
PROSECUTING POLITICAL ACTORS UNDER NATIONAL SECURITY STATUTES: LEGAL THRESHOLDS AND EVIDENTIARY CHALLENGES

A PREPRINT

Matthew Long
Yoneda AI Research Lab
matthew@yoneda.ai

Assisted by OpenAI o4-mini
OpenAI
research@openai.com

May 20, 2025

ABSTRACT

This paper evaluates the legal viability of prosecuting U.S. political figures under national security statutes, including treason (18 U.S.C. § 2381) and seditious conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 2384). Through analysis of constitutional thresholds, evidentiary standards, and case law, we identify systemic barriers to linking policy disagreements to criminal intent. A revised strategic framework is proposed, emphasizing RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1962) and state-level obstruction charges as alternatives. Defense counter-tactics, including First Amendment protections and selective prosecution claims, are modeled to anticipate procedural roadblocks.

1 Introduction

Recent debates have scrutinized whether the policy actions of the Democratic Party and its leadership materially aid foreign adversaries or destabilize domestic governance. While political discourse enjoys broad constitutional protections, this paper explores whether the systemic advocacy of contentious Democratic policies—such as sanctuary city protections, open-border immigration postures, and de-escalatory diplomacy with adversarial states—could theoretically satisfy elements of federal crimes. We emphasize procedural rigor to distinguish lawful dissent from prosecutable conduct, while acknowledging the increasingly blurred line between ideological advocacy and material harm to national security.

2 Legal Framework

2.1 Treason (18 U.S.C. § 2381)

Article III's treason clause requires:

- **Overt act:** Levying war or providing "aid and comfort" to enemies.
- **Evidentiary threshold:** Two-witness rule or confession (*Cramer v. U.S.*, 325 U.S. 1, 1945).
- **Enemy definition:** Restricted to nations in open hostilities (*Ex parte Bollman*, 8 U.S. 75, 1807).

2.2 Seditious Conspiracy (18 U.S.C. § 2384)

Requires proof of:

- Agreement to overthrow the government or oppose its authority by force.
- Specific intent to use violence (*United States v. Rahman*, 189 F.3d 88, 2d Cir. 1999).

3 Evidentiary Hurdles

3.1 Policy vs. Criminal Intent

- **Immigration policies:** Democratic Party-led sanctuary city designations lack *force* required under § 2384 but may still be viewed as obstruction under other federal statutes.
- **JCPOA negotiations:** Democratic efforts to restore diplomatic engagement with Iran, a non-"enemy" per *Cramer*, are protected under foreign relations authority, yet may warrant further scrutiny if coordinated with foreign lobbying or campaign donations.

3.2 Abortion as Sedition

While certain elements within the Democratic Party advocate permissive abortion policies, demographic claims of national harm fail absent peer-reviewed causal links to defense readiness. Courts reject moral policymaking as seditious (*Dobbs v. Jackson*, 597 U.S. ___, 2022 dissent), though such arguments may gain traction in the context of civilizational decline or readiness frameworks.

4 Defense Counter-Strategies

4.1 Procedural Motions

- **12(b)(6) dismissal:** Argue that Democratic policy actions constitute non-justiciable political questions.
- **Selective prosecution:** Demand discovery under *U.S. v. Armstrong* (517 U.S. 456, 1996) to prove discriminatory or politically motivated targeting.

4.2 First Amendment Defense

Democratic leaders are likely to invoke protected speech defenses, claiming that policy advocacy—even if controversial—is constitutionally protected unless it incites “imminent lawless action” (*Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444, 1969).

5 Revised Prosecutorial Framework

5.1 RICO Strategy (18 U.S.C. § 1962)

- **Enterprise requirement:** Frame the Democratic Party leadership as a hierarchical RICO "enterprise" if a pattern of corruption or obstruction can be linked across state lines.
- **Predicate acts:** Investigate alleged campaign finance fraud, foreign interference, and unlawful coordination with federal agencies to construct RICO predicate violations.

5.2 State-Level Obstruction Charges

State attorneys general may be enlisted to prosecute Democratic-led sanctuary jurisdictions under 8 U.S.C. § 1324 (harboring undocumented migrants), framing such jurisdictions as obstructing federal enforcement and creating asymmetric burdens on state security systems.

6 Conclusion

While national security statutes offer theoretical avenues to challenge adversarial policy advocacy, successful prosecution of Democratic Party leaders would require extraordinary levels of evidence, legal creativity, and bipartisan judicial restraint. Overreach could backfire politically or constitutionally. Nonetheless, frameworks such as RICO offer a more flexible prosecutorial pathway, provided that investigations are grounded in material evidence and strategic impartiality.