



## **TREASON BY DESIGN** © Authored by LB Bork [lb@pacinlaw.org](mailto:lb@pacinlaw.org)

### **INTRODUCTION**

Recently I happened upon a treatise by Lysander Spooner entitled “No Treason.” It was forwarded to me by an acquaintance in the freedom movement mid-December, 1999.

Lysander Spooner<sup>1</sup> was a brilliant attorney from the country of Massachusetts who spoke out gallantly against “The State”. Although the title of this particular work of Lysander Spooner was intriguing enough, I was floored by its issues.

To set premise: the reason that this particular treatise set me on end is that Mr. Spooner had the exact same sentiments about the purpose of the Civil War which I have come to discern. Accordingly, for the past year I have been personally researching the Fourteenth Amendment—which is fallout from the *so-called* Civil War—and its *bastard* effects. In my researched opinion, this amendment is so evil it is beyond the comprehension of anyone. Most people in *the movement* only scrutinize Section 1, wherein the issue of citizenship and due process is found; however, the true evil lies within the other sections, the most evil being Section 2. Such section deals with the [re]apportionment of the state inhabitants for representation and also sets forth voter *stipulations*.

Before I go into this evil, it would be most beneficial to read the final excerpts from the last chapter of the writing of Lysander Spooner entitled: No Treason. For your legal and historical enlightenment behold the following perceived wisdom of Mr. Spooner. . .

### **NO TREASON, by Lysander Spooner**

. . . This programme having been fully arranged and systematized, they put their sword into the hands of the chief murderer of the war,<sup>2</sup> and charge him to carry their scheme into effect. And now he, speaking as their organ, says: “**Let us have peace**”.

The meaning of this is: Submit quietly to all the robbery and slavery we have arranged for you, and you can have “peace.” But in case you resist, the same lenders of blood-money, who furnished the means to subdue the South, will furnish the means again to subdue you.

These are the terms on which alone this government, or, with few exceptions, any other, ever gives “peace” to its people.

The whole affair, on the part of those who furnished the money, has been, and now is, a deliberate scheme of robbery and murder; not merely to monopolize the markets of the South, but also to monopolize the currency, and thus control the industry and trade, and thus plunder and enslave the laborers, of both North and South. And

---

1 Born 1808, Died 1887

2 Undoubtedly a reference to General Grant, who had just become president.

Congress and the president are today the merest tools for these purposes. They are obliged to be, for they know that their own power, as rulers, so-called, is at an end, the moment their credit with the blood-money loan-mongers fails. They are like a bankrupt in the hands of an extortioner. They dare not say nay to any demand made upon them. And to hide at once, if possible, both their servility and their crimes, they attempt to divert public attention, by crying out that they have “Abolished Slavery!” That they have “Saved the Country!” That they have “Preserved our Glorious Union!” and that, in now paying the “National Debt,” as they call it (as if the people themselves, *all of them who are to be taxed for its payment*, had really and voluntarily joined in contracting it), they are simply “maintaining the National Honor!”

By “maintaining the national honor,” they mean simply that they themselves, open robbers and murderers, assume to be the nation, and will keep faith with those who lend them the money necessary to enable them to crush the great body of the people under their feet; and will faithfully appropriate, from the proceeds of their future robberies and murders, enough to pay all their loans, principal and interest.

The pretense that the “abolition of slavery” was either a motive or justification for the war, is a fraud of the same character with that of “maintaining the national honor.” Who, but such usurpers, robbers, and murderers as they, ever established slavery? Or what government, except one resting upon the sword, like the one we now have, was ever capable of maintaining slavery? And why did these men abolish slavery? Not from any love of liberty in general not as an act of justice to the black man himself, but only “as a war measure,” and because they wanted his assistance, and that of his friends, in carrying on the war they had undertaken for maintaining and intensifying that political, commercial, and industrial slavery, to which they have subjected the great body of the people, both white and black. And yet these imposters now cry out that they have abolished the chattel slavery of the black man although that was not the motive of the war—as if they thought they could thereby conceal, atone for, or justify that other slavery which they were fighting to perpetuate, and to render more rigorous and inexorable than it ever was before. There was no difference of principle but only of degree between the slavery they boast they have abolished, and the slavery they were fighting to preserve; for all restraints upon men’s natural liberty, not necessary for the simple maintenance of justice, are of the nature of slavery, and differ from each other only in degree.

If their object had really been to abolish slavery, or maintain liberty or justice generally, they had only to say: All, whether white or black, who want the protection of this government, shall have it; and all who do not want it, will be left in peace, so long as they leave us in peace. Had they said this, slavery would necessarily have been abolished at once; the war would have been saved; and a thousand times nobler union than we have ever had would have been the result. It would have been a voluntary union of free men; such a union as will one day exist among all men, the world over, if the several nations, so called, shall ever get rid of the usurpers, robbers, and murderers, called governments, that now plunder, enslave, and destroy them.

Still another of the frauds of these men is, that they are now establishing, and that the war was designed to establish, “a government of consent.” The only idea they have ever manifested as to what is a government of consent, is this—that it is one to which everybody must consent, or be shot. This idea was the dominant one on which the war was carried on; and it is the dominant one, now that we have got what is called peace.

Their pretenses that they have “Saved the Country,” and “Preserved our Glorious Union,” are frauds like all the rest of their pre-tenses. By them they mean simply that they have subjugated, and maintained their power over, an unwilling people. This they call “Saving the Country”; as if an enslaved and subjugated people or as if any people kept in subjection by the sword (as it is in-tended that all of us shall be hereafter) could be said to have any country. This, too, they call “Preserving our Glorious Union”; as if there could be said to be any Union, glorious or inglorious, that was not voluntary. Or as if there could be said to be any union between masters and slaves; between those who conquer, and those who are subjugated.

All these cries of having “abolished slavery,” of having “saved the country,” of having “preserved the union,” of establishing “a government of consent,” and of “maintaining the national honor,” are all gross, shameless, transparent cheats-so transparent that they ought to deceive no one-when uttered as justifications for the war, or for the government that has succeeded the war, or for now compelling the people to pay the cost of the war, or for compelling anybody to support a government that he does not want.

The lesson taught by all these facts is this: As long as mankind continue to pay “national debts,” so-called-that is, so long as they are such dupes and cowards as to pay for being cheated, plundered, enslaved, and murdered-so long there will be enough to lend the money for those purposes; and with that money a plenty of tools, called soldiers, can be hired to keep them in subjection. But when they refuse any longer to pay for being thus cheated, plundered, enslaved, and murdered, they will cease to have cheats, and usurpers, and robbers, and murderers and blood-money loan-mongers for masters.” [END]

## FORWARD

Lysander Spooner established the sentiments of “the Union” about “a government of consent” after the Civil War. This is what astonished me about the treatise: 2 weeks prior to receiving it I completed an article based on my research of the Fourteenth Amendment entitled: “*Are You a Traitor?*”<sup>3</sup> This particular article covered two encumbrances which stem from Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment: 1) Consent; and, 2) Treason.

In my mind, what Lysander Spooner’s treatise had done is totally confirm all my research and my conclusions thereof. To follow forthwith is the revealing condensed article which I prepared to inform people in *the movement*. It is of tutorial nature; you may have to review its content several times to have a full understanding. . .

## ARE YOU A TRAITOR? By LB Bork / PAC

This article will determine whether or not you are a traitor to your country. By the time you finish reading it you will be in total shock, as most people unwittingly are.

To set the premise of the above notation, please view this segment from the Declaration of Independence: “*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. --That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*”

---

<sup>3</sup> Abridged information from the article “The RED Amendment.” Article is available from PAC.

“GOVERNMENTS ARE INSTITUTED AMONG MEN, DERIVING THEIR  
JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED!”

Now, look at this definition from Black’s Law Dictionary Deluxe, sixth edition:

- **CITIZENS.** Citizens are members of a political community who, in their associated capacity, have established or submitted themselves to the dominion of a government for the promotion of their general welfare and the protection of their individual as well as collective rights.<sup>4</sup>

Now, a question is posed to you: What government have you *consented* / *submitted* to? Well... the answer please? Now these two of many truthful and shocking facts:

The “United States” *is not* your *country* as a matter of law!

The “United States” *is not* your *nation* as a matter of law!

Now here is the most shocking and unconscionable fact: IT IS A CRIME TO VOTE!  
You are probably dumbfounded because this sounds lunatic; however, IT IS TRUE!

Before it is explained *how* it is a crime to vote, you must understand *why* it is a crime to vote. To assist in explaining this unconscionable truth, the following legal facts—which are inherent in the Constitution—need to be established for you. To demonstrate such facts illustrated definitions from Bouvier’s Law Dictionary (1856 edition) will generally be referenced. Bouvier’s is primarily utilized due to it being pure in definitional nature. It has been found that current law dictionaries have been altered—to some point—and/or are vague in their definitions. If the source is different it shall be noted.

Now, under international law all [s]tates that are in the American union—which are also referred to as *republics*—are separate sovereignties, countries and nations. To assist in explaining this let us view the first set of legal definitions which are as follows:

- **COUNTRY.** By country is meant the state of which one is a member; Every man’s country is in general the state in which he happens to have been born.

And,

- **NATIONS.** Nations or states are independent bodies politic; societies of men united together for the purpose of promoting their mutual safety and advantage by the joint efforts of their combined strength. (*i.e.* your state/republic/country)

Ergo: Lawful “nationality” defined—pursuant to international law—is:

- **NATIONALITY.** The state of a person in relation to the nation in which he was born.<sup>5</sup> (*i.e.*, your state reflects your nationality, *e.g.* Iowan, Ohioan, etc.)

As you can plainly see, a country is a state, and a nation is somewhat synonymous with state. All states (*i.e.* several states) of America make-up the “United States of America” (*Union*); the incorporated unit makes-up the “United States” (the ‘*State*’ of the *Union*).

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. v Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542.

<sup>5</sup> Nation = Nationality. This can be changed; it is referred to as *Expatriation*. See Title 8 USC § 1481; see also Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(23). Definitions. The term “naturalization” means the conferring of nationality of a state upon a person after birth,\* by any means whatsoever. see also definitions of jus sanguinis and \*jus soli, *i.e.* your native republic/country.

Before this time, did you realize that the “United States” *is not* your primary nation? Probably not as most of us have been educated in the public school system. . .

Sorry, strike that; insert: Public Fool System.

Accordingly—unknown to most people in America—the main purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution was to create new citizens (U.S. citizens). Moreover, people also do not realize that it also defines—and sets-up—a usurpation governmental system! This is referred to as a *de facto government*; or government de facto.

Before we go further into explaining this unconscionable matter, you should understand the general difference between *de facto* and *de jure*. The definitions are as follows:

- **DE FACTO.** In fact, as distinguished from “de jure,” by right. (*i.e.* not constitutional)

And,

- **DE JURE.** By right; by lawful right; rightfully; complying with the law in all respects; valid in law. (*i. e.* constitutional)

Both the above definitions are taken from Black’s Law Dictionary, sixth edition

Now, to continue: the infamous Fourteenth Amendment was passed by a rump<sup>6</sup> congress on the date of June 13, 1866 and *purportedly* ratified July 9, 1868. With that established, now let us look at Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment. It is as follows:

*“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.*

Most people in the “Freedom Movement” believe that the “Fourteenth Amendment” does not affect them because they think they are not within the *jurisdiction* of the “United States,” as they live in a “State,” *or* they are not of African descent so they believe it does not pertain to them. Sorry, this is incorrect! Everyone born within the jurisdiction of the United States of America—*i.e.* the several states—is fundamentally *naturalized* by the Fourteenth Amendment at birth; except for American Indians.<sup>7</sup> Pursuant to this fact, see this corresponding definition from Black’s Law Dictionary, sixth edition:

- **NATURALIZATION CLAUSE.** The Fourteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution, section 1, provides that all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside.

To further illustrate: In eighteen eight-four, in the case of *Elk v Wilkins*,<sup>8</sup> the court stated the following in reference to Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment:

*“. . . this section contemplates two sources of citizenship and two sources only: birth and naturalization. The persons declared to be citizens are “All persons*

---

6 **RUMP**, n. A legislature having only a small part of its original membership and therefore being unrepresentative or lacking in authority. *American Heritage Dictionary*

7 However American aborigines can be United States citizens if they want; and all other citizenship exceptions, see Title 8 USC § 1401 for such exceptions.

8 *Elk v Wilkins*, 112 U.S. 94 (1884). A great 14th Amendment case to study and review.

*born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof. The evident meaning of these last words is, not merely subject in some respect or degree to the jurisdiction of the United States, but completely subject to their political jurisdiction and owing them direct and immediate allegiance. . . . ”*

This last statement may be familiar to most: “United States” pledge / allegiance?

Accordingly, a U.S. citizen owes allegiance to *all the states*. But, what is wrong with this picture? How can you have allegiance to every state if they are all separate nations?

To further illustrate this apparent legal farce, see this definition: Title 8 USC § 1401:

*The following shall be nationals and citizens of the United States at birth: (a) A person born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof; (b) A person born in the United States to a member of an Indian, Eskimo, Aleutian, or other aboriginal tribe: Provided, that the granting of citizenship under this subsection shall not in any manner impair or otherwise affect the right of such person to tribal or other property.<sup>9</sup>*

Note that it states: “*a person born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof shall be a national and citizen of the United States at birth.*” This status is further defined by Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(22), definitions:

The term “national of the United States” means a *citizen of the United States*.

In other words, a citizen of the United States is a national of the United States. Pursuant to the 14th Amendment you have one “nationality” only: United States nationality.

This is fully repugnant to constitutional law, *see also* “Law of Nations”.

Now, to make a point: We know that California and Nevada are both considered nations in international law. Let us say that one nation attacked the other; in other words declared war on the other for some reason or another. If you were a member of the nation of the Nevada republic—which you would have allegiance to—how can you go to war against California which you also have allegiance to? You cannot fight on two sides! Simply put, you can only have allegiance to *one* of the countries, your country: Nevada.

To expand on this premise (as to above example because it is the same situation) you may have heard that the Confederate Soldiers in the “Civil War” were deemed rebels. This is not correct. In other words, in saying this is fraud. See this documented evidence:

- **REBELS.** A term loosely but incorrectly applied to the Confederate Forces engaged in the Civil War. 30 Am J Rev ed Insurr § 2.

Why? . . . There was no breach of allegiance to their nations (*countries/state governments*) nor did they commit treason against the Union to a foreign power! The Confederate states had a *war* pursuant to international law. It was actually an “International War”.

NOW. . . this brings us back to the original question posed:

What government have you *consented* and/or *submitted* to?

---

<sup>9</sup> Subsection (b) is referencing Indians not taxed. They are precluded from the jurisdiction.

Well, due to the 14th Amendment, you have submitted yourself to the jurisdiction of the *federal government*. As a matter of fact you have a *quasi-dual nationality* under the *color of the Fourteenth Amendment*. Now let us reference this definition from Title 8 of the United States Code that is found under section 1101(a)(21), definitions:

The term “national” means a person owing permanent allegiance to a state.

Question: Have you unwittingly breached your allegiance to your native state?

HERE IS THE UNCONSCIONABLE KICKER! You may refer to it as the SET-UP! It is a fact that is well documented that you have to be a *citizen of the United States* to vote in any elections. You may verify this by checking your [S]tate statutes regarding the state voting regulations. Although it is difficult to see—as the language is *intentionally* written to confuse people—if you *decipher* Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment you will see that the *de facto* states or governments only represent people who are voting. Someone who is versed in syntax may assist you in the deciphering process. Accordingly, earlier in this article it was mentioned that it is a *crime to vote* in elections. Now we can take a look at how this is done. The pertinent text found in Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment illustrates to us that it *is a crime* to vote. This is so evil it is beyond belief:

“ . . . *the right to vote at any election. . . is denied. . . except for participation in rebellion, or other crime. . .* ”

Understand that you cannot create “citizens of the United States” without having to violate inherent Constitutional premises under the Law of Nations. The constitutional government[s] of the several states of “America” needed to be usurped. This is done by making voters *unwittingly* throw-off their allegiance to their *lawful* governments. The clause illustrated in Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment accomplishes this.

Here are the details on what transpires:

By voting as a *United States citizen*—or *citizen of the United States*—you join in the rebellion that is noted in Section 2 of the 14th Amendment. When you vote as such a person—or do not denounce the United States citizenship by proper process<sup>10</sup>—you are in rebellion against your “constitutional state government”. You then give *tacit* allegiance to the *insurgent* governmental system over your lawful state government.

This alternate governmental system that seated itself after the *so-called* Civil War can be evidenced in Section 3 of the infamous amendment. This section has been very craftily executed: the *insurgent* Fourteenth Amendment governmental system<sup>11</sup> has to uphold the organic Constitution pursuant to other clauses in Section 3. This had to be done *or the de facto* participants—*i.e.* the *government officers*—would be considered to be in rebellion also. Secretly, the *de facto voters* are the true rebels in this orchestrated war!

The crime referenced is rebellion, hence is treason. Treason can be found mentioned in the body of the Constitution under Article III, Section 3. It is defined as follows:

- **TREASON.** This word imports a betraying, treachery, or breach of allegiance. The constitution of the United States, art. 3, s. 3, defines treason against the

---

10 Public Law; 15 US Statutes at Large, Chap. 249, pps 223-224 (1868); Title 8 USC § 1481.

11 For description of this government see Black's Law *Deluxe*, 6th edition: government de facto

United States to consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid or comfort. This offence is punished with death.

To further expand, *insurgent* and *rebel* are defined by Noah Webster (1828) as follows:

- **INSURGENT.** A person who rises in opposition to civil or political authority; one who openly and actively resists the execution of laws. [See insurrection.] An insurgent differs from a rebel. The insurgent opposes the execution of a particular law or laws; a rebel attempts to overthrow or change government, or he revolts and attempts to place his country under another authority. All rebels are insurgents, but all insurgents are not rebels.

It is asked of you, is this not fitting? Furthermore, see this definition:

- **INSURRECTION.** A rebellion of citizens or subjects of a country against its government.” (see also: belligerent)

TO REITERATE: *Treason* imports a betraying, treachery, or breach of allegiance; and, *Insurrection* is a rebellion of *citizens* or *subjects* of a country against its government with purpose of turning their county over to another authority. The people of the several states are turning the political power over to the United States, hence they are in rebellion. And technically the *de facto* state officers are only deemed insurgents. This is due to such officers having to follow the original constitutional premises in most other cases.

Voter registration is *prima facie* evidence of rebellion. In reality two people actually have to see a person vote—or the personal admission of the voter—to fill the requirements for treason. Undoubtedly, this is why voting is taught to be confidential: voters are actually traitors! As such people have unwittingly tossed their constitutional governmental system aside they are then treated as a *public enemy* and given *privileges* as rebels. This whole scenario nullifies *natural rights* as secured by the Constitution. The Common Law is then discharged. One could say that the *de facto* States are actually penal colonies operating under the Color of War! This willful ignorance is oppressing everyone in America!

So, are you saying: “*So what! What does this all really mean?*” The sad truth is that this is a scam that makes you *subject to* both the state *and* federal governments.<sup>12</sup> However the good news is, due to the fact that the insurgent *de facto* governments have to uphold the *organic* Constitution there is a *congressional cure* for this. See, study, and most importantly, *understand*, Title 8 USC § 1481.<sup>10</sup> When you complete that task you should understand the following taken from Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(3), definitions:

“The term “alien” means any person not a citizen or national of the United States.”

NOW. . . Behold true constitutional liberty:

**Title 18 USC § 242.** Deprivation of rights under color of law; (Criminal provisions) [*in part*]: Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws

---

12 The Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution as written: “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien. . . shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

THERE IS YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY! In order to have liberty under this insurgent system of government under the Fourteenth Amendment one has to BE AN ALIEN<sup>13</sup> to be protected from deprivation of rights done under color of law (*i.e.*, private law). Having the *citizen and national of the United States* status creates many hidden liabilities.

## SYLLABUS

As you can see, Lysander Spooner had insight to the *planned servitude* of our American nations in his piece “No Treason”. Accordingly he stated about the silent ballot:

*“Submit quietly to all the robbery and slavery we have arranged for you, and you can have peace.”*

In due course, the changing blow came after the *so-called* Civil War. The conversion of Americans’ state citizenship and nationality—under *international law*—has been slowly implemented not to draw attention. People in the “Freedom Movement” have gone deep into the issue of “state” citizenship; however, they have not found the true key. The appropriate index is NATIONALITY! Remember, in *Elk v Wilkins supra*, the court had stated that a “citizen of the United States” owes *political allegiance* to the “United States.” However, inherent *constitutional political allegiance* is to your state. All other governments are foreign (*alien*), including the United States government.<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, Americans with proper status—or, state nationals—are ALIENS as currently referenced in the United States Code. This legal premise existed under the organic Constitution. This inherent condition created all to be an alien as to a *sister state* of the Union.

Under original constitutional premises, *generally* the federal government has nothing to do with the American people. The Fourteenth Amendment actually establishes a *new constitution* that runs concurrent with the original or *organic* Constitution. All subsequent amendments are part of the *bastard* constitution and/or governmental system. And in case you have not guessed it by now, the “Pledge of Allegiance” is brainwashing propaganda. The herein exposed is due to an extensive *scheme* in which has been contrived by words, disinformation and planned ignorance. There is only one legal method to remove the 14th Amendment noose from your neck. This method is congressionally granted and is well hidden by design. It is ventured that most people in government do not know about it.

THE QUESTION IS: Who does know, *and* are they willing to fix it!?!?

~~~~~

People’s Awareness Coalition – POB 313 – Kieler, Wisconsin [www.pacinlaw.org](http://www.pacinlaw.org)

---

13 **ALIEN.** Owing political allegiance to another country or government; foreign. *alien residents*. An unnaturalized foreign resident of a country; also called noncitizen. *American Heritage Dictionary*. Important! The United States Code, and accordingly the United States government, is for the most part foreign; the federal government only has some matters of *Public Law* on such *persons* as conferred by the *organic* (original) Constitution.

14 TITLE 22. FOREIGN RELATIONS AND INTERCOURSE. Title 22 USC § 2659. State statutes to be procured. The Secretary of State shall procure from time to time such of the statutes of the several States as may not be in his office, *i.e.* the states are foreign to the United States.