutional means.
- **Legal Definitions and Treason:** Under **Article III, Section 3**, treason includes "levying war" against the United States. The argument posits that an organized group deliberately subverting the electoral mechanism at scale can be characterized as **levying war by non-kinetic means**. If foreign adversaries are involved (e.g., through foreign-held software vendors), participants may also be liable for "**adhering to enemies**".
- **Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law:** Officials involved are alleged to have committed **Ultra Vires** acts—actions exceeding their legal authority, thereby losing governmental immunity and becoming personally liable for violating 1st, 5th, 14th, and 16th Amendment rights.

IV. The National Security Mandate

The provided **National Security Briefing Memo** categorizes these findings not as administrative failures, but as a **sovereign-level security breach**. The "Status Quo" is deemed unacceptable because:

- **Persistent Attack Surface:** The same algorithms can be reused, hidden in updates, or redeployed under new branding.
- **Irrecoverable Trust Deficit:** A Republic cannot function if the population rationally doubts that their votes are counted as cast.
- **Duty to Remove Infrastructure:** Just as compromised nuclear command systems are taken offline, weaponized election infrastructure must be decommissioned.

V. Proposed Remediation: Restoring the Republic

To restore sovereign integrity, the sources demand an immediate **Financial Reset** and **Electoral Restoration**:

1. **Termination of Electronic Systems:** Immediate decertification of all election systems dependent on the identified software.
2. **Reversion to Physical Processes:** A return to **hand-counted paper ballots** at the precinct level, with witnessed signatures and constant video surveillance.
3. **Mandatory Voter ID:** Implementing robust identity verification (e.g., RealID) to ensure each ballot corresponds to a unique, eligible citizen.
4. **Property Tax Repeal:** Replacing the "fraudulent" property tax system with a **Uniform State Sales Tax** to eliminate the debt-loop used to fund the criminal enterprise.

This framework establishes that the subversion of the "will of the citizens" through invisible code is a **National Security Risk** that necessitates a total redesign of the Republic's foundational mechanisms.