Election Fraud Truth Summit Special Report –
In partnership with the Citizen Coalition EveryLegalVote.com

Your Economic Battle Plan™ today has a very special topic and a very special purpose. The election of 2020 is one of the biggest economic battles we have faced as Americans. Literally trillions of dollars are at stake and in the end, it is your money. Foreign governments, corrupt bureaucrats, crony capitalists and the Deep State all have a vested interest in getting the outcome they want. They win. You lose. Unless we do something and take a stand now.

This is a **TAKE ACTION** briefing to protect your money, your livelihood, and your way of life.

**Your Briefing Today Will:**

- Walk through the irregularities of the 2020 election.
- Provide a new resources where you can learn more about fair elections.
- Introduce you to the people on the front lines fighting this battle.
- Expose those who want to steal from you, including foreign interference.
- Debunk the debunkers.
- Show you the truth.
- Give you actions you can take to protect our Constitution and stand for election integrity.

“Anyone who says the 2020 election was normal or says, ‘nothing to see here’ is LYING TO YOU and we will prove it.”–Kevin Freeman

**Your Mission:**

1. To take action, hold the line for Election Integrity, and understand the real fraud taking place in US elections.

2. To encourage Attorney General William Barr to ‘Do His Job’ as it relates to investigating election fraud and ensuring election integrity.
Ep. 3-117 (OSINT) Open-Sourced Intelligence Special Report. This is a Special Report with Kevin Freeman. It is comprehensive and includes subject matter experts in Election Fraud, Cyber, Intelligence, and Legal.

“There is foreign interference in our elections. For every dollar Russia spends affecting our election, Soros spends $3 and China spends $10.” –Col. John Mills

1. First, We Want to Share More About the Website EveryLegalVote.com and Why it Was Formed.

EveryLegalVote.com (ELV) is a website formed by concerned citizens and the Economic War Room team. You can find it at www.EveryLegalVote.com.

ELV is your website, it includes memes, stories, election fraud reports, videos, education, and most important and easy way to TAKE ACTION. The citizen coalition wanted to form a way to enable you to get involved and make a difference. The site is getting better every day and keeps track of the information the deep state and social media companies are banning and blocking.

WARNING: While we have received positive feedback from those looking for information and truth beyond the big tech censorship, we have created our own Hall of Shame page for those who are trying to censor our information.

SOME of our FAVORITE REVIEWS and Badge of Honors include:

Snopes - If you ask Snopes, they say this is a false website. But then, do you really trust SNOPES?

No Surprise - The New York Times has also attacked it. We see this as a badge of honor!

We encourage you to go to the website and explore the data and insights you may not be seeing anywhere else. Go to https://everylegalvote.com.
2. Objections? Answers to the Three Biggest Objections You May Be Hearing.

We want to help counter the narrative with the truth. Despite all of the evidence, the media and politicians are bombarding a message that’s causing a lot of people to give up. There are three main objections we want to address in this briefing to help equip patriots with what is really happening.

Objection #1: The media has debunked all the fraud reports.

This is a very dirty trick designed to manipulate you. I can give you one example. We showed you that “fact checker Snopes claims that McAfee said our website contains malware.” But McAfee certified our website as malware free!

Another trick is often how they word something. But sometimes, they just outright LIE. You may have heard of suitcase under tables in Georgia. Media says “debunked.” Mollie Hemingway at The Federalist proved them 100% wrong. Have you noticed that the debunkers never debunk claims of the LEFT? And the debunkers rarely show the proof. They tend to just quote people saying something’s not true. And the people they quote are always part of the problem.

So, Dominion Securities is quoted to disprove allegations of fraud at Dominion Securities.
Here’s the truth. In 2012, the New York Times warned that mail-in ballots were a huge risk for election fraud. As recently as three months ago, all experts agreed that voting machines were vulnerable to hacking and manipulation.

Other key points to consider:

• Don’t be a science denier! In 2012, the National Academy of Sciences published a paper that said statistical anomalies were major indicators of election fraud. This is science, the same kind that is used all the time in court rooms and to send rockets into space and design bridges.

• All those who debunk the risks of mail-in voting, or voting machines like Dominion Systems, or claiming that statistical analysis is meaningless are misleading you at best. Some are just plain lying.

• The only reason they are claiming “nothing to see here” is BECAUSE THEY BENEFIT FROM THE OUTCOME.

“Frankly, I think it’s a tell that many Republican politicians want to accept the results and move on. Gee, I wonder, have any of them been compromised? Are they hoping for better treatment in a Biden Administration? Have any of them benefited from rigged elections?” – Kevin Freeman

Despite Media Misinformation Attempts: You Are Part of the Majority that believe fraud influenced the Election!

According to a YouGov poll, 75% of voters believe fraud influenced the election.

Of those, more than half believe the fraud was pervasive enough to have influenced the outcome.

BOTTOM LINE: Politicians may be unwilling to admit the fraud, but the American people know better. Don’t let the media say it is all debunked. You know there’s fraud and 75% of Americans agree with you.
Objection #2: “If there were fraud, why isn’t Trump winning in Court?”

- Have you noticed that the lawsuit dismissals are mostly for reasons like, “you don’t have standing,” or “it was filed too late,” or “this should be in state court,” or “this should be in Federal Court.”
- The reality is that most of these courts don’t want to touch this for anything. They would rather not look because if they did, they might have to do something. That’s true for Republican judges and Democrat judges. They all wish someone else would do something.
- But don’t lose heart: The fraud is real and sooner or later it will come out. Which brings us to the next objection.

Objection #3: Isn’t all of this too late?

- Just as a reminder, this was published for the first time on December 8th.
- The Bush v. Gore decision wasn’t decided in the Supreme Court until December 12. There were elections decided even later than that in history. Until the electors meet and vote in the Electoral College, it’s not too late. And the Supreme Court can adjust the dates, if needed, to route out fraud.
- Bottom line: the stakes are too high to rush through this. We need to let the process work for the sake of our nation’s future.

For the rest of this briefing, we bring in top subject matter experts to share the truth around what is really happening. Obviously, we encourage all of our readers to review source data and make their own decisions.

3. Perspective From President Trump’s Legal Team – Joe diGenova

Joe diGenova, one of President Trump’s top lawyers. He has had an incredible career in the legal profession and served as the United States Attorney in the District of Columbia, which is the largest such office in the country. He answers key questions below.

- Let’s look at the fact that the lawsuits are being lost is proof that no substantive fraud
occurred. Certainly not enough to change the election. What is the real status of the lawsuits and why are you optimistic?

“Well, first of all, both the reporting and the judicial work on this has been just awful. We have presented huge amounts of evidence of vote manipulation, computer problems, backdating, failure to have signatures, illegal mailing ballots, illegal absentee ballots, observers being kept out of the counting areas. It’s endless. It goes on and on. That has been presented to committees in state houses, in courts, both state and federal. And there’s just no doubt that it occurred all over the United States.

The most important thing was that there was a circuit breaker on the night of the election in four major cities, in the four major swing states where the counting stops and then all of a sudden, miraculously, hundreds of thousands of votes showed up and transferring the result of the election from Trump to Biden.

The evidence on that is staggering. The statistical analysis which shows the anomalies and the incompatibility of that result with historical voting just lays it out cold.

We hope that the momentum created … will, in fact, wake up some state legislatures and make them have what are called electoral sessions, not joint sessions, not special sessions, but sessions that the legislators themselves can call without the governor or the secretary of state and either give their electoral votes to Trump or deny either candidate the electoral votes, but thus denying each candidate the necessary two hundred and seventy electoral votes. So that’s what we’re shooting for. I think that all the other things are proceeding in every state.”

• Another common statement is that time has run out. Next week the Electoral College meets. Even if there were fraud, is there time to make the case, get it heard, and get a favorable outcome for the President?

“Yes, there is time. Those dates are not set in constitutional stone. They are in statutory stone. But they can be bent. They can be bent,
because if the Supreme Court were to find that there was fraud, that there were illegal ballots, that states violated their own constitutions, allowing mail in ballots, and if this court were to nullify those votes, it could take enough time to have oral argument in those matters and could issue an order saying that the Electoral College would be postponed for a week or so. And there’s nothing in the Constitution that would prevent them from doing that because the dates for the Electoral College are not in the Constitution.”

A review of the most compelling evidence of fraud that will be brought into a hearing if a court will ever stop to listen. The evidence is broken out into four categories and we will have experts to address each of the four.

First. We will review the way the votes were counted. Remember the quote attributed to Stalin? “It’s not he who votes that counts but how the votes are counted.” And in this election, there are plenty of irregularities.

4. The Way Votes are Counted – Ballot Stuffing

A Look at the Georgia Count with Jacki Deason.
Jacki has been working with the President’s legal team, most recently in Georgia. Jacki was the one who broke the story about the hidden ballot cases.

Revelations from the fraud investigations underway in Georgia. Due to Fact Checker distortions, we are going to run in detail Jacki’s summary of events in the Georgia count.

“Here’s the situation in Georgia. Essentially, I was there as a volunteer having no idea what is about to happen in the following week or so. Basically, as you’ve heard, Georgia collected about one hundred affidavits. There are now about twelve hundred across the country. My job is to pore over those affidavits and find out what was most compelling in terms of evidence. Also, to then follow up with those people so we could have some evidence to support the contest that President Trump just filed Friday.
Well, there was so much in those affidavits it was tough to choose. But what was clear in two of them is that there were two Republican observers at the State Farm arena, which is now being called the state ballot form arena in Fulton County, Georgia. They reported that they were there as poll watchers starting at about 8:00 p.m. and then around 10:30, there was an election official who looked like a supervisor who yelled out to the room to stop counting and that they would resume their work in the morning at about 8:30. So you can see in the video, which was subpoenaed by the Trump legal team immediately I received the affidavits that, in fact, about that the overwhelming majority of the poll workers left at about 10:30. Behind them left the press as well as the Republican poll watchers or observers. They left because they believed both the supervisor and the Fulton County spokesperson who said to the press, which is right there, the press was right beside the Republican poll watchers, that they were done for the evening.

Under Georgia law, the public, the press, the Republican poll watchers only have the right to be present at a precinct or a tabulation center during the proceedings. They are not permitted to stay after counting stops and stand guard over the ballots. That would be great, but they’re not. So, our poll watchers had no choice but to leave. They did. Well, later on, they got a tip from someone that, in fact, counting had continued after they left. So, when they found this out, they rushed back to the arena. It’s now almost one o’clock in the morning. When they get there, the security guard stops them and will not let them in so they have a back and forth with him. He makes phone calls to his supervisor or whoever. And finally, after a verbal struggle, he promised them they could go inside. But then it was empty. And apparently he told them that people just left like five minutes ago. They’ve been counting all this time. So this is in the affidavit. So what do we do? We get the video. And by the way, it took a while to get it.”

“People need to understand, the people who are demanding the smoking gun evidence the day after the election, it doesn’t work like that. You have to build a case and it takes time through the legal process to get your affidavits, speak to your witnesses, get a signature, you know, subpoena, the video, that all takes time.” –Jacki Deason
The video showed exactly what our witnesses said. In fact, it was a bit worse because we’re watching, we go straight to the 10:00 p.m. hour and watch from 10:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. and sure enough, everything happened as they said. What was not expected, after everyone had left, the four workers who stayed behind began pulling cases out from under a table. And understand, some of the tables had long black tablecloths that stretched to the floor and some tables didn’t.

So there were ballot cases all over the place. I mean, stacked up against the wall, stacked up alongside the desks, the scanners stacked. Next to the people separating the envelope. They were everywhere and there was plenty of room, this was an enormous room.

In fact, our poll watchers said they were 40 to one 100 feet away from the counting, which made it impossible for them to even see what was going on. I mean, they could have had ten thousand ballots in a row for Biden or poll watchers would never even know, because throughout the process, early voting and election day throughout the state of Georgia, we had affidavit after affidavit where Republican poll watchers were forced to stay so far back from the ballot counting, they couldn’t even tell what was going on. They tried to get closer, even observing social distancing. Several of them had threats that law enforcement would be called. Keep in mind, Georgia law requires that the counting be open to the public and that means the press, and the Republican poll watchers, for accountability.

We view this as breaking the law all the way through. It was not just after-hours ballots, but all day long, they were denied proper access. So that’s a big problem. But as we point out in the video, they waited for some reason until everyone was gone and then pulled these ballots out from under a table where they had been hidden from view to count them.”
THE DEBUNKERS GET DEBUNKED: (Other highlights from Jacki Deason)

“And so what you might have seen is that quickly the by the next morning, there is a website, some No-Name website I’d never heard of. It was a fact checker website, which tried to debunk the video and proclaimed video debunked. Why? Because the secretary of state and his reps say so. Well, it should be obvious that if there was a massive failing here.

There was fraud and the people of Georgia had their votes stolen from them, guess whose fault that is? The secretary of state. So, this guy, as far as I’m concerned, based on all the information I have, he’s just unable or unwilling to take ownership and responsibility for what happened here. And you can see why.”

Jacki highlighted OTHER EVIDENCE OF FRAUD including:

• 2,500 felons illegally voting.
• 66,000 underage registrants.
• 2,400 people who were not on the voter rolls.
• Almost 5,000 who had registered in another state after registering in Georgia, which by definition under state law, you were no longer eligible to vote, period.
• 15,700, voting after a change of address.
• Over 10,000 dead people voting.

Over 1,000 people who claim to have a P.O. box as their address. (That’s not legal. Over 40,000 people who moved to different counties, which in Georgia is a big deal. When you move the county outside of 30 days from an election, you have to reregister. And that didn’t happen. So you’re no longer registered to vote and you cannot vote unless you register with the proper county. That’s Georgia’s way of keeping sure that the election has integrity. They don’t have a way of cross-checking registrants to ensure they are not registered in more than one place.)
Other Resources on Georgia:

Molly Hemmingway at the Federalist wrote a piece to “fact check” the “fact checkers” as it relates to this.

KEY TAKEAWAYS:

Jacki called for this evidence to be properly used to contest the election results and to hold accountable people who conducted criminal activity and for legal reforms in states with problems before the next election. This is hugely important in Georgia because of the upcoming senate race.

The problems are fixable. She pointed out that the legislatures in the contested states are primarily republican – WI, PA, MI, …but the governors could veto the bills.

“All of this due to decertifying. Whose fault is all of that? Who has it in their best interest to make sure they’re waving their hands and saying there’s nothing to see here? I can tell you who it is, it is the secretary of state. So why is the fact-checking website running to that person to say, tell us the story we want? Why are they going to other people that say, President Trump, the Senate candidates are Republican, the Republican Party of Georgia, and say, hey, you know, what do you have to say about this? Is this how this works?” –Jacki Deason

TAKE ACTION

“I’m so happy the country got to see it. You can’t un-ring the bell. People saw it. They can’t unsee it. And it doesn’t matter what incredibly implausible explanations the secretary of state would like to advance, people are not buying it.

And so this is why we need to contest the results of this election to hopefully hold accountable people who might have done something illegal here. We need to investigate further, but it doesn’t look good. And then we have to do legal reforms that are critical for the states. We need to show all the problems now, get them on the record and between now and the next election, do everything we can to fix these problems in the states because we know they’re there. They’re totally fixable because, with these contested states, they all have Republican...
legislatures, which is amazing. All of them either Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Michigan, they can fix this with the legislature. It might not happen in Michigan. I do not doubt Whitmer may veto a bill to fix the system, I’m guessing. But there’s so much to be done. And so there’s a lot of reasons why this legal process has to happen.”

5. Vote Counting and Data Anomalies – Colonel Phil Waldron (RET) who served in Army Intelligence with Cyber Expertise. He has been working investigating and sharing his findings at the recent public hearings.

Col. Waldron shares some of the data anomalies he has studied and shared with the State Legislators:

• The observational data, the map, and the patterns are anomalous.
• They match with hundreds and hundreds of affidavits of citizens from those states who’ve been working in the polls, who have made firsthand witnesses of lack of chain of custody of ballots that don’t meet signature requirements.
• Ballots that were mail in ballots that were the envelopes were opened when the processors received them. They didn’t have the security envelope, just lots and lots of irregularities in the actual voting process.
• We’ve also looked at the machine issues. There’s recently is in Ware County, Georgia. Here the input does not equal the output. And that was the big machine allegation.

“We’ve explained it and shown probable cause. The analogy would be there’s a car in the parking lot. It’s there’s a God-awful smell is coming out of the car. There’s a bloody handprint, but there’s no one willing to open the trunk to look to see if there’s a dead body in the trunk.” – Col. Phil Waldron
The State Legislators Response

- **No Authority Here?** - They don’t seem to realize the legislatures have the authority to look at this, at the elections, whether it’s a forensic audit, whether it’s a ballot audit, whatever that they deem proper. No one seems to be willing to take the political risks to make sure that their voters, their citizens of their state, have not had their civil rights denied.

- **The Spike in Vote Dumps** - So the objections that we’ve gotten from several state legislatures is that while these spike anomalies are there, they don’t really indicate anything.

- **We didn’t tell them that they were fraudulent.** We just said they were indicators of fraudulent activity because they were uploaded faster than the machines could process that number of ballots.

- The State Legislators said, “well those ballots could have been held in a queue and just uploaded all at once. And that is a process, a function that’s present in ESS And Dominion is called batch processing. The administrator can load lots and lots, you know, hundreds or thousands of ballots in a batch file. And according to the manual, they can vote those ballots however they see fit. If they think they’re 80 percent for one candidate and 20 percent for one candidate, they can set that determinant and push the button. And those ballots are all adjudicated at that rate or whatever rate that they determine.

- So we’ve only indicated that this is this is a spike. This is outside of the rest of the normal curve. And this is a good place to start looking if you want to get a true understanding of what happened in your election. So far, the legislatures don’t seem to want to assert their constitutional authority in managing and seating the electorates as their constituents have voted.

6. **Fractional Votes - Voting machines actually designed to cheat?**

Rod Martin, Technology Expert and Futurist shares his insights on how the counting really works.

There’s no doubt that there are issues with how the votes have been counted. A lot of that has to do with our second area of concern, the voting machines themselves like Dominion Systems. To address that issue, we have two experts, the first being Rod Martin, a technologist who worked with Peter Thiel and the PayPal startup team.
• The machines work in a unique way. **You aren’t counting when you’re fractionalization or tabulating as the voting machine terminology goes.** These machines are not designed to just count the votes.

• The average person, I think, rightly, morally believes that when we have an election, we actually have humans who sit there and look at each vote and mark down. OK, that’s one vote for Joe Biden, that one vote for Donald Trump. That’s one vote for the libertarian. And if you have a machine, do it. The machine is just replicating what a human would be doing. **WRONG!**

• Not these machines. These machines put all of these votes in a bucket. They fractionalized them. So you end up with these thousandth of a vote and it is only thousandths of a vote. The tabulation does not go out to further decimal places.

**The Result:** In rounding errors alone, we’ve seen cases where the rounding errors for as much as six thousand votes. **You do that across an entire national election and you can hide literally millions of votes if you wish to.** And my contention would be, that’s really the only reason you would program a system like this. There’s no reason for it not to just be a fancy adding machine, a Scantron from school. And the obvious question that must be addressed and clearly is in front of us because it has been abused.

> “Why on earth would you set up a system that is flawlessly designed to cheat if you weren’t intending to cheat? And indeed, that’s exactly what I believe we have found them doing.” —Rod Martin
News Update:

EPOCH TIMES: December 10, 2020  An elections supervisor in Coffee County, Georgia, demonstrated in recent videos posted online how Dominion Voting Systems voting software allows votes to be changed through an “adjudication” process. The process allows the operator to add vote marks to a scanned ballot as well as invalidate vote marks already on the ballot.

7. Voting Machine Vulnerability - Russ Ramsland continues this discussion on election fraud and potential for cybercrimes. Russ is former candidate for Congress and really self-taught expert on election systems. He warned well in advance of the election that these voting machines are vulnerable. He wasn't alone as every expert agreed. But he has stood up when others won't to tell you the truth.

A look at why the machines are vulnerable and what that means?

• As a result of 2018, we saw the Dallas County election logs and our cyber guy was horrified by what they saw. We jumped in and we started mapping the whole voter system for America.

• What we saw was amazing because we just found this whole thing from start to finish is one long set of vulnerabilities of all kinds.

• Next, we started researching the history and what everyone else had done on it, we found out we’re not the only guys that have found this. There are actually lots of cyber people out there. They’ve reported on all this stuff but nobody is paying any attention.

From our research we saw 2016 and 2018 as practicing various approaches of Election Fraud. Now, in 2020 we see them all coming together and we see three different levels of actors.
Zealots - We see zealots or local people who are trying to help put in fake voters and fake voter rolls and all that kind of stuff, purge good votes, and etc. This is the kind of thing we saw in Georgia and that videotape in Fulton County where we saw them pull all the boxes out and start feeding all the ballots.

Inside Actors - We also see inside actors and those may be the people in Dominion itself. It’s hard to say. Somebody has set the algorithms up what’s called ranked choice voting, inside these machines. And we now have absolute proof of it. You’ve seen it in Wade County recently. You’ve also seen it in Antrim County, we believe.

External Actors – State Actors – Foreign Interference. This includes actors like Iran or China or other state actors. Serbia is another example; Dominion has a back door directly into Serbia. We can trace all these IP addresses and we can see these people actually have real time access into the United States voting system. These actors have the ability to download whole new databases of votes and just change the votes.

There are multiple fraud efforts happening and it is not completely coordinated. This is not necessarily some grand conspiracy master plan. There are zealots, inside actors, and the external actors are out there and in some cases working on their own. These multiple actors make it more difficult for people to understand what is really happening. There’s not just one single fraud that you identify and say, that’s it! Now let’s go find it anywhere else. That’s not how this works.

The good news is that also ups the chances of starting to catch all this stuff. Look at Wade and Antrim counties, and the school bus in Arizona. They allegedly just found a broken-down school bus that was stuffed full of ballot boxes. The video of ballot counting inside of Atlanta. We are finding this stuff more and more.

The Evidence to prove all of this is clearly there - The problem is finding judges with courage.

“The problem isn’t a lack of hard evidence, there’s tons of hard evidence. The problem is finding judges with the courage to step up to this, because this is the hottest potato they may ever be handed in their entire career. And unless they’re really focused on their kids or their grandkids, they’re going to want to walk away from this. They’re going to just want to dismiss the suits. They’re just going to want to bury it. But the evidence is there.” –Russ Ramsland
Other Impossible Votes are as follows:

A. **Impossible Vote Loads** - The numbers on the vote loads are absolutely impossible. The machines can not physically tabulate the votes at the rates they are showing up in the system.

   “It’s like you and I, driving down in my Volkswagen Jetta and we get a speeding ticket for 540 miles an hour. We say, well, your Honor, there’s no way I could be doing 540 miles an hour. The capacity of the car won’t do that. Well, it’s the same with these voting machines. These voting machines won’t upload that many votes in that period of time. So, we know that the votes got loaded some other way.” –Russ Ramsland

B. **Impossible Voter Turn-Out Numbers.**
   
   • There is hard proof as far as the turnout numbers, the turnout numbers in certain counties are absolutely insane.

   • Some of these turnout, I mean, we’re talking 90%, 100%, and even 110% of the registered voters.

C. **Impossible Votes Actually Flipping From One Candidate to Another.**
   
   • Antrim and Wade County have demonstrated exactly what we’ve been saying, which is vote flipping. Votes literally were changed from what was originally tabulated in the machine.

   • See Rod Martin’s section above about fractional votes and how this is often accomplished. Also, more below from Garland Favorito.

D. **Impossible Fact Checking – Artificial Intelligence (AI) messages funded as part of Facebook operation, not real fact checkers.**
   
   • Look these things up online and there’s this little notice, “this has been debunked.”

   • These are actually artificial intelligence generated messages by a supposed group of fact checkers. But the reality is those guys are funded by Facebook. It’s a Facebook operation and it’s an automatic operation.

   • If you look to see the actual evidence of this supposedly new truth, not one single time can they offer any evidence that it’s actually been looked at or debunked. It is just a restatement with a claim it is not valid.
“All they can do is parrot what they saw on the screen that was produced artificially by machines.” –Russ Ramsland

See 90 second video link here that describes the fact checking process in detail – it is a good link to share with everyone.

EXHIBIT – VOTE FLIPPING and THE VOTING MACHINES IN ATLANTA

Garland Favorito shares his experience and the affidavit he filed in Georgia as it relates to machine counts vs hand counts not adding up.

Fact checkers have said that there is no proof that the voting machines can flip votes. But here is an example in Georgia where the hand recount showed a significant difference from the voting machine results.

The debunkers want to misconstrue what he said but the facts speak for themselves. Garland Favorito is filed the affidavit and reports what happened here.

The facts are that the hand count on it revealed 37 more votes for Donald Trump and 37 less for Joe Biden than what the machines actually counted on Election Day. So in other words, those machines flipped 37 votes from President Trump to former Vice President Joe Biden.

Now, we don’t know why they flipped the votes. We don’t know if it was a software error, if it was a configuration setting or a definition or mismatch of some kind.

I go through all those possible scenarios in my affidavit, and the most likely one, I believe, would be malware, although it’s not proved conclusively until we have a forensic investigation of the server. And that’s simply what we’re asking for.
Let’s investigate the server, do a forensic investigation and find out exactly what happened.

The elections director already confirmed, The hand count audit revealed:
- thirty-seven extra votes for Donald Trump
- thirty-seven less votes for Joe Biden.

Whenever you do an audit of the electronic vote, which is completely unverifiable to begin with, the normal procedure is that you accept the count of the hand count of the audit as being the correct results. And that was exactly what the elections director did. He did everything correctly as near as I can tell.

We’ve gotten his confirmation in writing. He confirmed it to me verbally and he confirmed it to Dr. Earl Martin verbally, who was a former Waycross City Commission candidate.

So we have those three corroborating pieces of evidence, plus the actual in my affidavit, I include the audit results from the secretary of state’s office and the certified election results from the secretary of state’s nominee. We have five corroborating pieces of evidence that prove the debunkers have been debunked.

Note: The switch, like Garland saw, demonstrates the machines are not perfect and there is reason to confirm what is really happening with potential electronic voting machine manipulation. The question is why is this really being debunked when there are five pieces of corroborating evidence?

8. Foreign Interference - Colonel John Mills - We know that our elections are vulnerable to foreign interference, but that risk is not confined to just the machines.

Colonel John Mills, a retired Army intelligence officer who served as the director of cybersecurity policy strategy and affairs and the Office of Secretary of Defense shares his insights on the foreign interference threats.
“The past four years, we’ve been told how Russia colluded to put Donald Trump in the White House, even though there was zero evidence uncovered to that effect. But did you see the media debunking that? Of course not. Have you heard anything about foreign interference in this election? Of course not. But that doesn’t mean that it isn’t there.” – Kevin Freeman

Election Warning Signs - There are so many warning signs about this election. The American public assumes that our elections are secure, they’re being done by citizens that care about the process, that are acting as sworn election officials, they’re upholding their duty and their oath of office. There’s this assumption that things are being taken care of. Unfortunately, very few Americans get involved, and state actors recognize this.

There is a Clear Motive for Foreign Interference:

CHINA Election Interference – China is somebody that is taking care of and paying attention to the US election process

- With China and their plan for the world. They do have a plan to be a rising hegemonic power, their intent is to replace us and retire us.

- The elections are nothing but a big, juicy target. They are so many opportunities for them, this is influence operations.

- This is an influence operations on steroids. These are influence operations that we in many ways pioneered back in the 1950’s with the Dulles brothers, but in many ways walked away from.

- They read our history, they read everything about us and they understand influence operations on a on a massive scale. So for years they have been essentially working what we would call preparation of the battle space. And a lot of that is influence operations. **A lot of that is essentially payments to key individuals to acquire essentially willing enablers inside our own country.**

- The Chinese have always had a reputation is being noisier and less careful. They’re not as concerned about being found out. And that professor last night from the clip on Tucker, was very emblematic of their behavior. (He was bragging about the people they had influenced and bought to control their agenda.)
Russia Election Interference

Historically, the Russians are known for being far more careful, far more silent, far more precise.

Influence Operations - A look at the numbers

“And again, in these influence operations, I just have to be totally clear, because I’ve actually run the numbers on this available capital for influence operations. And the simple model is, yes, Russia interferes in our elections and I believe they did and they have for years.” – Col. John Mills

Foreign Influence Operations, plus Soros activities
Investment of Russia vs Soros vs. China on these activities: Col. Mills Explains

For every ONE dollar Russia spends, Soros spends THREE dollars, the Chinese spend TEN dollars.

So, from the from our side, we always have to apply limited offensive and defensive resources.

The threat is China. Now, in this election specifically, it is just that they are all over the place! This was a massive blitz to essentially to topple our election, our election institution.

Our own people do not understand our processes. Therefore, how could you even set up an operation to secure our election operations when we don’t even know how our own elections operate?

There is a general lack of understanding of the Election Process - AG William Barr and our Intelligence departments lack resources and understanding of the election process.

“AG Barr said some comments the other day, I think they were probably inappropriate. The reality is our intelligence and law enforcement resources have effectively done very little, if anything, on Chinese influence operations. Why? Because being a former intelligence officer, a former colonel, and senior official in the Department of Defense, the intelligence community, how can you
even run an intelligence operation or law enforcement operation when you
don’t even understand the election process?” –John Mills

Some uninformed responses from our Government officials:

Chris Krebs our top cyber security official who worked on protecting our
election system from hackers was not prepared. He went with the talking
points provided to him from Dominion.

“Chris Krebs said very inappropriate things. The more honest and
truthful answer was, I don’t have the resources, the staffing, the
technical expertise to even say ‘yay’ or ‘nay’ on interfering with
Chinese interference.” –Col. John Mills

AG Barr was likely provided inadequate information for his response on the
integrity of the elections.

“What AG Barr said last week. I think it was inappropriate. I think that
was his own staff that frankly gave him a rote response of what is
the accepted truth without any modicum of actual investigation.”
–Col. John Mills

Foreign Interference with Chinese Ownership in Dominion? It could be true:

• Let’s consider the transaction and the Chinese here, we have the $400
million through USB securities in Switzerland to Dominion.

• Also, the mysterious nature of the eight registered companies under the
Election Assistance Commission, nobody understands what’s going on.
There’s eight registered companies, but when you do the business forensics,
it’s more like three and maybe even one company.

• And they’re privately held with very little responsibility or requirement to be
transparent.

“As it relates to Dominion Voting Machine ownership. We don’t
understand these companies, they’re privately held, there was
a $400 million transaction before the election. We also have this
open talk of buying off officials that Professor Dongsheng boasted
about on video.’ –Col. John Mills
Foreign Political Interference and Paper Ballots Being Purchased In China:

We have on social media and we’ve confirmed them with native Mandarin speakers talking about shipping ballots from China to Florida and North Carolina.

- There’s no control measures on these mail-in ballots.
- There’s essentially no corroboration of paper weave, paper weight, there are multiple paper types, of ink types. Are they copies? Have they been folded?

This is a Disneyland for China, who is looking to massively rush and overwhelm our election integrity. And they executed well.

Col. Mills has done some financial analysis in Virginia matching the number of personnel staffing and providing an apolitical view on this. Comparing the Republican party and the Democrat party in Virginia, the staffing is outrageously different.

He suggests that proceeds do not cover the amount of personnel they have working for the Democrat party in Virginia, for example. [Where does that extra money come from? It is very curious.]

From an influence operation perspective, matched with Chinese strategy, investment in our election system is just an incredible opportunity and gives China an incredible return on investment.

- The American election system, between the mysterious election machine companies.
- The operations and programing of the election machines makes no sense. Bringing all the votes together by all candidates and then using math to spin the numbers back out and apportion them. That makes absolutely no sense.

“We were concerned well in advance of this election; all the evidence points that this was and is a massive Chinese influence operation. And I have found is very few, of those personnel very few understand how our elections operate. And we just assume somebody is taking care of it. Somebody is taking care of election system and it looks like it could easily be state actors like China.” –Col. John Mills
“There’s no doubt that China desired to defeat President Trump and replace him with Vice President Biden. That was the conclusion of our nation’s intelligence service before the election.” – Kevin Freeman

9. Counterfeit Ballots - Dr. Lin shares insights on ballots being produced in China.

There appears to be counterfeit ballots being produced inside communist China and shipped to the US. Dr. Lin did an interview with Sidney Powell recently and she pointed out that counterfeit ballots were still being shipped into the United States, crossing Mexican-US borders.

SIDNEY POWELL INTERVIEW: [ON CAMERA]
“We do, we heard a video of somebody ordering ballots from China. We have evidence of a significant planeload of ballots coming in, and we have a witness that has said that they continue to come in because they intend to run counterfeit ballots in any runoffs or if they need them in recounts, too. So, it hasn’t stopped.”

- Dr. Lin expanded on Sidney Powell’s allegations regarding these counterfeit ballots.
- One young Chinese immigrant actually stepped forward to testify on these aspects.
- His English name is Vinness Ollervides.
- He is actually a princeling from the Chinese communist party because his grandfather was a very senior communist party member and was able to attend the formal ceremony when Chairman Mao announced the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949.
- He emigrated to the United States and now resides in California.
- Recently, he was using his connections inside China and managed to establish a contact with the owner of an underground print shop and he found out they were able to produce counterfeit ballots for customers from the United States.

[You can see the actual video footage of this on episode]
“So, from Mr. Ollervides’ testimony, we can see hundreds of thousands, even more than a million counterfeit ballots have been shipped into the United States. And I definitely think these allegations warrant more investigation and probably from the federal agencies. And the federal agents need to immediately stop the continuing influx of counterfeit ballots into the United States.” – Dr. Sean Lin

10. Foreign Interference, China and the Biden Family Compromised. – Dr. Sean Lin

A Chinese Professor is openly sharing about China’s US Infiltration.
China has already stated they want a Biden Presidency over a Trump Presidency. More evidence of why China cares.

Dr. SEAN LIN shares about the Professor in a video that connects Joe Biden’s family’s connection with the Chinese communist regime.

- This video is about a scholar from Renmin University, his name is Di Dongsheng.
- He’s the vice-dean of the school of international relations in Renmin University in Beijing. Mr. Di is no ordinary scholar.
- In 2015, he actually accompanied Mr. Go Wei Ming, the deputy director of the information office of state councils in China to visit Washington, DC and then hosted a seminar to promote Xi Jinping’s new book regarding the governance of China.
- Recently he made a very important speech on November 28th in Shanghai. And the event he was actually discussing about the opening of China’s financial market to the world.
- In this event, his speech addressed the connection between the deep state of the United States and the Chinese communist party and he actually implied that Hunter Biden’s global fund was established under the help of the Chinese communist regime.

Plus, more documentation - A review of another Chinese video that proves China’s interest in promoting Joe Biden and leveraging his family connections.
Excerpt from the tape - See actual footage [CLICK HERE and go to 55:01]

“So, why can’t we fix the Trump administration? Why between 1992 and 2016 China and the US use to be able to settle all kinds of issues? It’s just because we have people at the top – at the top of America’s core inner circle of power and influence. We have our old friends. For the past thirty years, forty years. We have been utilizing the core power of the United States. But the problem is that after 2008, the status of Wall Street has declined. And more importantly, after 2016, Wall Street can’t fix Trump. But now we’re seeing Biden was elected. The traditional elite, the political elite, the establishment. They’re very close to Wall Street. So, you see that, right? Trump has been saying that Biden’s son has some sort of global foundation. Have you noticed that? Who helped him, Biden’s son, build the foundations? There are a lot of deals in all these.” –Dr. Di Dongsheng.

“I would encourage everyone to watch the full episode of Mr. Di Dongsheng’s speech. I think this is very strong, indirect evidence after Hunter Biden’s laptop and also Mr. Bobulinski’s testimony. This is very important evidence, indirect evidence, to show the connection between Biden’s family and the Chinese communist regime. So, this is actually suggesting that Biden’s family poses a great threat to the national security of the United States.” –Dr. Sean Lin


In the 2020 election there’s this whole issue of impossible votes. You may have heard stories of 130,000 votes in a row for Joe Biden.

- One expert told us that the voting patterns like these were so impossible it would be like winning the Powerball lottery four times in a row.
The courts haven’t been willing to look at the statistical evidence and the media says, where’s the proof?

**The statistics are the proof. In fact, that’s how you find fraud. You start with anomalies.**

- Statistical analysis has long been considered in election analysis. It’s something the state department talks about.

- It’s in the Carter Center and others. And there’s even a National Academy of Sciences report in 2012 that said that is the best way to find fraud.

To drill down on the statistical evidence in the 2020 election, Jay Valentine, one of the world’s top experts on fraud identification shared his insights on why statistics matter when identifying fraud. He and his team are so good that eBay asked them to build their fraud detection system.

**About the numbers, science, and cyber criminal activity – Why statistics matter!**

Jay’s team has a long history in cybercriminal activity and how to find it when people are doing everything they can to use computers to hide the data. They broke some of the largest fraud rings in Medicare, Medicaid and property casualty insurance.

“When you’re looking at what’s called industrial level fraud. Industrial fraud is where you are dealing with large data sets, not somebody that’s just changing a few invoices, but big data fraud, the way that you find the fraud is you look for a starting point and the starting point is found with statistical pattern analysis.”

Now what that means is that every data set – it could be a data set of Girl Scout cookies and how they’re sold, it could be the most innocent data set in the world. All data sets have patterns in them of how the data looks and operates. Fraud is no different. What statistical pattern analysis does is it looks for the patterns in the data and it finds outliers, it finds anomalies in the data.
And what is happening in this election – and it’s very well shown on your site, everylegalvote.com, you have a very excellent presentation there of what statistical fraud looks like. So, what happens is with statistical fraud, you actually can look at these large data sets, you can see these very strange anomalies and from the anomalies, you can dig in and that’s where you find the real fraud.” –Jay Valentine

Mr. Valentine goes on to explain his insights on the 2020 election:

• He looked at large data sets of the analyses out there by people like Dr. Shiva and three or four other, very good statisticians.

• Jay considers these people are state of the art. Their mathematics are outstanding. He reviewed that material very carefully and was able to see fraud again and again.

• He concluded it is fraud that occurred at an industrial level.

• It was the type of fraud that could only be done with computers, with computers creating algorithms, and you can see it because, across different data sets, a precinct, for instance, might be a data set, every precinct had exactly the same algorithm moving votes from candidate A to candidate B.

• That can only be done with computer algorithms.

• His conclusion is very clear, if you take a look and you can get hold of those voting machines, and you can look at the source code and you can look at the log files, you’re going to find how that fraud actually occurred.

“We agree with the seventy-five percent of Americans who believe in fact that there was serious fraud.” –Kevin Freeman
12. How to Get this Addressed – Joseph Schmitz, Former Inspector General

Despite the above data, the courts have punted. There may be an unstoppable strategy, a way to get the courts interested.

To learn more, we have invited former inspector-general of the department of defense Joseph Schmitz to provide his perspective.

- Under the Constitution, article three, the Supreme Court has what is called original jurisdiction over a number of types of lawsuits, including a, states versus states.

- In the case that was filed last night by Texas against Pennsylvania, Michigan, Georgia, and Arizona, the attorney general in Texas invoked this constitutional provision providing the US Supreme Court with the original jurisdiction to hear these cases.

Schmitz shared another perspective that Texas might also take into account with the 1871 law and why that might apply.

- The fourteenth amendment was enacted in 1868 and it triggered a flurry of implementing statutes out of Congress, including the civil rights act of 1871, which prohibits conspiracies to deprive American citizens of basic civil rights.

- It focused on the voting rights of freed slaves. And this law, in the vernacular, is sometimes referred to as the Ku Klux Klan act, because there was a very serious problem after the fourteenth amendment was passed. There were literally violent conspiracies going on, mostly in the southern states, to prevent the freed slaves from having that fundamental right to vote.

- Making this even more interesting would be if West Virginia were to join Texas, considering the KKK’s history with Senator Byrd and all that, wouldn’t that be an irony?

- It’s not just civil rights generically. The US Supreme Court, in 1964 has referred to the right to vote as the right upon which every other right is based. Without the right to vote, And the Supreme Court implicitly was
saying in free and fair elections, without that right, all of our other civil rights are for not. They all go to the wayside.

• This is really an important civil right and it’s a fundamental right. It’s the – like the prime right, the prime civil right, and ironically, or not ironically, the civil rights act of 1871 was focused on voting rights. And that’s why Congress passed this statute which forbids anybody from conspiring to deprive American citizens of the right to vote in free and fair elections.

• Why not make this a Civil Rights case?

“I'm going to mention this to our attorney general here in Texas and suggest it everywhere Joe, I can’t imagine a better opportunity to stand up for the civil rights of Americans. I mean, what you just framed was that this is truly a civil rights issue. It’s not just somebody conducting voter fraud in one state or another. What they do in Pennsylvania or in Georgia or in Michigan, what they’re doing there actually really is denying civil rights, isn’t it?” –Kevin Freeman

Looking at the 1871 act, it literally says, if two or more persons conspire, that’s what it sure appears like to me, what happened.

• The fact that Texas sued four states for essentially doing the same thing, it wasn’t coincidental. People had to be conspiring for these four states to be doing the same thing. And as Texas points out in the complaint filed last night, it was a violation of the fourteenth amendment equal protection clause. And that’s exactly what the civil rights act of 1871 focuses on.

• The most compelling thing I found is the way that the Texas attorney general actually framed the issue and cited statistical analysis that shows that it was like a one in a gazillion chance of all four of these states, considering where the actually ballot projections were on the morning of the 4th of November, it’s like one in a bazillion chance that all four of those states would have flipped to Joe Biden.
Case Study - A Look at Fraud and the Election.

“I heard last week; Mark Levin had this brilliant analysis of what’s going on in Pennsylvania. And, you know, people talk about, there’s no evidence of systemic fraud.

I wrote the Inspector General manual, the subtitle of which is ‘fraud, waste, abuse and other constitutional enemies, foreign and domestic.’ So, Mark points out the same point that I point out in my handbook, if there’s criminal fraud, there’s civil fraud, and what’s happening is the people are raising sort of a straw man of criminal fraud as if that’s the only way fraud can manifest itself.

I wrote an article last week in NewsMax. The elephant in the living room is this is a deliberate effect – I mean, a deliberate overt conspiracy. Mark Levin points this out – since October of 2019, there has been a deliberate effort to corrupt the election process, and this was long before COVID, by the way, to corrupt the election process in Pennsylvania by pushing for this massive mail-in ballot.

The bipartisan commission that was set up after Bush versus Gore, to see what went wrong, said that the mail-in votes are the ripest area for fraud. And they weren’t talking about criminal fraud. If you just look and see what’s happened over the last eighteen months, there is a deliberate conspiracy to corrupt the election process in the battlefield states of Pennsylvania, Michigan, Georgia, Arizona, Nevada.” –Joseph Schmitz

SUMMARY - WHAT WE’VE COVERED SO FAR:

1. We introduced you to www.EveryLegalVote.com as an important educational resource.

2. We debunked the debunkers and answered the objections people are raising.

3. We looked at some of the most compelling evidence that serious fraud took place.

4. We shared a legal strategy that could rock Washington and the nation, but framed as a Civil Right’s issue.
ACTION STEPS:

We all need to take responsibility and act. There are two things we need to do:

1. We first need to PRAY! Time is short and the stakes are high. We are caught between the Egyptian Army and the Red Sea. So, let’s take time, get on our knees, and ask God to expose the fraud, bring truth to life, and make things right.

2. Second, we need to TAKE ACTION. Tell the leaders to DO YOUR JOB! Go to https://everylegalvote.com and click the Take Action button. Be sure to click the Take Action where we make it easy to make your voice known in less than 60 seconds!

3. To date, patriots like you have helped drive over 3.5 million actions. This has worked. We did help force legislative hearings in four states we targeted, Arizona, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Georgia.

4. TAKE ACTION NOW and urge everyone you know to do the same.

5. Hold the line, demonstrate social patience, and do not fall to the media narratives of the election being over until we are assured every legal vote is counted. America needs to know there is integrity in our voting systems and machines.

6. Review the 98-page letter with Exhibits put out by EveryLegalVote (we’ve added at the end of this Economic Battle Plan™ for your convenience).

7. You heard about election fraud from us in the Economic War Room before. If you are new to Economic War Room, you can see more information and election fraud background at www.EconomicWarRoom.com/myvote.


   - If you are following Economic War Room® you will be on the leading edge as it relates to global threats, geopolitical analysis, and how you can weaponize your money to strengthen America. Your money, livelihood and way of life are at risk and these tools are designed to mobilize America to protect their economic liberty.

   - Learn more about Economic War Rooms financial advisor training at https://www.economicwarroom.com/advisor. We will be launching this in 2021.
In the Economic War Room®, we encourage Americans to be the “small ships that make the difference.” You cannot solely rely on the government or the president to solve America’s problems. You have to make a difference. It is up to you to help take our country back and create a voice for economic liberty. [The small ships are based on Churchill’s Operation Dynamo that rescued the British Expeditionary Forces in the Miracle of Dunkirk].

We need more Economic Patriots on the team! Consider what you can do now to help strengthen America or even help someone in need. Keep in touch with your congressional representatives. Choose from the list or set your own goals:

- Get others to sign up on our website (https://www.economicwarroom.com) and review our free weekly Economic Battle Plans™. Each of these will address critical solutions to the threats highlighted in this briefing.
- At our Economic War Room® website, sign up to TheBlaze for our complete weekly shows. Please use our code (ECON) from that link for a discount and FREE trial.
- Follow, like, comment, and share on FB and Twitter. Look for short video segments on FB and make sure those are shared. We recognize these tools may be compromised at times, but if they are not filtered, they are the major platforms available to reach out to the public. [Know that alternatives to the social platforms listed above are under EWR consideration.]
- Check out XOTV (https://xotv.me/channels/233-economic-war-room), a new free speech video platform that Economic War Room is proud to partner with. Access is FREE but consider making a donation to EWR on that website to help with Economic War Room’s research and production costs.
- You are welcome to share this battle plan and our short video segments with friends on FB or YouTube. We set up the Economic War Room® to be your resource for information, preparation, and mobilization.
- Do this now! Have a financial action plan based on multiple geopolitical scenarios developed now. Advanced preparation is key. Trying to figure what to do when an economic event happens is usually too late.
- Talk with your financial advisor as it relates to your savings/investments. Ensure your advisor understand the potential impact economic/geo-political scenarios could have on your portfolio. LOOK FOR ECONOMIC WAR ROOM’S ADVISOR AND INVESTOR ONLINE TRAINING COURSES COMING SOON.
Shareable Quote:
“What we are seeing play out is perhaps the most intense Economic Warfare you will see. That’s because the battle for control of America is largely about the money. If we lose integrity in our elections, we will lose America.”

–Kevin Freeman

*DISCLAIMER: The Economic War Room® and its affiliates do not provide investment advice. In cases where guests or others may discuss investment ideas, these should not be viewed or construed as advice. The sole purpose is education and information. And, viewers should realize that in any case past performance is not indicative of future results. Neither Kevin Freeman, his guests or EWR-Media Holdings, LLC suggests, offers, or guarantees any specific outcome or profit. You should be aware of the real risk of loss in following any strategy or investment even if discussed on the show or any show-affiliated materials or websites. This material does not take into account your particular investment objectives, financial situation or needs and is not intended as recommendations appropriate for you. You must make independent decisions regarding information, investments, or strategies mentioned on this website or on the show. Before acting on information on economicwarroom.com website or on the show, or any related materials, you should consider whether it is suitable for your particular circumstances and strongly consider seeking advice from your own financial or investment advisor.
The EWR Collection Deck – From Kevin Freeman
(List of resources and external links for more information)

Quick Access Links
Understanding the Election Fraud
Election Irregularities
Using Data
Bi-Partisan Proof That Voting Machines Can Be Hacked
2020 Machines Gone Wild?
About Kill Chain Documentary
Foreign Interference
Time for Action?
Potential for Lawsuit

98-Page Open-Letter from America to DOJ

[] - Must Read/Watch

Where to Access Economic War Room
On BlazeTV https://get.blazetv.com/economic-war-room/
Our Website https://www.economicwarroom.com/
Our Facebook page https://www.facebook.com/economicwarroom/
Our Twitter page https://twitter.com/economicwarroom
Our YouTube page https://www.youtube.com/economicwarroomwithkevinfreeman
Our XOTV Channel https://xotv.me/channels/233-economic-war-room
Link to all Battle Plans https://www.economicwarroom.com/battleplans
Understanding the Election Fraud

[ ] Every Legal Vote website  www.EveryLegalVote.com

[ ] Primer on Fraud  https://everylegalvote.com/primer

Fraud PhD  https://everylegalvote.com/phd

Fraud Stories  https://everylegalvote.com/explore

[ ] Economic War Room Shows  https://www.economicwarroom.com/myvote

Never, Never Surrender  https://youtu.be/EBRNDWcuw9g

Trump Supporters Rally in Washington to Protest Vote Fraud, Media  

Keet Lewis With  EveryLegalVote.com On Lou Dobbs  


Washington Watch Interview  https://www.tonyperkins.com/get.cfm?i=LR20K09

Sandy Rios Interview  

Kevin Freeman | ACWT Interview 11.17.20  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DSom2SP8FBQ

EveryLegalVote interview on NewsMax  https://youtu.be/5D-XsUEwwhM

Russ Ramsland on America Can We Tal  https://youtu.be/0K3UHBN3O9k

Securing America Election Fraud Special  
https://www.securingamerica.tv/securing-america-election-fraud-special/

[ ] War Room: Pandemic Ep 542  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CVZLYXS_u6s8t=1659

Liquid Lunch on Every Legal Vote  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MPTD64bzs34

[ ] Glenn Beck Interviews Kevin Freeman  https://youtu.be/qF9i05tSesS
Election Irregularities

- Reasons why the 2020 presidential election is deeply puzzling

- Doubts cast over claims of fair and free election
  https://www.wnd.com/2020/12/doubts-cast-claims-fair-free-election/

- Infographic: What Happened in Atlanta on Election Night
  https://www.theepochtimes.com/what-happened-in-atlanta-on-election-night-2_3607130.html

- ‘Tsunami’ of vote-fraud evidence rolled out in Pennsylvania, Arizona, Georgia, Michigan

- Reported Burst Pipe in Atlanta Ballot Counting Area Was Overflowing Urinal: Investigator
  https://www.theepochtimes.com/reported-burst-pipe-in-atlanta-ballot-counting-area-was-overflowing-urinal-investigator_3607741.html

- Georgia Poll Observers Say They Were Effectively Told to Go Home
  https://www.theepochtimes.com/georgia-poll-observers-say-they-effectively-were-told-to-go-home_3605825.html

- Election Fraud Allegations: Infographic
  https://www.theepochtimes.com/election-fraud-allegations-infographic_3605589.html


- “Dominion Contractor at Detroit Counting Center: 1000’s of Ballots Scanned Multiple Times
  https://justthenews.com/politics-policy/elections/dominion-contractor-detroit-counting-center-says-thousands-ballots-were

- 3 Percent of Nevada Mail Ballots in Question After Survey Finds Defrauded Voters

- Election lawyer alleges Zuckerberg, wife tried to illegally influence election in Michigan

- A Running Compendium of Fraud Charges in Election 2020

- No, The Georgia Vote-Counting Video Was Not ‘Debunked.’ Not Even Close
  https://thefederalist.com/2020/12/07/no-the-georgia-vote-counting-video-was-not-debunked-not-even-close/
'Voter Integrity Project' Releases Evidence of Thousands of Vote Fraud Issues – Combined with Affidavits from Rudy and Gateway Pundit’s Statistical Analysis – More Than Enough Information to Refute Election Results  

Whoa: Nearly a Third of Democrats Believe the Election Was Stolen From Trump  
https://davidharrisjr.com/steven/whoa-nearly-a-third-of-democrats-believe-the-election-was-stolen-from-trump/  

Willful Blindness  
https://jrnyquist.blog/2020/11/20/willful-blindness/  

'There Was in Fact Fraud That Took Place:' FEC Chairman Trey Trainor  
https://www.theepochtimes.com/there-was-in-fact-fraud-that-took-place-fec-chairman-trey-trainor_3588656.html  

Using Data  
Statistical detection of systematic election irregularities  
https://www.pnas.org/content/109/41/16469  

PATRICK BYRNE | ACWT INTERVIEW 12.9.20  
https://americacanwetalk.org/patrick-byrne-acwt-interview-12-9-20/  

Our Problems Are In Code We Don't Want  
https://jayvalentine.com/our-problems-are-in-code-we-dont-want/  

Joy Valentine | The Man That Actually Built Ebay’s Fraud Protection Engine Exposes Voter Fraud  
https://www.thrivetimeshow.com/business-podcasts/jay-valentine/  

Statistician and Fraud Expert Jay Valentine Weighs In On The Latest Election Results And What’s Next  
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oi6euD3HLyQ  

Securing America Election Fraud Special #26.4 - Jay Valentine - 11/25/20  
https://youtu.be/kZpm38pEZMM  

Impossible! Michigan, Georgia, PA and VA All Show the Exact Same Vote Ratio Between Trump and Biden Among Mail-In Votes  

Dr Shiva Ayyadurai, MIT PhD Testimony 113020  
https://youtu.be/nwHa1pfyJjc  

Show the Graphs, Mr. President!  
https://stream.org/show-the-graphs-mr-president/  

DATA: Michigan Analysis Suggests Absentee Votes 'Manipulated By Computer', Flags Hundreds Of Thousands Of Ballots  
https://thenationalpulse.com/politics/michigan-election-fraud-analysis/
In sworn statement, prominent mathematician flags up to 100,000 Pennsylvania ballots

Bi-Partisan Proof That Voting Machines Can Be Hacked

[1] 2018 NY Times Video: Professor Shows Students How Easy It Is to Hack a Dominion Voting Machine

Democratic senators warned of potential ‘vote switching’ by Dominion voting machines prior to 2020 election

[1] Reliability of pricey new voting machines questioned

Top Democrats Raised Concerns About Dominion Voting Technology in 2019

2019 MSNBC report on hacking voter machines
https://twitter.com/jackposobiec/status/1330364450935812100?s=21

HBO’s John Oliver Called It ‘Completely Insane’ to Use Electronic Voting Machines in Nov. 2019

‘Software I Hacked In 2005 Is Still In Use’: Cyber Security Expert Harri Hursti On 2020 Presidential Election


Smartmatic, Comelec execs indicted
https://manilastandard.net/mobile/article/238782

2006 CNN report on voting machines
https://twitter.com/squirrel_hockey/status/133059189645529090

2020 Machines Gone Wild?

Dominion System Flips Georgia Trump Votes to Biden State Orders Counties to Certify Dominion Results Anyway
Economic Battle Plan
Election Fraud - Special Report
CLEARED FOR RELEASE 12/08/2020 (Economic Battle Plan™ Points: 200)

- Election Supervisor shows on video how dominion software allows changing and adding votes

- Sidney Powell Claims That Dominion Is ‘Shredding Documents’

Smoking Gun: Dominion Transferring Vote Ratios between Precincts in PA.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KIlI46HdqKg&feature=youtu.be

Dominion, Smartmatic, and SCYTL were selected by the Krebs as part of his Council of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security of the DHS

- Election Systems in Michigan County Appeared to Be Connected to Internet: Sworn Affidavit

- Captured in Real Time: That Moment in Virginia at 5:12 AM Where they Took 169,000 Votes Off the State Totals

- Paper Warned About the Software Company at Center of Ballot Glitches in Swing States; UPDATE: MI SOS Responds
  https://townhall.com/tipsheet/bethbaumann/2020/11/07/key-swing-states-were-utilizing-a-software-company-at-the-center-for-ballot-glitch-n2579664

- The Small World of Voting Machine Certification

- Dominion Engineer Told Antifa He’d ‘Made Sure’ Trump Wouldn’t Win, Report Says

- Dominion, the Foreign Software Company with a Controversial Background Deciding American Elections

- CLAIM: Dominion Exec Bragged That He Made Sure ‘Trump Is Not Gonna Win’ on Conference Call

Pennsylvania Bombshell: Biden 99.4% vs. Trump 0.6%
https://spectator.org/pennsylvania-bombshell-biden-99-4-vs-trump-0-6/

Sidney Powell sues Arizona officials over Dominion software, alleges 412,000 illegal ballots
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Enough Votes to Turn the Election–Voting Machine Secrets Revealed [YouTube Video](https://youtu.be/LzMQxHdaAkk)

Five Videos – Five States Where Votes Were Switched Live on TV Away from President Trump to Biden – Updated [Gateway Pundit](https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2020/11/four-videos-four-states-votes-switched-live-tv-away-president-trump-biden/)

Dominion Contractor. There is an avenue for fraud. [YouTube Video](https://youtu.be/60j7c-Oa4UE)

There are Issues with Dominion Voting Systems Software [Eye on Tampa Bay](http://www.eyeontampabay.com/2020/11/there-are-issues-with-dominion-voting.html)


About Kill Chain Documentary

Kill Chain: The Cyber War on America’s Elections – Watch the HBO Original Documentary | HBO [HBO](https://www.hbo.com/documentaries/kill-chain-the-cyber-war-on-americas-elections)


HBO video makes claims about hacked Alaska election computer system in 2016 [Must Read Alaska](https://mustreadalaska.com/hbo-video-makes-claims-about-hacking-alaska-election-system-in-2016/)


The journal of a plague year; threats of election dysfunction [Boston Globe](https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/03/19/arts/journal-plague-year-threats-election-dysfunction/)


Meanwhile, A Deeper Danger Than Pandemic [Forbes](https://www.forbes.com/sites/melikkaylan/2020/03/24/meanwhile-a-deeper-danger-than-pandemic/)
This Documentary Will Show You Just How Fragile Our Democracy Really Is
https://time.com/5809745/kill-chain-documentary-hbo-review/

Foreign Interference

[] As the 2020 Election Continues In the Courts, The Deadline for President Trump’s Executive Order Regarding Foreign Intervention in US Elections Silently Approaches

[] Georgia, Mired in Election Disputes, Fosters Cozy Ties With China

Voter Rights Group Notifies DOJ of Pakistani Link With Nevada Election Email System


[] China Gets Its Money’s Worth From America’s Elites
https://andmagazine.com/talk/2020/12/08/china-gets-its-moneys-worth-from-americas-elites/

The Murky Foreign Actors Behind US Election Fraud

[] Chinese boast Biden White House will restore their influence

Troubling Foreign Ties Behind Voting Machines Used in US

$400 Million SEC Filing Links Dominion, UBS, and China

Hunter Biden Called His Father and Chinese Business Partner ’Office Mates’ in September 2017 Email

Statement by NCSC Director William Evanina: Election Threat Update for the American Public

Digital Forensic Analysis Shows Dominion’s Server Connected to Iran and China: Affidavit
Firm That Owns Dominion Voting Systems Received $400 Million From Swiss Bank With Connection to Chinese Government Before Election – Summit News

Breaking: Antrim County, Mi Examination Results – Dominion Machines Connected To Internet, Fake Ballots Thought To Be Sent To Europe For Approval...Cyber Teams Have Concrete Proof Of Election Fraud

Time for Action?

Electoral College Deadlines Not ‘Set In Stone’: Election Integrity Watchdog

Trump’s challenges failed but there’s still room for drama

How the 1876 Election Tested the Constitution and Effectively Ended Reconstruction

Michigan To Publish Dominion Forensic Audit

Sidney Powell Announces Emergency Filings in Georgia, Michigan, Arizona and Wisconsin

Potential for Lawsuit

U.S. Supreme Court Rules Unanimously You May Sue Government Agents for Damages When They Violate Your Individual Rights

Civil Rights Act of 1871: https://www.fjc.gov/history/timeline/civil-rights-act-1871

Ku Klux Act passed by Congress
https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/ku-klux-act-passed-by-congress

Introduction To Federal Voting Rights Laws

Note: The Economic Battle Plan™ contains hyperlinks to other Internet sites not under the editorial control of EWR-Media Holdings, LLC. These hyperlinks are not express or implied endorsements or approvals by EWR-Media Holdings, LLC, of any products, services or information available from these 3rd party sites. Links to these 3rd party sites are open source links that may require subscription or registration.
An Open Letter from America
From: Every Legal Vote Coalition - 11 Dec 2020

Subject: DO YOUR JOB! Restore Confidence America’s Election System

To: William Barr, Attorney General of the United States;
CC: Those with a DUTY to Protect U.S. Elections;
Those with a DUTY to Investigate Crime & Injustice

Prior to the November 3, 2020 elections, the American people were repeatedly assured via press releases and video recordings that those officials in Washington and around the nation responsible for election integrity in states across the country would make certain that this year’s balloting was secure. Unfortunately, the American people are now persuaded that the presidential race and perhaps others were, instead, marred by widespread and material fraud, irregularities, crime and foreign influence.

The attached compilation reflects the efforts of our Every Legal Vote citizens’ initiative to facilitate the reporting of fraud witnessed during the election. It offers ample proof of that conclusion and makes absolutely mandatory thorough and immediate investigations by federal and state-level law enforcement.

Over the past month our website, EveryLegalVote.com, has received more than thirty-five hundred such reports and personal testimonies from those around America who witnessed fraud and crime, particularly in Pennsylvania, Michigan, Arizona, and Georgia.

Such evidence includes the following:

- Reports of public officials breaking the law by campaigning at polling locations, of crowds bullying voters on election day and people voting more than once.
- Video footage of criminal acts in Georgia with poll workers pulling out hidden boxes of ballots to be counted illegally in the dark of night and without poll watchers present.
- Votes in states such as Michigan and Pennsylvania by those who appear to be deceased.
- Several states taking steps to delete and destroy data, including ballot envelopes shredded contrary to the Supreme Court directive in Pennsylvania and computer anomalies in Georgia. Of course, willful destruction and manipulation of evidence violates multiple federal statutes.
- We are seeing intimidating and even violent threats and physical harm committed against election fraud witnesses. For example, after hearings in Michigan, an elected official doxed these brave witnesses and even recorded a video calling on “soldiers” to “make them pay.” This is unacceptable, un-American and a federal crime.
- Numerous reports from expert witnesses testifying under oath have established that voting machines such as Dominion’s have built-in vulnerabilities, were connected to the internet, are vulnerable to hacking and were overseen by employees with little oversight. Company personnel allegedly briefed state officials on how to change vote tallies and a Dominion official reportedly stated prior to the election that he had “made f***ing sure’ that ‘Trump’s not gonna win.’”
- There appears to be growing evidence of foreign interference including reports of foreign printing and distribution of U.S. election ballots, voter registration information from Nevada being sent to Pakistan, and extensive influence operations conducted by Communist China via its penetration of Silicon Valley and Wall Street.
• **Unaccountable individuals with foreign ties** reportedly also intervened. For example, George Soros has a long history of funding projects aimed at undermining vote integrity in the United States and elsewhere around the world and his Open Society Foundation and philanthropy seems to have been active in this year’s election.

Taken together, such evidence refutes official statements to the effect that this election was *the most secure in American history* and that *any fraud seen to date has not been on a scale that could have resulted in a different outcome in the election*. The same applies to media accounts that insist there has been no substantive fraud identified and that the election has been secure from foreign interference.

To help clarify the facts and correct widespread disinformation in addition to compiling citizens’ reports of fraud, Every Legal Vote sponsored a televised “**Election Fraud Truth Summit**” on December 8, 2020. It featured powerful interviews with an array of election integrity experts, attorneys, an internationally renowned statistician and forensic fraud-detectors. The summit’s unmistakable conclusion is that our sacred right to vote in free and fair elections was successfully attacked in the 2020 election. Victims of fraud have subsequently been denied due process and in some cases put at risk. Perpetrators of such fraud seem to be disappearing, “lawyering up” and/or destroying evidence. Media and social media companies are censoring the truth. And all the while, the urgently needed investigations and, where appropriate prosecutions, seem not to be going anywhere.

While the Every Legal Vote Coalition strongly commends the state attorneys general who have joined forces to challenge the unconstitutional actions taken in the course of this election by some states, we should not have to depend on the Supreme Court to rectify these wrongs. More must be done now – at the Federal and State levels – to investigate the electoral fraud and other misconduct that accompanied those actions – and thereby prevent any repetition of these mortal threats to our representative form of government.

General Barr, your department and its counterparts in the states possess the formal authorities and tools needed to root out such criminal activity and foreign interference. You have the power to arrest and prosecute those who perpetrate it. In particular, General, you have been empowered with specific authorities under the **Executive Order on Imposing Certain Sanctions in the Event of Foreign Interference in a United States Election** dated September 12, 2018.

**We, therefore, urge you and every one of those copied on this open letter in the strongest possible terms:** **DO YOUR JOB.**

Our coalition stands ready to support you in assuring that every legal vote is counted in the presidential election of 2020 and down ballot and that those not legally cast are not counted. We will work with your respective offices and investigators to ensure that your vital work is informed by ours and, most especially, that the testimony of Americans who have asked us to ensure that their voices are heard is included and that equal justice under law prevails.

Respectfully,

Every Legal Vote Coalition

CC:

**Jeffrey A. Rosen**, Deputy Attorney General

**John C. Demers**, Assistant Attorney General for National Security

**Jeffrey R. Ragsdale**, Director and Chief Counsel, Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR)

**Daniel Kahn**, Acting Chief, Fraud Section

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
Enclosed: (click on the Enclosure to be taken to that section)

Enclosure 1 - Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI
Enclosure 2 - Check Your Vote Summary, including evidence of tens of thousands of deceased voters
Enclosure 3 - Five States and The Election Irregularities and Issues - December 8, 2020
Enclosure 4 - Epoch Times Infographic: What Happened in Atlanta on Election Night
Enclosure 5 - Ruby Freeman Bias & Alleged Criminal Activity
Enclosure 6 - “Statistics IS Evidence” by Jay Valentine & National Academy of Sciences
Enclosure 7 - Plain language description of Dominion Election Fraud: “Not Rounding Errors”
Enclosure 8 - Open-Source Intel: Sample collection of articles on crime, fraud, and foreign influence
Enclosure 9 - Foreign Influence Example - Transcript of Remarks by Di Dongsheng of China
Enclosure 10 - Non-State Actor Influence Example - Open Society Foundation (George Soros)
Enclosure 11 - E.O. on Imposing Certain Sanctions in the Event of Foreign Interference in a US Election, September 12, 2018
Enclosure 12 - Joint Statement of ODNI, DOJ, FBI and DHS: Combating Foreign Influence in U.S. Elections, October 19, 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENCLOSURE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ &amp; MI</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>DOMESTIC MARRIAGE, NONBENEFIT MAIL-VOTE, MAIL BALLOTS, MANUFACTURING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Ballot Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a native Arizonian and a successful entrepreneur. I am 44 years old and have several stories to share from my experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am a native Arizonian and a successful entrepreneur. I am 44 years old and have several stories to share from my experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived in Arizona since 1997, and I have voted in every election since then.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have lived in Arizona since 1997, and I have voted in every election since then.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My story is about the impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My story is about the impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been registered to vote in Arizona since 1997, and I have voted in every election since then.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have been registered to vote in Arizona since 1997, and I have voted in every election since then.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about the impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am concerned about the impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The impact of the new voter registration laws on our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
ENCLOSURE 1

Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>LASTNAME</th>
<th>FIRSTNAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>TELPHONETYPE</th>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>AMOUNTTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>MCHALE</td>
<td>602-555-5555</td>
<td>MOBILE</td>
<td>123 Main St</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>MCHALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>MCHALE</td>
<td>602-555-5555</td>
<td>MOBILE</td>
<td>123 Main St</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>MCHALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>MCHALE</td>
<td>602-555-5555</td>
<td>MOBILE</td>
<td>123 Main St</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>MCHALE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
ENCLOSURE 1
Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI
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Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>FRAC_TYPE</th>
<th>ENCLOSURE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABDUL</td>
<td>ABU</td>
<td>ABDULLAH</td>
<td>602-123-4567</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>SHAME</td>
<td>ENCLOSURE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>502-567-8901</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>FAKE</td>
<td>ENCLOSURE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMMAR</td>
<td>AMMAR</td>
<td>AMMAR</td>
<td>702-890-1234</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>SHAME</td>
<td>ENCLOSURE 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was the victim of identity theft. A stranger purchased a new phone in my name and then opened a new credit card in my name. I never authorized the purchase of the phone or the opening of the credit card. I had to spend a lot of time and money to clear my name and recover my credit. This incident has caused me a lot of stress and anxiety. I think it is important to be proactive in monitoring your credit and protecting your identity. EveryLegalVote.com is a great resource for information on how to do this.

I was the victim of a phone scam. A stranger called and pretended to be a representative of a company I had business with. They asked me to give them my banking information so that they could correct some errors on my account. I was hesitant to give them my information, but they convinced me that it was necessary. After they got my information, they used it to make unauthorized transactions on my account. I had to spend a lot of time and money to recover my lost money and fix my credit. I think it is important to be aware of these types of scams and to never give out your personal information to strangers over the phone.

I was the victim of a phishing email. A stranger sent me an email that looked like it was from my bank. The email asked me to click on a link to update my account information. I clicked on the link and was directed to a website that looked very similar to my bank's website. I entered my account information into the website, but it was not the real website. I was relieved when I realized what had happened and I changed my password.

I was the victim of a rental fraud. A stranger rented a property from me and then subleased it to someone who paid no rent. I was not aware of the sublease and when I went to collect the rent, I was told that the subtenant had moved out. I was shocked and was not able to recover the rent. I think it is important to be careful when renting property to ensure that the tenant is responsible.

I was the victim of a charity scam. A stranger called and asked me to donate money to a charity that claimed to be helping victims of natural disasters. I was hesitant to give them my money, but they convinced me that it was necessary. After I gave them my money, they never provided any evidence of how it was being used. I think it is important to be careful when donating money to ensure that it is going to the right place.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>LASTNAME</th>
<th>FIRSTNAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:email1@sample.com">email1@sample.com</a></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>123-456-7890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:email2@sample.com">email2@sample.com</a></td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>987-654-3210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:email3@sample.com">email3@sample.com</a></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>456-789-0123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATE** | **COUNTY** | **ILIATION**
---------|-----------|-----------
MI | WAYNE | DEMOCRATIC MACHINE |

**Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI**

**ENCLOSURE 1**

**The Entire Wayne County Vote is All Corrupt Fraud**

There were supposed to be 2 recasts and 2-3 at counting center. **EveryLegalVote.com** had that they had to disallow several votes but that they did everything they could to code the ballots in a way that they would be counted. Some of the workers had to be fired because of the discrepancies in the votes. The workers were told to report any discrepancies to the supervisor, but they were not doing that. There were allegations of vote counting being done at the counting center, but they were not investigated.

**The military ballots were thrown out in the same manner as the rest of the votes.** The military ballots were not counted. The workers were told to report any discrepancies to the supervisor, but they were not doing that. There were allegations of vote counting being done at the counting center, but they were not investigated.

**EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition**
Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI

Hello,

My name is [Name], and I live in Pinellas County, Florida. I am writing to report a series of irregularities that occurred during the 2020 election in my county. I noticed numerous discrepancies in the vote counting process. Despite numerous attempts to contact local election officials, they have not provided any explanation for these issues.

In addition, I witnessed a group of individuals casting their votes at a Satellite Voting Center located in another county. Despite being registered to vote in Pinellas County, these individuals were able to cast their votes without any identification verification. This raises serious concerns about the integrity of the voting process.

I urge you to investigate these concerns further and take necessary actions to ensure the fairness and accuracy of the electoral process. I believe that every vote counts, and we must do everything in our power to protect the integrity of our elections.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Address]

[City, State ZIP Code]

[Email]

[Phone]

[Note: The above text is an example and should be replaced with actual information from the document.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>imate Usage</th>
<th>MAIL</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| not.com | ninenine | 123 AD | 456 ABC | Michigan election outcomes have the issue of election fraud.

We doubt you are aware of the 138,339 votes that went to view (not verified) by Trumps campaign. Michigan law requires that the ballot be scanned at the time of receipt. All ballots that have been counted correctly were verified by the Trump campaign. However, we have noticed that some ballots were not counted correctly by the Trump campaign. In some cases, the ballots were not scanned at the time of receipt. In other cases, the ballots were scanned at the time of receipt but were not counted correctly. We have attached evidence of this to our report. We recommend that you review this evidence and take appropriate action.

# everylegalvote.com - a citizens coalition

Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI

**EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition**
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Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>POSTAL CODE</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>PHONE TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jsmith@gmail.com">jsmith@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>123-456-7890</td>
<td>12345</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>RAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mdoe@gmail.com">mdoe@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>987-654-3210</td>
<td>54321</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Washtenaw</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jmiller@gmail.com">jmiller@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>456-789-0123</td>
<td>23456</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>RAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sadoe@gmail.com">sadoe@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Doe</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>789-012-3456</td>
<td>65432</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Washtenaw</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

A sample of fraud stories submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from Arizona and Michigan. The stories include various forms of voter fraud, such as dead voters, election harvesting, and voter impersonation. The stories are submitted by citizens who believe they have evidence of such fraud and are calling for action to be taken to ensure fair and honest elections. The stories are organized by email address and include contact information for further correspondence.

---

**Emphasis**

- The importance of reporting voter fraud
- The need for transparency in elections
- The role of citizens in monitoring elections

---

**Conclusion**

The stories submitted to EveryLegalVote.com highlight the ongoing challenges in maintaining the integrity of the voting process. It is crucial for citizens to remain vigilant and report any instances of fraud or irregularities. The stories serve as a call to action for elected officials and authorities to take serious measures to prevent voter fraud and ensure fair elections for all.

---

**Notes**

- Additional contact details and sources are available on the EveryLegalVote.com website.
- The stories are part of a broader initiative by EveryLegalVote.com to promote civic engagement and accountability in the electoral process.

---

**Resources**

- EveryLegalVote.com
- Arizona Attorney General's Office
- Michigan Secretary of State

---

**References**

- EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
- Arizona Attorney General's Office
- Michigan Secretary of State
### EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition

#### ENCLOSURE 1

**Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>LASTNAME</th>
<th>FSTARTNAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>TSTORY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>REFRAUD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jackley@email.com">jackley@email.com</a></td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>JACKSON</td>
<td>BADFAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jerry@email.com">jerry@email.com</a></td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>ヶI</td>
<td>FRAUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:michael@email.com">michael@email.com</a></td>
<td>McGraw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>MIAMI GALES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:john@email.com">john@email.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Customer named John reported to the FRAID that he received a phone call from the FRAID and that the call was a solicitation for a product that was not disclosed. The call was made by a person who claimed to be a representative of the FRAID. The customer was told that he would receive a free trial if he agreed to purchase the product immediately. The customer was not interested in the product and refused to provide any personal information. However, the person on the call continued to press the customer to purchase the product and eventually hung up on the customer.</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>MIAMI GALES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jill@email.com">jill@email.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>MIAMI GALES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:peter@email.com">peter@email.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>MIAMI GALES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:**
This table represents a sample of fraud stories submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from Arizona (AZ) and Michigan (MI). The stories are submitted by citizens who have experienced various forms of fraud, ranging from product solicitations to unsolicited phone calls. Each story provides a brief description of the incident, including the state and county where it occurred, along with the type of fraud reported. The information is compiled to raise awareness about the prevalence of fraud and to encourage community vigilance against such practices. EveryLegalVote.com aims to empower citizens with tools and resources to protect themselves from these tactics.
Check Your Vote Summary, including proof of tens of thousands of deceased voters

Another group of citizen-researchers has created a resource that will assist law enforcement with investigating voter fraud: https://checkyourvote.org/

The website provides findings in Michigan such as:

- **17,327** randomly checked Michigan voters that were registered for voting and were above the age of 80. Every name on this list has voted in the 2020 election and has also been found in one or more obituaries online. (Visit the link to check for yourself)

- **19,121** General Election Absentee Ballots with impossible issue, return, send and receive dates

The website’s findings in Pennsylvania were even more alarming:

- **40,000** randomly checked voters above the age of 80 in Pennsylvania, that were registered for voting and have also been found in one or more obituaries online. Every name on this list has voted in the 2020 presidential election. (Visit the link to check for yourself)

- A Republican absentee ballot was **72% more likely** to go missing than a Democrat absentee ballot.

- **27,663 absentee** ballots that have been mailed to P.O. Boxes and then subsequently have been filled out and returned. 102 voters on this list were not registered for voting, yet casted a ballot.

- **29,112** General Election Absentee Ballots had impossible issue, return, send and receive dates.

- **1111** unique voters over 112 years old.

All personal information on this list is publicly available and has been obtained legally by concerned citizens. It is now available for law enforcement professionals to DO THEIR JOBS to investigate. We attach just a few pages of the Michigan data below so you can click on the hyperlinks and see the obituaries and the proof that votes were cast for these deceased persons. **This is a MASSIVE amount of criminal fraud that MUST be investigated.**
FIVE STATES AND THE ELECTION IRREGULARITIES AND ISSUES

DECEMBER 8, 2020
KEY POINTS RE QUESTIONABLE ELECTION RESULTS IN FIVE STATES

- The U.S. Constitution gives absolute authority to State Legislatures to determine the “manner” of how a federal election is run.

- The U.S. Constitution gives absolute authority to State Legislatures to appoint presidential electors.

- State Legislatures have enacted election laws that permit citizens to participate and express their will regarding the selection of presidential electors.

- Under the U.S. Constitution, however, State Legislatures always have final authority regarding how presidential electors are chosen.

- Democrat Party committees and left wing allies circumvented numerous state election codes by filing lawsuits and seeking executive agency actions to pressure judicial and executive branches of numerous state governments to “rewrite” their election codes without legislative action.

- In its election lawsuits, the Trump campaign documented thousands of illegal votes that were cast, counted, and included in the final tabulation of these five states.

- These votes violated the Election Codes adopted by the State Legislatures, which also violates the U.S. Constitution.

- These illegal votes were outside the margin of victory in all five states.

- Time is short for the courts to remedy these wrongs and declare the elections null and void.

- There is also a constitutional remedy:

  - The U.S. Constitution vests in State Legislatures absolute authority to choose presidential electors. If the “manner” chosen by the State Legislature is not followed, which occurred in the 2020 presidential election
in these five states, then the State Legislature must reclaim its constitutional authority and responsibility to do what the constitution requires: appoint the presidential electors.

- In the alternative, the State Legislature can decide not to certify any presidential electors because the “manner” of voting was illegal and unconstitutional. The election than goes to the U.S. House of Representatives.

- Congress has the ultimate responsibility for receiving and counting the electoral college votes.

- There is no constitutional obligation for Congress to accept fraudulent vote and electoral votes.
ARIZONA

(11 Electoral votes: 10,457 vote gap)

Democrat-controlled Maricopa County election officials did not “allow political party observers to effectively observe” the process of verifying mail-in signatures.

- Almost 700,000 mail-in votes were counted without any Republican oversight according to eight witnesses at the November 30 hearing in Maricopa County.

- Observers had to remain behind a specific point, which was at least ten to twelve feet away from the counting process.

- Most of the computer screens were turned so that the observers could not see them even if they had been sufficiently close to the screens.

- Arizona election law states that “procedures shall allow political party observers to effectively observe the election process. . . .” (Emphasis added.)

- Many Republicans were escorted from the building by election officials when they protested the illegal situation of not being allowed to effectively observe the process.

Democrat-controlled Maricopa County election officials violated Arizona election law regarding handling duplicate ballots.

- A duplicate ballot situation arises when a ballot is damaged or defective so it cannot be properly counted. Arizona election law requires that when a new ballot is to be substituted for a damaged or defective ballot (duplicated), it shall only be done in the “presence of witnesses,” shall “be clearly labeled ‘duplicate,’” and shall “bear a serial number that shall be recorded on the damaged or defective ballot.”

- Maricopa County transmitted electronic information for duplicate ballots to an offsite printing company, which printed them offsite.

- The offsite company delivered the duplicate ballots to the election center in “batches,” which were not connected to the originals in any clearly observable way. Thus, there was no effective way of confirming whether the duplicates matched the originals.

- The duplicating process took place without Republican witnesses.
Maricopa County utilized **Dominion machines**.

- **Six minutes after the polls closed at 7 p.m. November 3, Biden received a net gain of 143,100 votes.** Cyber Security expert witness, retired Col. Phil Waldron, testified that such increase was a **mathematical impossibility** because there were not enough machines in use to process that many votes in that short amount of time.

- The Dominion voting machines were **connected to the internet, thereby completely violating all security mandates.**
GEORGIA

(16 Electoral votes: 12,670 vote gap*)

Georgia law allows federal elections to be contested under specific provisions if sufficient to change or place doubt in the result. The relevant provisions are 1) if there was misconduct, fraud, or irregularity by election officials and 2) when illegal votes have been received or legal votes rejected.

- Georgia officials allowed approximately 100,000 unqualified persons to register and cast votes that are illegal under the above provisions as follows:

  66,247 Underage persons allowed to register illegally, then voted
  8,718 Potential number of persons deceased prior to the date the state records accept votes, relying on available records re: name and birth year. Only the Secretary of State has the full birthdate information to ascertain the exact number of illegal votes cast in the name of deceased persons. Witness affidavits show that absentee ballots were sent to dead persons in Georgia
  2,560 Felons
  2,423 Unregistered persons
  4,926 Persons registered in another state after moving from Georgia
  1,043 Persons registered using a P.O Box, not a legal residence
  15,700 Persons who had filed a national change of address with the USPS as having relocated to another state prior to Election Day, and
  40,279 Persons who moved without reregistering/ voting in their new county.

- Secretary of State Raffensperger violated Georgia law, which requires voters to request absentee ballots, no earlier than 180 days before the election for which the absentee ballot is requested.

- Raffensperger sent unsolicited absentee ballot applications to all persons on the active voter rolls before the 2020 Georgia primary, and allowed requests for absentee ballots for the general election by checking a box on the application for the primary.

- At least 305,701 persons, according to State records, applied for absentee ballots more than 180 days prior to Election Day, violating state law.
ENCLOSURE 3
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MICHIGAN

(16 Electoral votes: 150,000 vote gap)

Republicans were prohibited from meaningful observation of mail-in vote counting in Wayne County.

- Michigan law requires an election challenger “be provided a space within a polling place where they can observe the election procedure and each person applying to vote.” The challenger must also be allowed to “inspect poll books as ballots are issued to electors and witness electors’ names being entered in the poll book.”

- Michigan law authorizes the election challenger to challenge election procedures not being properly performed, any person who the challenger has good reason to believe is not registered, improper handling of a ballot, violations of time the polling place is open, campaigning and fundraising by an election inspector, and any other violation of election law.

- An election challenger may examine each ballot as it is being counted.

- Michigan law provides a felony punishable by up to two years in prison for: any person who threatens or intimidates a challenger performing any of the above activities, any person who prevents a challenger from exercising their rights, and any person who fails to provide a challenger with “conveniences for the performance of the[ir] duties.”

- Over 500,000 mail-in votes were counted in Wayne County without any meaningful Republican observation.

- More than 100 Michigan credentialed challengers provided affidavits describing the numerous methods used by Democrat-controlled Wayne County to deny them a meaningful opportunity to carry out the election duties described above. Some of these methods include the following:
  - Most of the challengers designated by the Republican Party or Republican candidate were denied access to the TCF Center (formerly Cofo Hall) while all Democrat challengers were allowed access.
  - Those few Republicans who were admitted were not allowed sufficiently near the vote counting process to have meaningful observation of it.
  - Those few Republicans who were admitted were forced to remain at least six feet from the vote counting process but Democrat challengers were not
forced to remain behind such a barrier.

- At least three challengers swore Wayne County election officials physically pushed them away from the counting tables so they could not meaningfully observe the vote count.

- Many challengers swore they were threatened and harassed by Wayne County election officials, including being called “a racist name.”

- One challenger observed Democrat challengers sharing a packet of information entitled “Tactics to Distract GOP Challengers.”

- An election official told a challenger that Wayne County had a police SWAT team outside the building if Republican challengers argued too much.

- Another election official told a challenger that “since English was not [her] first language…[she] should not be taking part in this process.”

- Whenever a Republican challenger was ejected from the counting area, Wayne County election officials would cheer.

- Many challengers swore that their challenges to ballots were ignored by not being recorded or by being told “you cannot challenge this.” One challenger was told that her challenges were no longer being accepted because the “rules no longer applied.”

Challengers were prohibited from viewing the process for making a “duplicate” ballot.

- Michigan law states “If the rejection is due to a false read the ballot must be duplicated by two election inspectors who have expressed a preference for different political parties.” The duplication process must also be observed by challengers.

- One challenger was told he was not allowed to observe ballot duplication because it “was personal like voting.”

- Many challengers testified that duplication was performed only by Democratic election workers.

Wayne County election officials ran batches of ballots through the vote tabulation machines-some multiple times.

- One challenger observed a stack of about 50 ballots being fed “multiple times” into a ballot scanner machine.
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PENNSYLVANIA

(20 Electoral votes: 82,000 vote gap)

Republicans were prohibited from observing the mail-in vote counting in Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties.

- Over 680,000 mail-in votes were recorded without any Republican oversight.

- Although Democrats were mostly (but not always) also prohibited from observing the mail-in vote count, it was of no significance: where Republicans were excluded, the Democrat-controlled county had hired the counters.

- The prohibition violates state law, which requires that each candidate and political party “shall be entitled to appoint” watchers.

- In Philadelphia, Republicans obtained a court order to allow watchers to observe within a specific distance. Democrat-controlled Philadelphia election officials threatened the Republicans with arrest if they walked beyond the metal barriers, which were 20-100 feet from the vote counting area.

- Democrat-dominated Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that since the state legislature did not specify the exact distance for “observing,” it would not do so. Thus, it held that just being in the room (some the size of a football field) was sufficient to “observe” under the statute.

- Allegheny and Philadelphia counties claimed the reason for not allowing Republicans to observe the counting process was COVID. However, other Pennsylvania counties had no such problem when permitting all candidates to have “watchers” to observe mail-in voting.

Although Pennsylvania election law, upheld by its Supreme Court, does not provide for “curing” a defective ballot, some counties allowed curing while others did not.

- “Curing” a ballot means that if a voter provides a mail-in ballot prior to election day and it is defective, e.g. insufficient information on the outside envelope or missing a second internal envelope containing the ballot, election officials contact those voters to “cure” the defect.

- The night before the election, Secretary of State Boockar emailed all county election officials that defective ballot voters should be contacted and provided provisional ballots.
• Mostly Republican counties did not cure because they considered to do so violated state election law. Mostly Democratic counties allowed voters to cure defective ballots.

The facts above establish that votes/voters were treated differently in Pennsylvania, depending on the county. Some votes were scrutinized by the candidates while others were not subject to any Republican oversight. Some voters were permitted to cure defective ballots while others were not. This difference in treatment of votes violates constitutional Equal Protection, as decided in Bush v. Gore, where the Supreme Court found that Florida was treating chads differently in vote counting.

The Pennsylvania legislature violated the state constitution when it passed Act 77. The constitution permits absentee ballot voting only in a few specific instances, such as sickness or having to work on election day. Act 77, which allows mail-in voting for any reason, is unconstitutional.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court violated the U.S. Constitution when it ignored the (unconstitutional) Act 77’s deadline for receipt of ballots. Act 77 retained the requirement that no ballot can be counted if received after 8p.m. election day. Under the U.S. Constitution, Art. I, only state legislatures have authority to prescribe “times, places and manner of holding elections….” The state Supreme court changed that deadline to three days after the election and even held that if the post mark cannot be read the ballot should be counted. Justice Samuel Alito directed Pennsylvania officials to segregate those ballots received after the deadline from those received timely under state law. How do we know that was done honestly if no Republicans could observe the process?

Note: Biden outperformed Clinton in the city of Philadelphia by 20,000 plus votes. He outperformed Obama by approximately 16,000 votes.
WISCONSIN

(10 Electoral votes: 20,400 vote gap)

Absentee voting is a “privilege” under Wisconsin law and therefore must be “carefully regulated to prevent the potential for fraud or abuse....” The Legislature has made clear that the statutory requirements for absentee voting are mandatory and must be strictly applied. Four major issues in Wisconsin are based on violations of these strict provisions. Milwaukee County and Dane County, the two largest counties in the state, counted over 200,000 votes that were cast in violation of the state constitution and its election laws.

Wisconsin law S 6.86(1) (ar) specifically prohibits a clerk from issuing an absentee ballot “unless the clerk receives a written application.”

- The Canvassing Boards in Milwaukee and Dane Counties decided that the Clerk’s receipt of the envelope that contains the completed absentee ballot satisfied that requirement.

- 170,140 absentee ballots without the statutory required application were issued, cast, and counted in Milwaukee and Dane Counties.

- Other Wisconsin municipalities followed the statute by requiring a written application.

- Representatives of the Trump Campaign objected to counting absentee ballots that did not have a written application but were overruled by the two Democrat-controlled counties.

Wisconsin law S 6.87 (6d) is clear, “If a certificate is missing the address of a witness, the ballot may not be counted.”

- After completing an absentee ballot, the voter must place it into a secure envelope and seal it in front of a witness, who must sign and provide his or her address.

- 5,517 ballots were cast and counted with incomplete or incorrect Ballot Envelopes.

- Clerks in Milwaukee and Dane Counties illegally altered envelopes by supplying the missing information, either by using their own knowledge or searching unknown data bases.

- The Wisconsin Legislature in 2015 reaffirmed the long-held legal position of the State that specifically prohibits a Clerk from altering ballots in any respect and requires exclusion of ballots that are contained in incomplete or improperly
completed envelopes.

- Representatives of the Trump Campaign objected to counting such incomplete or improper ballots but were overruled by the two Democrat-controlled counties.

**Wisconsin law that permits a person to request absentee voting on the basis of being Indefinitely Confined contains strict monitoring provisions.**

- To qualify, a voter must be “elderly, infirm or disabled and indefinitely confined,” such as a nursing home resident.

- Clerks are charged with reviewing and expunging from the voter rolls those claiming to be Indefinitely Confined where the Clerk has “reliable information [the] elector no longer qualifies for the service.” No effort was made by the clerks in Milwaukee and Dane Counties to follow this mandate. A simple Google search revealed “Indefinitely Confined” voters who attended weddings, parties, and protests.

- 28,395 Indefinitely Confined Absentee Ballots were issued in Milwaukee and Dane Counties after March 25, 2020.

- **In Milwaukee County, the Indefinitely Confined ballots were 11,978 in 2016 and 45,693 in 2020. In Dane County, the Indefinitely Confined ballots were 4569 in 2016 and 22,519 in 2020.**

- Representatives of the Trump Campaign objected to counting Indefinitely Confined ballots but were overruled by the two Democrat-controlled counties.

**Dane County’s city of Madison on several different dates created 206 locations dubbed “Democracy in the Park” during which absentee ballots were distributed and certified.**

- The events did not comply with Wisconsin law S6.855(1).

- The sites were not established by an act of the City of Madison Common Council, the governing body, as required by law.

- Biden campaign officials advertised the events, thus inappropriately coordinating with the city’s election officials.

- **17,271 absentee ballots were distributed during these events.**

- Representatives of the Trump Campaign objected to the counting of Democracy in the Park votes but were overruled by the two Democrat-controlled counties.

Note: Biden outperformed Clinton in Milwaukee by 28,000 plus votes. He underperformed Obama by 14,000 plus votes.
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On the night of Nov. 3, tens of thousands of absentee ballots for Fulton County, Georgia, were counted at the State Farm Arena’s vote-tabulation center in Atlanta. In recent days, the fog of incomplete and conflicting information provided by interested...

https://www.theepochtimes.com/what-happened-in-atlanta-on-election-night-2_3607130.html?utm_source=news&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign...
On the night of Nov. 3, tens of thousands of absentee ballots for Fulton County, Georgia, were counted at the State Farm Arena’s vote-tabulation center in Atlanta. In recent days, the fog of incomplete and conflicting information provided by interested parties has begun to clear. It now appears that a state election monitor was absent for part of the counting process. It is also clear that Republican poll watchers were prevented from meaningfully observing much of the process, even though they were allowed in the room.

Georgia is a key battleground state, controlling 16 electoral votes. Current results show Democratic presidential candidate Joe Biden ahead of President Donald Trump by about 12,000 votes. The Trump campaign and other groups are challenging the results, alleging fraud and other illegibilities. The campaign demanding that the state legislature grant the electoral votes to Trump.

The office of Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger, a Republican, acknowledged investigating numerous instances of potential fraud, but has rejected the notion that Fulton County officials themselves were involved in fraud during the election night count at the arena.

---

1. **RULE CHANGE**

On Aug. 10, the State Election Board approved a new rule that allows election officials to start opening and scanning absentee ballots three weeks before Election Day. State law says the ballots can only be opened on Election Day. The state is being sued over the rule, based on the argument that the board didn’t have the jurisdiction to issue the rule change.

The rule allows officials to verify signatures on ballot packers and feed ballots to scanners. The votes are then to be stored in scanner memory until they can be added to the tallies on election night. It’s not clear to what degree Fulton County has followed new rule. County spokesperson Jessica Corbett declined to answer questions posed by The Epoch Times for this article.

2. **WATER LEAK**

On Election Day, ballot-processing work at the State Farm Arena was delayed.

"At approximately 6:07 a.m., the staff at State Farm Arena notified Fulton County Registration and Elections of a water leak affecting the room where absentee ballots were being tabulated," Fulton County told FOX 5, an Atlanta Fox affiliate, in a statement. "The State Farm Arena team acted swiftly to remediate the issue. Within 2 hours, repairs were complete."

"The emergency delayed officials from processing ballots between 5:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m.,” the report says.

An Atlanta NBC affiliate, 11Alive, reported that "Fulton County Registration chief Ralph Jones said that the pipe burst just after 6 a.m. Tuesday in the room above where they [sic] ballots were being kept, and water was draining down to the left side of the room where the ballots were."

A local attorney who filed a record request about the burst pipe only received a brief text message exchange about the incident, describing it as "highly exaggerated ... a slow leak [that] caused about an hour-and-a-half delay" and stating that "we contained it quickly; it did not spread," according to the text conversation that the attorney, Paul Dzikowski, shared with The Epoch Times.

According to Frances Watson, chief investigator of the Georgia secretary of state’s office, "the incident initially reported as a water leak late in the evening on November 3rd was actually a urinal that had overflowed early in the morning on November 3. The incident "did not affect the counting of votes by Fulton County later that evening," he said in a Dec. 5 sworn affidavit.

3. **SECURITY CAMERA FOOTAGE**

Security camera footage from the arena shows workers moving around furniture after 8:20 a.m. It’s not clear whether that had to do with the water leak.

Only some parts of the footage were made publicly available when the Trump campaign’s legal team aired them during a Dec. 3 Georgia Senate committee hearing on election issues. The arena provided the footage to “all parties in each related Georgia voting litigation,” the arena’s legal chief, Scott Wilkinson, told video or documents; he said.

Attempts to obtain the footage from the Trump legal team, the state, and county authorities have been unsuccessful.

One of the election workers in the arena center has been identified as Registration Officer Wandrea "Shaye" Moss, based on her conspicuous hairstyle and other features. At about 8:21 a.m., the cameras captured her moving one of the tables, which was covered with a black cloth that extended
The Epoch Times via email, "Without a subpoena, our policy does not allow us to release the ground. The table would later become the center of national attention.

MONITORS PLACED FAR AWAY

At around 8:15 p.m. on Election Day, two Republican poll monitors arrived at the State Farm Arena to observe the vote tabulation process, according to a sworn affidavit by one of the monitors, Michelle Branton.

As their affidavits and security camera footage from the arena show, the monitors were roped off in a media area at one end of the large tabulation center's room. They were so far from the election workers that they couldn't see in any detail what was being done. Some parts of the room, such as the area where the ballot scanners were placed, were so far away that it's likely the monitors couldn't discern what was going on there at all. Both said they didn’t even know the scanners were in the room until one of the officials explained the process to them.

DELAys

At 8:40 p.m., 11Alive reported that "Fulton County election officials said they are behind—by about four hours—counting absentee ballots after a pipe burst in a room at State Farm Arena where some of those ballots were being held."

"According to those officials, none of the ballots were damaged in the process," the channel said in an update to live coverage of the election.

At 10:08 p.m., 11Alive investigative reporter Andy Pierro reported that Fulton County wouldn’t be counting about 40,000 to 60,000 ballots that night.

"It's not due to the State Farm water pipe issue," he said memo he posted on Twitter. "It's due to the sheer volume mail-in/drop off absentee ballots the county received."

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
The released footage shows, beginning at 9:57 p.m., a man in a black jacket bringing an empty black ballot box and placing it next to the table installed by Moes. He's accompanied by a woman in a purple t-shirt, who was later identified as election worker Ruby Freeman based on her apparel, hairstyle, and public posts and videos on Facebook, where she also appeared to identify herself as Moes's mother.

A minute later, the man places a white tray of ballots inside the box. Freeman then closes the box. The man then brings another box and places it in another tray of ballots that was previously on top of the table.

Shortly after that, the video skips to 10:19 p.m., and two closed ballot boxes are seen on top of the table. The video, which then jumps to 10:25 p.m., shows the two boxes still on top of the table, in addition to another tray of ballots. At 10:37 p.m., the table appears to have been cleared, with no sign of the boxes. The media and the monitors can still be seen in their designated area. Nearly all the workers are gone.

The poll monitors said that activity at the arena slowed after 10 p.m. At around 10:30 p.m., a person clearly identified by them as Moes "yelled out [that] they should stop working and come back tomorrow (the next day, Wednesday, November 4) at 8:30 A.M.,” said Mitchell Harrison, one of the monitors in his affidavit. Branton answered with this...
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---

**MONITORS LEAVE**

The camera footage shows them leaving at about 10:40 p.m., leaving only seven people behind: Moss, Freeman, two women in yellow t-shirts, one man in a red shirt, one man in a light blue coat, and one man in a black jacket.

The monitors indicated they were under the impression that work at the arena had concluded. Cobb, the county spokesperson, appeared to be under the same impression.

In an 11:36 p.m. update, 11Alive reported that “Regina Waller with Fulton County told 11Alive that State Farm Arena absentee ballot counters have been sent home.”

“The election department sent the ballot counters at the State Farm Arena in Atlanta home at 10:30 p.m., Regina Waller, the Fulton County public affairs manager for elections, tells ABC News,” said the network’s 11:34 p.m. tweet.

But that wasn’t the case. The women in yellow t-shirts are seen continually placing batches of ballots on two scanners, one after another.

The scanners were placed at the opposite side of the room, at least 50 feet away from where the media and monitors were instructed to stay. With several columns obstructing the view, it’s possible the monitors couldn’t see what the workers were doing.

---

**BOXES UNDER THE TABLE**

At about 10:51 p.m., Moss is seen pulling a black ballot box out from under the table she had placed there in the morning. The box appears to have a white tray on top of it. Moss picks the tray up and then puts it back on top of the box.

At 11:03 p.m., one of the women in yellow t-shirts pulls away a ballot box placed right beside the table. She takes stacks of papers out of it and starts placing them on the scanner.

About 30 seconds later, Moss pulls another ballot box from underneath the table, placing it next to Freeman’s table, and scans it.

About 30 seconds after that, Moss pulls another ballot box from underneath the table. She places it next to another table, and scans it again.

At one point, it appears Freeman places the same stack on the scanner repeatedly. This could legitimately be done in cases when ballots get jammed in the scanner feed. The video quality, however, makes it difficult to discern whether this was the case.

At 11:04 p.m., the man in the light blue coat and the man in a black jacket leave the room.

About 40 seconds later, the man in a red shirt can be seen pulling another ballot box from underneath the table. He places it next to another table, and scans it again.

---
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Registration Officer Wandrea "Shaye" Moss is seen pulling a box from underneath a table at the State Farm Arena in Atlanta, Ga., on Nov. 3, 2020.

A woman in a yellow t-shirt is seen pulling a box that was beside a table at the State Farm Arena in Atlanta on Nov. 3, 2020.

Registration Officer Wandrea "Shaye" Moss is seen pulling a box from underneath a table at the State Farm Arena in Atlanta on Nov. 3, 2020.

A man in a red shirt is seen pulling a box from underneath a table at the State Farm Arena in Atlanta on Nov. 3, 2020.

MONITORS RETURN

After the next jump to 1:47 a.m., three people are seen coming in. According to the Trump campaign, two of them were Republican observers. Harrison said he and another monitor, Trevor McKinley, were told to go back to the arena after they learned from news crews that the counting had continued.

Indeed, Alive 11 reported around 12:38 a.m. that "another official in Fulton County says some work is still being done at the State Farm Arena with ballots."

Three people, two of them likely the Republican poll monitors, are seen rigging up the tabulation center room at the State Farm Arena in Atlanta on Nov. 3, 2020.

OFFICIALS RESPOND

The available footage doesn't show the exact moment the boxes, which were placed under the table. Watson said his investigators reviewed the footage and determined that the boxes were filled, sealed, and placed under the desk when the monitors were still present.

"Around 10 p.m., with the room full of people, including official monitors and the media, video shows ballots that had already been opened but not counted placed in the boxes, sealed up, stored under the table," he said. "This was done because employees thought that they were done for the night and were closing up and ready to leave."

Gabriel Sterling, Georgia's voting system implementation manager, told Newsmax that only some of the workers were told to go home.

"There are cutters, the people who are opening the envelopes, and there's the ones who are scanning," he said.

Registration and Elections Director Richard Barron told the Fulton County Board of Commissioners that when he learned that staff were dismissed at 10:30 p.m., he advised that some workers needed to continue, the county's spokeswoman previously told The Epoch Times.

"Based on that directive, a smaller crew continued to work through the night. It may be possible that observers left at the time, the majority of the staff left, but from the information we have, processing was never closed to observers," she said.

A Georgia secretary of state spokesperson said in a statement that it's "inaccurate and misleading" for the secretary of state's campaign to claim that the "investigator" and an "independent monitor apprehend the tabulation board." Both observed scanning until 10 p.m. and halted for the night around midnight, Newsmax reported.

"It's not clear who the monitor and investigator were, as they are not named in the report," Newsmax reported. "Sterling also acknowledged that there was an "82-minute" period when no monitor was present.

"
Freeman’s Facebook page has ceased to be publicly accessible in recent days, after some of its content was posted on Twitter. The content included videos of her sitting in a cubicle and walking around an office space with trays of absentee ballots seen on tables. At one point, a man brings her a tray labeled “Ballot Signature Verification” with nearly 400 absentee ballot envelopes in it. The first envelope lacks a return address. Early in-person votes are cast on absentee ballots, which also need to be placed in envelopes. It’s not clear whether the envelope would have a return address in that case.

In Georgia, absentee ballot signatures are matched by county election clerks to signatures on record for each voter. The clerks flag any mismatches for further verification, including a follow-up with the voter. Less than 0.2 percent of absentee ballots are rejected for signature issues, according to the state. That only accounts for mailed absentee ballots. It’s not clear what the rejection rate is for early voting ballots.

Each county has a bipartisan election board, which may oversee the signature-matching process, according to Ryan Germany, general counsel of the secretary of state.

“For signature matching, they can choose to be as involved in that as they want,” he said during the Senate hearing.

None of the five members of the Fulton County election board answered emailed questions regarding their involvement in the signature-matching oversight.
Ruby Freeman CONFESSION and suspect mail/absentee ballots

These postings are from Ruby Freeman’s Instagram account. She has now lawyered up. She can be found wearing the purple shirt in the after 10:30PM secret vote counting video that occurred after Ralph Jones yelled loudly to send the other poll workers and Republican observers home on election night in Fulton County, GA.

In Late October, Ruby Freeman livestreamed from her cubicle, showing hundreds of boxes and USPS carriers filled with presumably Mail-in ballots. None were secured, none were clearly abiding by chain of custody rules. And when a election worker brought her a box of mail-in ballots ‘to enter into the computer’ the very first envelope had NO return address.

In various states at least 27,663 absentee ballots were mailed to P.O. Boxes and filled out and returned. It is possible this is evidence of that. Or these are stuffed ballots created by Fulton County employees.
JAY VALENTINE: “THE SCALE OF FRAUD IS MASSIVE – ALL IN ONE DIRECTION”

“It’s the equivalent of flipping a coin a hundred and thirty thousand times and every time it comes up heads.”

Jay Valentine is a well-respected expert on fraud who previously ran the fraud protection program for eBay, has served as an expert witness in numerous court cases involving fraud, and helped break up major industrial scale fraud associated with Medicaid and Medicare. In a recent radio interview on “Secure Freedom Radio” he revealed that “Statistics IS Evidence” and made the following observations about the November 2020 U.S. Presidential Election:

“The scale of fraud is massive. And it is all in one direction. That’s interesting. But there’s something else very interesting that nobody’s commenting on. And that is that you don’t see anybody on the other side questioning the mathematics or the statistics, saying, oh, no, no, no. These types of things easily could happen and here’s how. You don’t see any math people coming forward saying that. The reason is, anybody who has a college-level statistics background, you don’t have to be a PhD in statistics here, to look at these data sets and look at these anomalies, all of which go in the same direction, and it’s absolutely black and white, it’s not a ninety-nine percent probability. It’s like a – it’s as close to a hundred percent as you can be. I mean, nothing in life is a hundred percent, but this is as close as you can be.”

“The way it works is that when you are dealing with very large number sets and industrial fraud, think of big number sets, think of tens of millions, hundreds of millions of data points, then you can’t just start at the beginning of the alphabet and kind of go through and check everything. You have to use things called data pattern analysis. And numbers are funny things. When you have very, very large groups of numbers, whether it’s sales numbers or whether it’s real estate numbers, whatever they might be, they have characteristics. Those characteristics are patterns. Every pattern has outliers. And so, what you look for, you look for the outliers. And in this particular election, what’s interesting is that there are massive numbers of outliers from the data patterns and what is unique that has never happened before is every outlier favors Joe Biden. So, when you see that, you don’t have to dig a whole lot farther. That’s where you look for the fraud.”

“The fact that fraud happens is nothing unusual. And the fact that dead people vote is nothing unusual, that happens in every election and that’s something that here in America, Americans kind of get a kick out of. We’re not talking about that kind of fraud. We’re talking industrial fraud here where millions of votes were moved. Where in the middle of the night, at the same time, in a coordinated effort across four, five, six, seven states something unusual happened. A week later, statisticians start looking at these anomalies. Anomaly after anomaly favored Joe Biden. Now, that doesn’t just happen. And that’s the type of statistics that any fraud person, you don’t have to be a PhD, would look at that and say, black and white, that is massive industrial fraud and it is, it is something that is prima facie. It is prima facie fraud.”
“It’s by far the greatest fraud in history. I mean, you take a look at, numerically, the data points of this fraud and you look at the impact that it has had, bigger than the, you know, John Law and the Mississippi bubble, bigger than Bernie Madoff, bigger than Enron. This is – this is as big as you can get and you cannot ever look at a point in history and see a greater fraud than what perpetrated in this past 2020 election.”

“Amercians know what went on. People aren’t stupid. You don’t need a PhD in statistics to tell you this was massive fraud. And if people lose faith in the electoral process, then this country as we know it is over. And so, if the Supreme Court doesn’t deal with this issue and deal with it in a very forthright way, America as we know it is behind us.”

The Full Radio Interview can be found here:

https://simplecast.com/s/dd5895c0

Off the air, Mr. Valentine also suggested the attached report published by the National Academy of Sciences as a must-read to understand why “Statistics IS Evidence” when investigating election fraud.
Statistical Detection of Systematic Election Irregularities

Article in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, September 2012
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It’s not the voting that’s democracy, it’s the counting:
Statistical detection of systematic election irregularities
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Democratic societies are built around the principle of free and fair elections, that each citizen’s vote should count equal. National elections can be regarded as large-scale social experiments, where people are grouped into usually large numbers of electoral districts and vote according to their preferences. The large number of samples implies certain statistical consequences for the polling results which can be used to identify election irregularities. Using a suitable data collapse, we find that vote distributions of elections with alleged fraud show a kurtosis of hundred times more than normal elections. As an example we show that reported irregularities in the 2011 Duma election are indeed well explained by systematic ballot stuffing and develop a parametric model quantifying to which extent fraudulent mechanisms are present. We show that if specific statistical properties are present in an election, the results do not represent the will of the people. We formulate a parametric test detecting these statistical properties in election results. For demonstration the model is also applied to election outcomes of several other countries.

Free and fair elections are the cornerstone of every democratic society [1]. A central characteristic of elections being free and fair is that each citizen’s vote counts equal. However, already Joseph Stalin believed that “The people who cast the votes decide nothing. The people who count them decide everything.” How can it be distinguished whether an election outcome represents the will of the people or the will of the counters?

Elections are fascinating, large scale social experiments. A country is segmented into a usually large number of electoral districts. Each district represents a standardized experiment where each citizen articulates his/her political preference via a ballot. Despite differences in e.g. income levels, religions, ethnicities, etc. across the populations in these districts, outcomes of these experiments have been shown to follow certain universal statistical laws [2-6]. Huge deviations from these expected distributions have been reported for the votes for United Russia, the winning party in the 2011 Duma election [7, 8].

In general, using an appropriate re-scaling of election data, the distributions of votes and turnout are approximately a Gaussian [5]. Let \( W_i \) be the number of votes for the winning party and \( N_i \) the number of voters in electoral district \( i \), then the logarithmic vote rate is \( \nu_i = \log \frac{W_i}{N_i} \). In figure 2 we show the distribution of \( \nu_i \) over all electoral districts. To first order the data from different countries collapse to a Gaussian. Clearly the data for Russia and Uganda boldly fall out of line. Skewness and kurtosis are listed for each data-set in table SII, confirming these observations quantitatively. Most strikingly, the kurtosis of the distributions for Russia (2003, 2007 and 2011) and Uganda deviate by two orders of magnitude from each other country. The only reasonable conclusion from this is that the voting results in Russia and Uganda are driven by other mechanisms or processes than other countries.

However, such distributions only reveal part of the story, and a different representation of the data becomes helpful to gain a deeper understanding. Figure 1 shows a 2-d histogram of the number of electoral districts for a given fraction of voter turnout (x-axis) and for the percentage of votes for the winning party (y-axis). Results are shown for recent parliamentary elections in Austria, Finland, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, and the UK, and presidential elections in the USA and Uganda. Data was obtained from official election homepages of the respective countries, for more details and more election results, see SOM. These figures can be interpreted as fingerprints of several processes and mechanisms leading to the overall election results. For Russia and Uganda the shape of these fingerprints are immediately seen to differ from the other countries. In particular there is a large number of districts (thousands) with a 100% percent turnout and at the same time a 100% of votes for the winning party.

The shape of these irregularities can be understood with the assumption of the presence of the fraudulent action of ballot stuffing. This means that bundles of ballots with votes for one party are stuffed into the urns. Videos purportedly documenting these practices are openly available on online platforms [9-11]. In one case the urn is already filled with ballots before the elections start, e.g. [9], in other cases members of the election commission are caught filling out ballots, e.g. [10]. Yet in another case the pens in the polling stations are shown to be erasable, e.g. [11]. Are these incidents non-representative exceptions or the rule?

We develop a parametric model to quantify the extent of ballot stuffing for a given party to explain the election fingerprints in figure 1. The distributions for Russia
FIG. 1. Election fingerprints: 2-d histograms of the number of electoral districts for a given voter turnout (x-axis) and the percentage of votes (y-axis) for the winning party (or candidate) in recent elections from eight different countries (from left to right, top to bottom: Austria, Finland, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Uganda, UK and USA) are shown. Color represents the number of electoral districts. Districts usually cluster around a given turnout and voting level. In Uganda and Russia these clusters are 'smeared out' to the upper right region of the plots, reaching a second peak at a 100% turnout and a 100% of votes (red circles). In Finland the main cluster is smeared out into two directions (indicative of voter mobilization due to controversies surrounding the True Finns). In the UK the fingerprint shows two clusters stemming from rural and urban areas (see SOM).

and Uganda are clearly bimodal. One at intermediate levels of turnout and votes, smeared towards the upper right parts of the plot. The second peak is situated at the vicinity of the 100% turnout, 100% votes point. This suggests two modes of fraud mechanisms, incremental and extreme fraud. Incremental fraud means that with a given vote ballots for one party are added to the urn and votes for other parties are replaced. This occurs within a fraction $f_i$ of electoral districts. In the election fingerprints in figure 1 these districts are shifted to the upper right. Extreme fraud corresponds to reporting nearly all votes for a single party with an almost complete voter turnout. This happens in a fraction $f_e$ of districts, which form a second cluster near 100% turnout and votes for the incumbent party.

For simplicity in the model we assume that within each electoral district turnout and voter preferences follow a Gaussian distribution with the mean and standard deviation taken from the actual sample, see figure S2. With probability $f_i$ ($f_e$) the incremental (extreme) fraud mechanisms are then applied. Note that if more detailed assumptions are made about possible mechanisms leading to large-scale heterogeneities in the data such as city-country differences in turnout (UK) or coast–non-coast (USA) (see SOM), this will have an effect on the estimate of $f_i$. Figure 3 compares the observed and modeled fingerprint plots for the winning parties in Russia, Uganda and Switzerland. Model results are shown for $f_i = f_e = 0$ (fair elections) and for best fits to the data (see SOM) for $f_i$ and $f_e$. To describe the smear to the main peak to the upper right corner, an incremental fraud probability around $f_i = 0.04$ is needed for the case of United Russia. This means fraud in about 64% of the districts. In the second peak around the 100% turnout scenario there are roughly 3,000 districts with a 100% of votes for United Russia representing an electorate of more than two million people. Best fits yield $f_e = 0.05$, i.e. five percent of all electoral districts experience extreme fraud. A more detailed comparison of the model performance for the Russian parliamentary elections of 2003, 2007 and 2011 is found in the figure S3. The fraud parameters for the Uganda data in figure 3 are $f_i = 0.45$ and $f_e = 0.01$.

The dimension of election irregularities can be visualized with the cumulative number of votes as a function of the turnout, figure 4. For each turnout level the total number of votes from districts with this, or lower turnouts are shown. Each curve corresponds to the respective election winner in a different country. Normally these cdfs level off and form a plateau from the party’s maximal vote count on. Again this is not the case for Russia and Uganda. Both show a boost phase of increased extreme fraud toward the right end of the distribution (red circles). Russia never even shows a tendency to form a plateau.

It is imperative to emphasize that the shape of the fingerprints in figure 1 will deviate from pure 2-d Gaussian distributions due to non-fraudulent mechanisms, such as heterogeneities in the population or voter mobilization,
FIG. 3. Comparison of observed and modeled 2-d histograms for (top to bottom) Russia, Uganda and Switzerland. The left column shows the actual election fingerprints, the middle column shows a fit with the fraud model. The column to the right shows the expected model outcome of fair elections (i.e. absence of fraudulent mechanisms \( f_i = f_c = 0 \)). For Switzerland the fair and fitted model are almost the same. The results for Russia and Uganda can only be explained by the model assuming a large number of fraudulent districts.

see SOM. However, these can under no circumstances explain the mode of extreme fraud. A bad forgery is the ultimate insult\(^1\).

It can be said with almost certainty that an election does not represent the will of the people, if a substantial fraction \((f_c)\) of districts reports a 100% turnout with almost all votes for a single party, and/or if any significant deviations from the sigmoid form in the cumulative distribution of votes versus turnout are observed. Another indicator of systematic fraudulent or irregular voting behavior is a kurtosis of the logarithmic vote rate distribution of the order of several hundreds.

Should such signals be detected it is tempting to invoke G.B. Shaw who held that "[d]emocracy is a form of government that substitutes election by the incompetent many for appointment by the corrupt few."
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SUPPORTING ONLINE MATERIAL

The data

Descriptive statistics and official sources of the election results are shown in table SI. The raw data will be made available for download at http://www.complex-systems.meduniwien.ac.at/. Each data set reports election results of parliamentary (Austria, Finland, Russia, Spain, Switzerland and UK) or presidential (Uganda, USA) elections on district level. In the rare circumstances where electoral districts report more valid ballots than registered voters, we work with a turnout of 100%. With the exception of the US data, each country reports the number of registered voters and valid ballots for each party and district. For the US there is no exact data on the voting eligible population on district level, which was estimated to be the same as the population above 18 years, available at http://census.gov. Fingerprints for the 2000 US presidential elections are shown in figure S1 for both candidates for districts from the entire USA and Florida only. There are no irregularities discernible.

Model

A country is separated into \( n \) electoral districts \( i \), each having an electorate of \( N_i \) people and in total \( V_i \) valid votes. The fraction of valid votes for the winning party in district \( i \) is denoted \( v_i \). The average turnout over all districts, \( \bar{a} \), is given by \( \bar{a} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i (V_i/N_i) \) with standard deviation \( s_a \), the mean fraction of votes \( \bar{v} \) for the winning party is \( \bar{v} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i v_i \) with standard deviation \( s_v \). The mean values \( a \) and \( v \) are typically close to but not identical to the values which maximize the empirical distribution function of turnout and votes over all districts. Let \( v \) be the number of votes where the empirical distribution function assumes its (first local) maximum (rounded to entire percents), see figure S2. Similarly \( a \) is the turnout where the empirical distribution function of turnouts \( a \) takes its (first local) maximum. The distributions for turnout and votes are extremely skewed to the right for Uganda and Russia which also inflates the standard deviations in these countries, see table SI. To account for this a 'left-sided' ('right-sided') mean deviation \( \sigma^L_v \) (\( \sigma^R_v \)) from \( v \) is introduced. \( \sigma^R_v \) can be regarded as the incremental fraud width, a measurable parameter quantifying how intense the vote stuffing is. This contributes to the 'smearing out' of the main peaks in the election fingerprints, see figure 1 in the main text. The larger \( \sigma^R_v \), the more inflated the vote results due to urn stuffing, in contrast to \( \sigma^L_v \) which quantifies the scatter of the voters’ actual preferences. They can be estimated from the data by

\[
\sigma^L_v = \sqrt{\langle (v_i - v)^2 \rangle_{v_i < v}},
\]

\[
\sigma^R_v = \sqrt{\langle (v_i - v)^2 \rangle_{v_i > v}}.
\]

Similarly the extreme fraud width \( \sigma_e \) can be estimated, i.e. the width of the peak around 100% votes. We found that \( \sigma_e = 0.075 \) describes all encountered vote distribu-

FIG. 1. Turnout against percentage of votes for Bush (left column) and Gore (right) in the 2000 US presidential elections. Results are shown for all districts in the USA (top row) and for districts from Florida (bottom). There are no traces of fraudulent mechanisms discernible in the fingerprints.

FIG. 2. A stylized version of an empirical vote distribution function shows how \( v \), \( \sigma^L_v \), \( \sigma^R_v \) and \( \sigma_e \) are derived from the election results. \( v \) is the maximum of the distribution function. \( \sigma^L_v \) measures the distribution width of values to the left of \( v \), i.e. smaller than \( v \). The incremental fraud with \( \sigma^R_v \) measures the distribution width of values to the right of \( v \), i.e. larger than \( v \). The extreme fraud width \( \sigma_e \) is the width of the peak at 100% votes.
TABLE I. Descriptive statistics of the election result datasets. Each row in the table corresponds to one election of the given type in the respective country. The number of electoral districts $n$, mean turnout $\bar{\tau}$ and votes for winning party $\bar{v}$ are shown together with estimates for fraud parameters $f_1$ and $f_2$, as well as the sources where the data can be downloaded (as of 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Election</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$\bar{\tau}$</th>
<th>$\bar{v}$</th>
<th>$f_1$</th>
<th>$f_2$</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>parliament (2008)</td>
<td>2542</td>
<td>0.74 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.26 ± 0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>parliament (2011)</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>0.70 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.17 ± 0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>parliament (2003)</td>
<td>95181</td>
<td>0.62 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>parliament (2007)</td>
<td>96192</td>
<td>0.70 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>parliament (2011)</td>
<td>95057</td>
<td>0.64 ± 0.18</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.30</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>parliament (2008)</td>
<td>8112</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>parliament (2007)</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>president (2011)</td>
<td>23968</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.20</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>parliament (2010)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0.65 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.35 ± 0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>president (2000)</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>president (2008)</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>[source]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. Skewness and kurtosis of rescaled zero-mean, unit-variance distributions of $\nu_i$ shown in figure S2, and for the remaining datasets listed in table SI. Russia and Uganda fall strongly out of line, with deviations in skewness of about one order of magnitude and deviations in kurtosis of mostly two orders of magnitude, compared to each other country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria (2008)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland (2011)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (2003)</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (2007)</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (2011)</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain (2008)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland (2007)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda (2011)</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (2010)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA (2000)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA (2008)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distributions reasonably well. For a visualization of $\sigma_1^2,$ $\sigma_2^2$ and $\sigma_3$ see figure S2.

While $f_1$ and $f_2$ measure how many districts incremental and extreme fraud occur, $\sigma_3$ and $\sigma_4$ quantify how intense these activities are, if they occur. To get an estimate for the width of the distribution of turnout over district which is free of possible fraudulent inflences, the turnout distribution width $\sigma_\tau$ is calculated from electoral districts $i$ which have both $\tau_i < \bar{\tau}$ and $a_i < a$, that is $\sigma_\tau = \sqrt{(\overline{(a_i - a)^2})_{a_i < a}}(\overline{\tau_i < \bar{\tau}})$.

Incremental fraud is a combination of two processes: stuffing ballots for one party into the urn and re-casting or deliberately wrong-counting ballots from other parties (e.g. erasing the cross). Which one of these two processes dominates is quantified by the deliberate wrong counting parameter $\alpha > 0$. For $0 < \alpha < 1$ the wrong-counting process dominates, for $\alpha > 1$ the urn stuffing mechanism is prevalent. In the following $N(\mu, \sigma)$ denotes a normal distributed random variable with mean $\mu$ and standard deviation $\sigma$. The model is specified by the following protocol, which is applied to each district.

- Pick a district $i$ with electorate $N_i$ taken from the data.
- The model turnout of district $i$, $a_i^{(m)}$, is $N(\mu, \sigma_\mu)$.
- A fraction of $e_i^{(m)} \in N(\nu, \sigma_\nu)$ people vote for the winning party.
- With probability $f_i$ incremental fraud takes place. In this case the district is assigned a fraud intensity $x_i \in N(0, \sqrt{\sigma_\pi^2})$. Values for $x_i$ are only accepted if they lie in the range $0 < x_i < 1$. This is the fraction of votes not cast, $(1 - e_i^{(m)})N_i$, which are added to the winning party. Votes for the opposition are wrong counted for the winning party with a rate $x_i^\alpha$ (where $\alpha$ is an exponent). To summarize, if incremental fraud takes place the winning party receives $N_i (a_i^{(m)} e_i^{(m)} + x_i (1 - a_i^{(m)}) + x_i^\alpha (1 - e_i^{(m)}) a_i^{(m)})$ votes.
- With probability $f_e$ extreme fraud takes place. In this case opposition votes are canceled and added to the winning party with probability $y_i \in 1 - N(1, \sigma_e)$ (i.e. the above with $y_i$ replacing $x_i$).
FIG. 3. Comparison of results from the 2003, 2007 and 2011 Russian parliamentary elections and the fraud model. In the left column the distributions of the number of districts with a given percentage of votes for United Russia is shown for data (blue) and fraud model (red). The middle column shows the observed turnout against votes distributions. The data from 2007 and 2011 shows the same pattern, although the main cluster for United Russia is at a higher percentage of votes. For 2003 there is a smaller number of districts with 100% turnout and votes, and the main cluster is spread out less. The right column shows fits for the data with the fraud model, using parameters $f_t = 0.51, f_e = 0.01$ (2003), $f_t = 0.50, f_e = 0.04$ (2007) and $f_t = 0.64, f_e = 0.05$ (2011).

Acceptable values for $y_i$ are again from the range $0 < y_i < 1$.

Fitting the model

The parameters for incremental and extreme fraud, $f_t$ and $f_e$, as well as the deliberate wrong counting parameter $\alpha$, are estimated by a goodness-of-fit test. Let $pdf(v_i)$ be the empirical distribution function of votes for the winning party (in percent) over all districts. The distribution function for the model districts $pdf(v_i^m(\cdot))$ is calculated for each set of $(f_t, f_e, \alpha)$ values where $f_t, f_e \in \{0, 0.01, 0.02, \ldots \}$, $\alpha \in \{0, 0.1, \ldots 5\}$. We report values for the fraud parameters where the statistic

$$S(f_t, f_e, \alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{pdf(v_i) - pdf(v_i^m)}{pdf(v_i)} \right)^2$$

assumes its minimum, see Table I for $f_t$ and $f_e$.

The extreme fraud parameter $f_e$ is zero for all elections except Russia (2003, 2007 and 2011) and Uganda. These are also the only elections where the incremental fraud parameter $f_t$ is not close to zero, say $f_t > 0.1$. It is interesting to note that $\alpha$ assumes the same value for all Russian elections, $\alpha_{Russia} = 2$, different from Uganda where $\alpha_{Uganda} = 0.3$. Results for $\alpha$ from countries where $f_t$ is close to zero can not be detected in a robust way and are superfluous, since there are (almost) no deviations from the fair election case.

Special care is needed in the interpretation of $f_t$ and $f_e$ values in countries where election districts contain several polling stations. It may be the case that extreme fraud takes only in a subset of the polling stations within a district place. In that case extreme fraud would be indistinguishable from the incremental fraud mechanism.

On alternative explanations for election irregularities

It is hard to construct other plausible mechanisms leading to a large number of polling districts having 100% turnout and votes for a single party than urn stuffing. The case is not so clear for the 'smeared out' main cluster. In some cases, namely UK and Finland this cluster also takes on a slightly different form. This effect clearly does not inflate the turnout as much as it is the case in Russia and Uganda, but it is nevertheless present. In the UK there are well known large-scale heterogeneities between urban and rural areas (see e.g. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/election) in both turnout and voter preferences. Generally speaking, urban areas show a smaller turnout and a lower preference for the winning Conservatives. Another possible mechanism is successful voter mobilization. This may lead to a correlation between turnout and a party's votes. The Finland elections, for example, where marked by radical campaigns by the True Finns. They managed to mobilize evenly spread out across the country, with the exception of the Helsinki region, where the winning National Coalition Party performed significantly better than in the rest of the country.
A $100 wager: most Americans believe in common sense vote counting. We all imagine each candidate has a bucket, every vote is like a pebble being tossed into that bucket, and each vote represents a single citizen’s choice. The first democracy literally used urns and pebbles. After voting day, two Greek urns were emptied onto counting boards for tabulation and the winner was declared, in public, without dispute. Two plus two equals four; unless the data goes through a piece of software IP paid for by the social communist Hugo Chavez.

It will surprise many Americans and legislators to know that this transparent and normal expectation is not how our voting system currently works. Imagine if you mixed blue and red paint, and then tried to keep track of how many gallons of red paint are in the bucket by the color of the mixed paint. No competent data engineer would design the system this way as their first choice for vote counts.

In most cases all votes are mixed up in the same electronic bucket. Then complex algorithms assign ‘weights’ to each candidate, and spit back out an estimated amount of votes won per candidate. These are the fractions. If a grocery store followed this model to figure out what you owe, they’d be charged for unfair business practices in Michigan - there would always be extra money in their till.

The media claims that apparently missing votes in the tabulation are just ‘rounding errors’. Dominion software manuals teach state employees how to set low rounding settings. In fractional voting, although rounding to .000 looks impressive, for every million voters in a statewide race rounding will lose or hide 1,000 votes. At only two decimal places, 10,000 votes vanish. The only useful purpose of low precision with millions of ballots is to conceal disenfranchisement by calling it ‘rounding errors’.

Rounding errors cannot occur in an honest two bucket system. Even monkeys can count pebbles. Every American instinctively knows this complex algorithm driven system is wrong.

The safest way to steal fractional votes is to use counties that are already heavily going for the outsider. The best time to steal is during a large release of ballots. This means that the opponent will still win the county, and the win will discourage any auditing of the ballots within the county. But the important fractionally stolen votes are effectively moved to where they are needed to flip the race to the establishment preference.

Defenders of Dominion and the other election software companies have already begun claiming there was no fraud because Trump won many of the Dominion counties. That is a misdirection. Much of the theft happened within these precincts. Fractional voting made sure the theft that was built into the software stayed hidden.

Dominion’s system was first used to help Hugo Chavez steal his referendum in 2004. The vote counting software IP comes from Smartmatic. The HuffPost has pointed out that “the IP for the vast-majority/near entirety of Sequoia’s voting systems was actually secretly owned by the Hugo Chavez-tied, Venezuelan-based firm”. Today Dominion is Sequoia is Smartmatic IP under the hood. HuffPost again: “Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez is still tied to a huge percentage of U.S. Elections, as now overseen by a Canadian firm.” And the CCP are also involved through some ownership in Smartmatic.
Scytl is the data security center for Dominion, where vote tabulation occurs, overseas in China, Serbia, Germany, and Spain. Everylegalvote.com has the Scytl GitHub showing election database schematics. The design diagram explains the flow of the votes, including a procedure for ‘decorating’ the vote, which means to smooth the final percentages to make them look more normal to the naked eye.

These facts all indicate the opportunity for vote stealing. But the media is shouting for evidence and proof. In the Philadelphia dataset fractions actually move between precincts. The fraction logic set a specific number of votes that Trump was allowed to get, out of a total number of votes. Dominion then set a minimum on Biden. The remainder of votes were then split to the third party candidate, or also went to Biden. The Libertarian did not get 3% of actual cast votes.

On the day of November 4, looking at the precinct level tabulations, there were about 90,000 entries made that day to the database by the precinct machines. For literally half of the tallies, Trump receives between zero and ten percent of the votes assigned by the software. This makes no sense, even in a heavily Democrat city like Philly. Trump’s voters were robbed.

Fractional fraud is found in the precinct entries. On November 4, four precincts (06-13, 50-18, 51-26, 59-23) report a vote fraction of exactly 1/48, meaning Trump received just 1 vote for every 48 votes posted. Then the fraction is moved by the software to two new precincts, 17-16 and 28-16 within about five minutes during what appears to be a scheduled ‘update’ that occurred across all precincts. Moving the fractions around like this makes it very hard to track, notice, and identify the vote switching and rounding errors. But it does not happen by accident. These precise ratios cannot all happen in a random count.

Computers prefer to use prime numbers when calculating fractions. Many of the vote switching ratios in the Philadelphia data are prime number based. One fraction 4/65 (which is the prime number 13 multiplied by 5) is unusual to find in a truly random count. Philadelphia precinct 20-06 originally reports vote totals split by this fraction at 07:08:18 on November 4. Then between 09:06:53 and 09:39:44 the fraction is moved from precinct 20-06 to four new ones: 36-08, 40-42, 43-09, and 61-11. This means that each of these new precincts got an adjustment to match the same fraction in their published ballot counts.

If you swipe pebbles from a Grecian urn, it is easily found out. If you shrink the value of a Michigann Republican’s vote so that his vote is only 4/65 of his Democrat neighbor’s vote, he cannot discover this. His vote was still ‘counted’ by the state and shows up in the tally. But it is only worth 4/65 of his neighbor. This is a violation of the sacred right to an equal vote, equal value in the count.

There can only be one conclusion from these proofs and evidences. From the beginning, the intent of electronic voting was to change an ancient honest system of two buckets into an inherently dishonest single bucket of slop. Considering the poisoned well that Smartmatic originated from in Venezuela, this is not a major leap. But until now the focus in the press and social media has been on individual instances or evidences of fraud. Americans reject the fundamental dishonesty and unfairness in the one bucket system.

How do we fix this since almost every state used these designed-to-fraud systems? One way would be for the Michigan legislature to call an emergency session, use their police powers to impound every voting machine, thumb drive, hard drive, official phone and anything else used in the election, and work with fraud investigators to discover what happened with every vote during the tabulation. Discover how the vote count was stopped, in coordination with the other swing states, right at the point where Trump was leading.
Who took the phone calls? Who made the directive state-wide to stop counting? Was Dr. Eric Coomer, the Dominion VP for Security and patent holder of their ballot security technology, directing things behind the scenes? These questions must be answered as well as the forensic investigation of the machines.

In addition, require every precinct and county to submit all audit trails, documents, total blank ballot counts and number of ballots used. Finally, process the cast ballots in every county in Michigan while going by hand to filter out the other kinds of fraud (fake ballots, invalid signatures, dead voters). Sort the ballots into two stacks, one for Biden and one for Trump. Count the pieces of paper using a basic paper counter, such as the Bantam-INT that can count up to 2,000 pages per minute. The vote counting machines must not be used for this process – they CANNOT be trusted to count fairly.

These steps will remove all fraud possibilities and solidify all true citizens behind the real winner of the 2020 election, whether it was Biden or Trump. Americans always accept a win gained fair and square.

Further Reading:

https://www.huffpost.com/entry/exclusive-on-heels-of-die_b_620084
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KIII46HdqKg&feature=emb_logo
https://gnews.org/580072/
https://gnews.org/577635/
**Election Fraud**


Supreme Court Pushes Up Deadline in Pennsylvania Mail-In Ballot Dispute [https://www.newsmax.com/t/newsmax/article/1000280/16](https://www.newsmax.com/t/newsmax/article/1000280/16)


Wisconsin Lawmakers Seeking to Figure Out Whether Nov. 3 Election Was Fair and Accurate [Epoch Times.com](https://www.epochtimes.com/wisconsin-lawmakers-seeking-to-figure-out-whether-nov-3-election-was-fair-and-accurate)

Michigan GOP Poll Challenger: ‘They Didn’t Disqualify a Single Ballot’
The Epoch Times.com: Michigan GOP Poll Challenger: ‘They Didn’t Disqualify a Single Ballot’

Witnesses Testify at Michigan House Hearing
The Epoch Times.com Witnesses Testify at Michigan House Hearing

Facts Matter (Dec. 2): 280,000 Ballots Go Missing in PA
The Epoch Times.com Facts Matter (Dec. 2): 280,000 Ballots Go Missing in Pennsylvania (theepochtimes.com)

Witness on Verge of Tears Testifying About Intimidation, Harassment at Detroit Vote Processing Center

Infographic: What Happened in Atlanta on Election Night
https://www.theepochtimes.com/what-happened-in-atlanta-on-election-night-2_3607130.html

Coffee County Letter Says It Couldn’t Certify Georgia Recount Over ‘Inability’ to Duplicate Results

Voting Machine USB Drives Had Totals Altered Overnight, Witness in Nevada Election Contest Alleges

3 Percent of Nevada Mail Ballots in Question After Survey Finds Defrauded Voters

Data Scientist: ‘Weird’ Spike in Incomplete Nevada Voter Registrations, Use of ‘Casinos’ as Home Addresses

Arizona GOP Says Ballots Were ‘Altered and Removed’ from Trump’s Total
https://www.theepochtimes.com/arizona-gop-says-ballots-were-altered-and-removed-from-trumps-total_3603162.html

Election Supervisor Demonstrates Vote Changing on Dominion Software
https://www.theepochtimes.com/election-supervisor-demonstrates-vote-changing-on-dominion-software_3614714.html

**Criminal Activity**

USPS Whistleblower in Michigan Claims Higher-Ups Were Engaging in Voter Fraud
https://townhall.com/tipsheet/bethbaumann/2020/11/04/usps-whistleblower-in-michigan-claims-higher-ups-were-engaging-in-voter-fraud-n2579501

USPS Whistleblower Jesse Morgan Says He Was Interrogated
https://theepochtimes.com/usps-whistleblower-jesse...

MI Atty General Intimidates Witness of Fraud Training Given to Poll Workers
As Many as 6,000 Illegal Votes Identified in Nevada – Thousands of People Referred to DOJ For Potential Criminal Violation of Election Laws

INTERVIEW WITH KEVIN FREEMAN ON EVERYLEGALVOTE.COM AND MASSIVE BIDEN ONLY VOTES
American Family Radio - Interview with Kevin Freeman on Everylegalvote.com and Massive Biden Only Votes (afr.net)
One person’s vote equal to half a vote and another person’s vote is equal to two votes!
Economic War Room: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TFKigfQ-jv0#_blank

Col. John Mills former Cyber Security Expert for Pentagon confirms upcoming GA race will be stolen if no urgent changes
Real America’s Voice: Securing America: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mtr0Hhz2wvl#_blank

Liquid Lunch on Every Legal Vote
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MPTD64bzs34#_blank


Kevin Freeman, Every Legal Vote – Identifying Election Fraud and Calling it Out
America Can We Talk with Debbie Georgatos: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DSom2SP8FBQ#_blank

Keet Lewis with EveryLegalVote.com on Lou Dobbs

Never, never, never Surrender! - National Pulse Raheem Kassam interview with Kevin Freeman from Every Legal Vote
Real America’s Voice: National Pulse: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EBRNDWcuw9g#_blank

Steve Scalise, John Eastman, Kevin Freeman, Scott Rasmussen
Washington Watch: https://www.tonyperkins.com/get.cfm?i=LR20K09#_blank

NTD Business Full Broadcast on Every Legal Vote

Raheem Kassam talks about everylegalvote.com
https://americasvoice.news/video/lkCzLr981u0HBMs/#_blank

Texas AG Hopes Supreme Court Will Take Up Election Case, Hear Arguments

Wisconsin USPS Subcontractor Alleges Backdating of Tens of Thousands of Mail-In Ballots

Michigan GOP: Secretary of State Trying to Delete Election Data Amid Audit Calls

Every Allegation in Trump Georgia Election Contest Supported by Testimony: Attorney
Witnesses at Michigan Hearing Testify on GOP Worker Harassment

Foreign Influence & Interference
From August, 2020 – FOX News
China’s anti-Trump election meddling raises new alarm
https://www.foxnews.com/politics/china-election-interference-threat

Intelligence officials say they are increasingly concerned about interference in the U.S. election by China, adding to existing concerns about meddling by Russia that have been around since 2016

Georgia, Mired in Election Disputes, Fosters Cozy Ties with China
The Epoch Times: Georgia, Mired in Election Disputes, Fosters Cozy Ties With China

Lawsuit Claiming Iranian, Chinese Operatives Potentially Targeted Dominion Voting Systems

Sidney Powell to Newsmax TV: Dominion Designed to ‘Rig Elections’

Sidney Powell: Backdoor Access From Foreign Countries Into 2020 Election Machines
https://populist.press/sidney-powell-backdoor-access-from-foreign-countries-into-2020-election-machines/

Voter Rights Group Notifies DOJ of Pakistani Link With Nevada Election Email System
EpochTimes.com: Voter Rights Group Notifies DOJ of Pakistani Link With Nevada Election Email System
In this transcript of the now-infamous speech by the Chinese Communist Party’s political operative Di Dongsheng, who highlighted on November 28 the fact that China helped Biden’s son build his global companies.

Dongsheng, associate dean, School of International Relations at Renmin University of China on Nov 28, 2020 in Shanghai was featured on the television program “The Answers.” The topic for a panel discussion was “Will China’s Opening Up in the Financial Sector Attract Wall Street Wolves?”

TRANSLATED TRANSCRIPT BELOW

“Trump waged a trade war with us. Why couldn’t we handle him? Why is it that between 1992 and 2016 we always resolved issues with US? Did you guys know? All the crisis, the Yinhe incident, bombing of the embassy or the mid-air collision, everything was taken care of swiftly, in no more than two months.

Why? Now, I’m going to drop a bomb - because we had people up there [laughter] inside America’s core circle of power, we had our old friends. Due to time constraint, I won’t expand on that, but let me very quickly tell you a short story. Director General Zhang Zhixiang spoke well with some amazing stories. So here is my story. Well,… it was… because we are on live streaming, millions of people are watching, I have to be careful how many details I go into, I can’t turn them in. (a literal and more direct translation: I can’t sell out these people )[laughter]

Let me just put it this way: It was in 2015, before the second last visit to the U.S. by Secretary General Xi [Jinping]. As we all know, everybody in the system must warm things up for his visit. The way one organization in the Party did the warm-up was to boost some publicity, i.e. to promote Xi’s new book Xi Jinping: The Governance of China. We will launch its first English edition in U.S. by having a press conference before his arrival, to build him some momentum. Who will do this job? Just like today, they said, “Hey, Di Dongsheng, you are very good at fooling the foreigners” because they had seen how I conned them, which they thought was very effective. So, I would be the host and part of the panel. It was just like what we are doing today, I being the host and a speaker. The senior officials picked the venue and told us to go to Politics and Prose Bookstore at 3:30 pm next Thursday. It’s on Connecticut Ave, in Washington DC, 2650 Connecticut Ave, I think. We’d launch the new book there. So we went there to make the booking. Things are run very differently in China and in U.S. It was very difficult to book the place with such a short notice. The owner said arrogantly “Sorry, can’t do it.” So I asked him, “Which author booked the place for that timeframe?” What did I mean by asking him that? Well, there is nothing U.S. dollars can’t buy. If one bundle of cash couldn’t, I’d I throw in another. [laughter]. That’s how I work. [laughter and applause].

Still, the owner said arrogantly “Sorry but I won’t tell you which author booked the place for that timeframe. We have our principles.” He was very arrogant, very pretentious. Later I learned that this fella was a Democrat. Although a Democrat, he used to be a journalist in Asia. So he had some opinions on our Party, which is why he deliberately refused to play along. I thought it was over. We have to find another venue or time. So we reported this problem to the senior leaders. and let them solve the problem. I was just helping out anyway. However, on Thursday morning, one of the deputy directors of that [Party] department who was the keynote speaker of that day called me by phone and told me that everything would go as planned, in the exact venue at the exact time. I went there right after lunch to find the senior leader had already got there before I did.
And the reason why we could go as planned was because a hero had helped us out. He introduced me to an old lady with a big nose, obviously a Jew simply by that look. She gave me a business card and told me her name. She said “nice to meet you” although in Mandarin with a very authentic Beijing accent. I was shocked. “You speak better Mandarin than me. I’ll never lose my provincial Jiangsu accent. But you are spot on.” She was quite content with my compliments. “I not only speak Mandarin, but also have Chinese citizenship.” As you all know, you guys can’t have foreign citizenship. There is no dual citizenship in China. But it’s very unlikely for old ladies like her to give up US & Israel citizenships for Chinese citizenship. Don’t you think?

I suddenly realized she is one of the Chinese people’s old friends. What she said next impressed me even more. “I have not only Chinese citizenship, but also Beijing hukou [official household registration]. I have a courtyard house in a prime location, in the Eastern District along the Chang-An Avenue [near Tiananmen Square]. Drop by for tea when you are back in Beijing. Any problem in here during your stay in the U.S. just let me know.” Which basically means “I’ve got you covered.”

Then I saw the arrogant shop owner was with an annoyed face, directing the staff to arrange tables and chairs, reluctantly following someone’s order. I asked her how she managed to force him to comply. We tried everything with him. He’s too arrogant. The old lady cunningly grinned, “I reasoned with him.” Do you know where that phrase came from? It’s a famous line from the mafia movie the Godfather, in which they cut the horse head off and stick it in someone’s bed. Of course she is not mafia. So, who is she? Why had she been living in China for 30 years? And why such an authentic Beijing accent? Remember the big Wall Street institution I mentioned earlier? The top Wall Street financial institution. Well, she’s the president of its Asian operations. I can’t say more without making political trouble. if you do. [laughter and applause]

OK. In plain and simple language, during the last three to four decades, we used the core circle inside America’s real power. As I said the Wall Street had a very profound influence over America’s domestic and foreign affairs since the 1970s. We used to heavily rely on them. Problem is the role of Wall Street has been declining since 2008. But most importantly, after 2016 the Wall Street couldn’t control Trump, because, awkwardly, there was a soft breach of contract between them, which made them hostile to each other. I won’t go into details because we might run out of time. During the U.S.-China trade war, they tried to help. My friends in U.S. told me that they tried to help, but they couldn’t.

Now with Biden winning the election, the traditional elites, political elites, the establishment, they have a very close relationship with the Wall Street. You all heard that Trump said Biden’s son has securities companies all over the world.

But who helped Biden’s son build his global companies? You understand?--There are indeed buy-and-sell transactions involved in here [audience applause].

So I think at this particular time [after Biden won the election], it is of strategic and tactical value for us to show goodwill [to Biden]--of course, this is just from my limited perspective as a political economist.
George Soros’s role in Election Influence

To be investigated: evidence suggests that George Soros has a long history of funding projects to undermine voter integrity in the U.S. and around the world, thus elevating his “open society” policies and candidates. Millions of dollars in grants can be found in Open Society Foundation IRS 990s and internal OSF memos made public and still on Scribd.com (OSF is Soros.org).

Millions of Americans wonder, why is one man, with his family and global network, allowed so much influence and harm to America, and to other nations? Is the Soros network above the law and thus not investigated for breaking laws, perhaps including interstate commerce to incite riots such as his funding of non-profits like Alliance for Justice (AfJ) related to Antifa, RICO laws, Patriot Act laws, untruthful media and “fact-checkers,” foreign election collusion and more? Why is the Soros network allowed to continue its harm to people and U.S. Constitutional law? Where are the leaders in our government who will stand up for truth and justice -- for America?

Our team can assist with further research, if requested. Below, please find a short list of Soros influence projects to begin a proper investigation –

1) Soros’s ties to voting technology including Smartmatic & Dominion
2) Soros’s Open Society Foundation (OSF) decades of projects to reduce voter integrity
3) Soros’s Opposition to Republican U.S. Presidents
4) Soros’s funding of corrupt Secretaries of State, District Attorneys, Governors, members of Congress and other government officials.
5) Soros’s influence in elections around the world, see OSF documents on Scribd etc.
6) Soros’s ties to “Color Revolutions” against political opponents, around the world.
7) Soros’s financial support of elections, policies and candidates advancing crime and criminality by weakening laws, police and U.S. national security; support of the “rights” of terrorists, propaganda and the “sex work” industry in America and globally.

1) Soros ties to technology, including Smartmatic & Dominion and Social Media:

A. Smartmatic/Dominion -

George Soros’s longtime relationship with British “Lord,” Mark Malloch Brown, former Chairman of Smartmatic with ties to Dominion Voting Systems, while on the global board of Soros’s Open Society Foundations (OSF) and a leader of OSF’s International Crisis Group (ICG) that targets ‘open society’ political opponents (who are pro-sovereignty) around the world. This month, George and Alex Soros named Mark Malloch Brown the incoming President of Open Society Foundations (OSF). Quite a job for someone closely aligned with election theft concerns.

National Pulse wrote that Dominion & Smartmatic are not distinct and “fierce competitors” but have a non-compete agreement indicating previous connectivity. Some of this strategy is media and perception social manipulation. The question is, to what extent is it voting manipulation.
B. Dominion & Smartmatic associations - (screenshot below)

See an interactive chart of Dominion/Soros connections here:

https://graphcommons.com/graphics/d208e5f8-aa2a-429b-b576-63e676d9f3e3?sel=1bb0fe52-9274-468b-9734-7908d6f1f6e&auto=true

C. Dominion’s Toronto office shared a floor with Tides Foundation, a Soros and Open Society Foundation funding pass-through. Dominion quickly move in 2020, (as they also quickly moved after the 2020 election, in Denver.) A story here: https://www.rebelnews.com/dominion_voting_shares_office_with_far_left_george_soros_linked_group


Previous warning from Democrats re: Dominion Voting Systems:


On Tides Foundation including various Soros connections. https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/tides-foundation/
D. Dominion’s connections to VP Biden, Pres. Obama, AG Holder and Serbia:


“The Machines are made by Flex in China for the most part and the programming is done in Serbia and Canada and the International Corporation is Barbados.”

E. Smartmatic executives faced criminal indictment in the Philippines.

F. 2015 video of Mark Malloch Brown, OSF board member and Smartmatic Chairman: Part of Smartmatic ‘technology is licensed From Dominion’:

https://thenationalpulse.com/news/soros-linked-smartmatic-chair-on-dominion/?fbclid=IwAR0_gN-CzhyljnJtGD4tV/iGtbsH3sC1VSylyuqCHNVwIebbzW9MyQgkDFQ

Link: https://manilastandard.net/mobile/article/238782


Check: Dominion use of Smartmatic IP in their systems through Sequoia software that they basically white-labeled? Smartmatic never gave up the IP control. And the IP was sold or used as collateral in a transaction with Chinese interests in what 2018 or 2019.

G. Facebook:


Investigative questions include but are not limited to:

a. What person(s) owns Dominion Voting Systems, past and present?

Often the answer is “Staple Street Capital” but is this a shell, protecting whom?

Was it sold to a China-related bank/entity?
Is there a Soros’s connection to Dominion?

Begin with The Carlyle Group, Staple Street Capital, Smartmatic and Mark Malloch Brown, William Kennard, John Poulos, Sequoia, ES&S and more.

What of John Poulos, CEO of Dominion. See his (and team’s) patents and authorizations from Colorado and other Secretaries of State for election management and oversight.

Eric Coomer, Dominion VP and Chief Strategy & Security Director, was a participant in Antifa who showed hatred for President Trump. OAN reports, Eric Coomer traveled to all battleground states in 2019 and 2020. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=746HTjhFifA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=746HTjhFifA)

What is Coomer’s influence in our voting process?

b. Soros connections to Smartmatic including Mark Malloch Brown, Peter Neffinger etc. These questions will beget more questions to be answered.

2) Soros OSF’s decades of projects to reduce voter integrity

Samples of projects include:

b. Attempts to lower the age of voting.
c. Ballot projects funded by OSF; ballots to match machines in various states
d. Attempts to force open borders, caravans and give ID to non-citizens for illegal voting.
e. Attempts to give prisoners and felons rights to vote.
f. More.

Various Poulos, Hoover, Ikonomakis, Obradovic patents at Justia.com

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
Sample: a chart of OSF’s internal 2013 Public Sphere Goals including media, governance, deflectively accusing the Right of “money in politics,” and Voting & Courts.
Sample grant: OSF funds the Brennan Center for “better ballot design regulations and templates for each brand and model of voting machines used in the state ...” Note: what began with 5 states mentioned in 2009, has likely expanded to most or all states. (This is before George Soros put $18 Billion more into OSF, in 2018).
3) Soros’s Public Opposition to Republican U.S. Presidents

A. His 2003 attempt to remove President George W. Bush: https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2003/11/11/soross-deep-pockets-vs-bush/c7c8f9a0-d902-4298-ac8e-9132ad499238/?fbclid=IwAR0uTML0j9p9iMcu3YKdrZedg-9YAvT17RGY2AKHM2lUBBSo8FqB8tWTHH8

**Washington Post** – Soros’s Deep Pockets vs. Bush

By Laura Blumenfeld, November 11, 2003

“George Soros, one of the world’s richest men, has given away nearly $5 billion to promote democracy in the former Soviet bloc, Africa and Asia. Now he has a new project: defeating President Bush.”It is the central focus of my life,” Soros said, his blue eyes settled on an unseen target. The 2004 presidential race, he said in an interview, is “a matter of life and death.”

Soros, who has financed efforts to promote open societies in more than 50 countries around the world, is bringing the fight home, he said. On Monday, he and a partner committed up to $5 million to MoveOn.org, a liberal activist group, bringing to $15.5 million the total of his personal contributions to oust Bush.

Overnight, Soros, 74, has become the major financial player of the left. He has elicited cries of foul play from the right. And with a tight nod, he pledged: ‘If necessary, I would give more money.’

‘America, under Bush, is a danger to the world,’ Soros said. Then he smiled: ‘And I’m willing to put my money where my mouth is.’”

B. President Donald J. Trump, “A danger” and “temporary phenomenon”

https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2018/01/27/soros_trump_will_disappear_in_2020_or_ever_sooner.html?spot_im_comment_id=sp_v0xu5oCZ_700520580_c_KW21yL&spot_im_highlight_immediate=true&utm_source=SpotIM&utm_medium=Share&utm_content=sp_v0xu5oCZ_700520580_c_KW21yL

4) Soros funding of corrupt Secretaries of State, District Attorneys, Governors, members of Congress, Supreme Court and other elected officials.

Sample of election fraud in Philadelphia: early voting was exploited by numerous individuals to vote multiple times, on multiple days, and cast multiple ballots each visit. I also have the name of the election official who was informed but allowed it to continue, and all of this took place under the watch of a DA Larry Krasner who can be tied to George Soros.


Soros ties to Debate Commission member

https://thenewamerican.com/debate-commission-member-has-ties-to-soros-backed-transition-integrity-project/
Soros-funded State Attorneys, District Attorneys, Sheriff(s) included for inquiry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>City, State, County</th>
<th>Soros Money</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Warren</td>
<td>State Attorney</td>
<td>Hillsborough County, Florida</td>
<td>$1,400,000.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arahnia Ayala</td>
<td>State Attorney</td>
<td>Orange &amp; Osceola counties</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Biberurz</td>
<td>Running for DA</td>
<td>Loudoun, Virginia</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Beadle</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve J. Wright</td>
<td>Lost Primary for DA</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Donohue</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Delaware county</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stewart</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>Cadillac, Michigan</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Gonzalez</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>Beaver County, Texas</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Black</td>
<td>State Attorney</td>
<td>Chicago, Cook County</td>
<td>$588,350.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Ogg</td>
<td>District Attorney ****</td>
<td>Houston, Harris County, Texas</td>
<td>$588,350.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Gardner</td>
<td>City Council Attorney</td>
<td>St. Louis City</td>
<td>$1,050,000.00</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumpy Craver</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max McCall</td>
<td>Lost DA to Kevin Barton</td>
<td>Washington County, Oregon</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Phillips</td>
<td>Lost Primary for DA</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Barnett</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>Marion County, Arkansas</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Rollins</td>
<td>Director of Attorneys</td>
<td>Suffolk County, Massachusetts</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Byrne</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
<td>$564,330.00</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/soros-bombers-attack-Florida-school/2016/07/07/11d22082-0002-11e5-b4e6-bb69a11e4f12_story.html">Link</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DAAs backed by Soros, other liberal activists join fray in clash with police [Link](https://www.foxnews.com/politics/da-soros-justice)

The U.S. Supreme Court, political, cultural and judicial activism – [Link](https://capitalresearch.org/article/faithful-americas-faithless-attacks-on-amy-coney-barrett-courtesy-of-george-soros/)

Overall Leftist influence includes; [Link](https://capitalresearch.org/article/george-soros-a-lifetime-fortune-spent-on-liberal-influence/)

and [Link](https://capitalresearch.org/article/mapping-the-open-society-network-on-soross-90th-birthday/)
5) Influence of elections around the world.

Below, see a sample (one of many) of an OSF spreadsheet of elections by nation, dates, who and what they are funding with dollar amounts.

A. Europe and Eurasian elections

Sample from OSF’s internal “elections shared framework … may 31 unit strategies” document (one of hundreds of such documents on OSF election work)

B. Israel: While claiming to be a victim of anti-Semitism, Mr. Soros funds anti-Semitic organizations, and opposition to PM Netanyahu and Israel itself.

6) Soros's ties to “Color Revolutions” around the world.

ENCLOSURE 10
Non-State Actor Influence Example - Open Society Foundation (George Soros)

7) **Soros’s financial support of crime and criminality by weakening laws, police and of U.S. national security; support of the “rights” of terrorists; support of the “sex work” industry in America and around the world.**

   A. Soros opposed President Bush declaring war on terror in response to the deadliest terrorist attack in history when 2,977 people died on 9/11/2001.

   B. Efforts to close Guantanamo Bay and weaken penalties and consequences for violent terrorism, funded by Open Society Foundations (OSF)

   C. Weakening the rights of police to stop crime, funded by Open Society Foundations (OSF)

   D. National security reform projects funded by Open Society Foundations (OSF)

   E. Mass migration projects, law and media, and rights of migrants over the rights of citizens, throughout Europe and America funded by Open Society Foundations (OSF)
By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) (NEA), section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code,

I, DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United States of America, find that the ability of persons located, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States to interfere in or undermine public confidence in United States elections, including through the unauthorized accessing of election and campaign infrastructure or the covert distribution of propaganda and disinformation, constitutes an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Although there has been no evidence of a foreign power altering the outcome or vote tabulation in any United States election, foreign powers have historically sought to exploit America’s free and open political system. In recent years, the proliferation of digital devices and internet-based communications has created significant vulnerabilities and magnified the scope and intensity of the threat of foreign interference, as illustrated in the 2017 Intelligence Community Assessment. I hereby declare a national emergency to deal with this threat.

Accordingly, I hereby order:
Section 1. (a) Not later than 45 days after the conclusion of a United States election, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of any other appropriate executive departments and agencies (agencies), shall conduct an assessment of any information indicating that a foreign government, or any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign government, has acted with the intent or purpose of interfering in that election. The assessment shall identify, to the maximum extent ascertainable, the nature of any foreign interference and any methods employed to execute it, the persons involved, and the foreign government or governments that authorized, directed, sponsored, or supported it. The Director of National Intelligence shall deliver this assessment and appropriate supporting information to the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(b) Within 45 days of receiving the assessment and information described in section 1(a) of this order, the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the heads of any other appropriate agencies and, as appropriate, State and local officials, shall deliver to the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Defense a report evaluating, with respect to the United States election that is the subject of the assessment described in section 1(a):

(i) the extent to which any foreign interference that targeted election infrastructure materially affected the security or integrity of that infrastructure, the tabulation of votes, or the timely transmission of election results; and

(ii) if any foreign interference involved activities targeting the infrastructure of, or pertaining to, a political organization, campaign, or candidate, the extent to which such activities materially affected the security or integrity of that infrastructure, including by unauthorized access to, disclosure or threatened disclosure of, or alteration or falsification of, information or data.

The report shall identify any material issues of fact with respect to these matters that the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security are unable to evaluate or reach agreement on at the time the report is submitted. The report shall also include updates and recommendations, when appropriate, regarding remedial actions to be taken by the United States Government, other than the sanctions described in sections 2 and 3 of this order.
(c) Heads of all relevant agencies shall transmit to the Director of National Intelligence any information relevant to the execution of the Director's duties pursuant to this order, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law. If relevant information emerges after the submission of the report mandated by section 1(a) of this order, the Director, in consultation with the heads of any other appropriate agencies, shall amend the report, as appropriate, and the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall amend the report required by section 1(b), as appropriate.

(d) Nothing in this order shall prevent the head of any agency or any other appropriate official from tendering to the President, at any time through an appropriate channel, any analysis, information, assessment, or evaluation of foreign interference in a United States election.

(e) If information indicating that foreign interference in a State, tribal, or local election within the United States has occurred is identified, it may be included, as appropriate, in the assessment mandated by section 1(a) of this order or in the report mandated by section 1(b) of this order, or submitted to the President in an independent report.

(f) Not later than 30 days following the date of this order, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence shall develop a framework for the process that will be used to carry out their respective responsibilities pursuant to this order. The framework, which may be classified in whole or in part, shall focus on ensuring that agencies fulfill their responsibilities pursuant to this order in a manner that maintains methodological consistency; protects law enforcement or other sensitive information and intelligence sources and methods; maintains an appropriate separation between intelligence functions and policy and legal judgments; ensures that efforts to protect electoral processes and institutions are insulated from political bias; and respects the principles of free speech and open debate.

Sec. 2. (a) All property and interests in property that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of any United States person of the following persons are blocked and may not be transferred, paid, exported, withdrawn, or otherwise dealt in: any foreign person determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Homeland Security:
(i) to have directly or indirectly engaged in, sponsored, concealed, or otherwise been complicit in foreign interference in a United States election;

(ii) to have materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of, any activity described in subsection (a)(i) of this section or any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order; or

(iii) to be owned or controlled by, or to have acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, any person whose property or interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order.

(b) Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, as amended by Executive Order 13757 of December 28, 2016, remains in effect. This order is not intended to, and does not, serve to limit the Secretary of the Treasury’s discretion to exercise the authorities provided in Executive Order 13694. Where appropriate, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, may exercise the authorities described in Executive Order 13694 or other authorities in conjunction with the Secretary of the Treasury’s exercise of authorities provided in this order.

(c) The prohibitions in subsection (a) of this section apply except to the extent provided by statutes, or in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses that may be issued pursuant to this order, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the date of this order.

Sec. 3. Following the transmission of the assessment mandated by section 1(a) and the report mandated by section 1(b):

(a) the Secretary of the Treasury shall review the assessment mandated by section 1(a) and the report mandated by section 1(b), and, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, impose all appropriate sanctions pursuant to section 2(a) of this order and any appropriate sanctions described in section 2(b) of this order; and

(b) the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate agencies, shall jointly prepare a recommendation for the President as to whether
additional sanctions against foreign persons may be appropriate in response to the identified foreign interference and in light of the evaluation in the report mandated by section 1(b) of this order, including, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law, proposed sanctions with respect to the largest business entities licensed or domiciled in a country whose government authorized, directed, sponsored, or supported election interference, including at least one entity from each of the following sectors: financial services, defense, energy, technology, and transportation (or, if inapplicable to that country’s largest business entities, sectors of comparable strategic significance to that foreign government). The recommendation shall include an assessment of the effect of the recommended sanctions on the economic and national security interests of the United States and its allies. Any recommended sanctions shall be appropriately calibrated to the scope of the foreign interference identified, and may include one or more of the following with respect to each targeted foreign person:

(i) blocking and prohibiting all transactions in a person’s property and interests in property subject to United States jurisdiction;

(ii) export license restrictions under any statute or regulation that requires the prior review and approval of the United States Government as a condition for the export or re-export of goods or services;

(iii) prohibitions on United States financial institutions making loans or providing credit to a person;

(iv) restrictions on transactions in foreign exchange in which a person has any interest;

(v) prohibitions on transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions, or by, through, or to any financial institution, for the benefit of a person;

(vi) prohibitions on United States persons investing in or purchasing equity or debt of a person;

(vii) exclusion of a person’s alien corporate officers from the United States;

(viii) imposition on a person’s alien principal executive officers of any of the sanctions described in this section; or
(ix) any other measures authorized by law.

Sec. 4. I hereby determine that the making of donations of the type of articles specified in section 203(b)(2) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1702(b)(2)) by, to, or for the benefit of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order would seriously impair my ability to deal with the national emergency declared in this order, and I hereby prohibit such donations as provided by section 2 of this order.

Sec. 5. The prohibitions in section 2 of this order include the following:

(a) the making of any contribution or provision of funds, goods, or services by, to, or for the benefit of any person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order; and

(b) the receipt of any contribution or provision of funds, goods, or services from any such person.

Sec. 6. I hereby find that the unrestricted immigrant and nonimmigrant entry into the United States of aliens whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, and I hereby suspend entry into the United States, as immigrants or nonimmigrants, of such persons. Such persons shall be treated as persons covered by section 1 of Proclamation 8693 of July 24, 2011 (Suspension of Entry of Aliens Subject to United Nations Security Council Travel Bans and International Emergency Economic Powers Act Sanctions).

Sec. 7. (a) Any transaction that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, causes a violation of, or attempts to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in this order is prohibited.

(b) Any conspiracy formed to violate any of the prohibitions set forth in this order is prohibited.

Sec. 8. For the purposes of this order:

(a) the term “person” means an individual or entity;

(b) the term “entity” means a partnership, association, trust, joint venture, corporation, group, subgroup, or other organization;
(c) the term “United States person” means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States (including foreign branches), or any person (including a foreign person) in the United States;

(d) the term “election infrastructure” means information and communications technology and systems used by or on behalf of the Federal Government or a State or local government in managing the election process, including voter registration databases, voting machines, voting tabulation equipment, and equipment for the secure transmission of election results;

(e) the term “United States election” means any election for Federal office held on, or after, the date of this order;

(f) the term “foreign interference,” with respect to an election, includes any covert, fraudulent, deceptive, or unlawful actions or attempted actions of a foreign government, or of any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign government, undertaken with the purpose or effect of influencing, undermining confidence in, or altering the result or reported result of, the election, or undermining public confidence in election processes or institutions;

(g) the term “foreign government” means any national, state, provincial, or other governing authority, any political party, or any official of a governing authority or political party, in each case of a country other than the United States;

(h) the term “covert,” with respect to an action or attempted action, means characterized by an intent or apparent intent that the role of a foreign government will not be apparent or acknowledged publicly; and

(i) the term “State” means the several States or any of the territories, dependencies, or possessions of the United States.

Sec. 9. For those persons whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this order who might have a constitutional presence in the United States, I find that because of the ability to transfer funds or other assets instantaneously, prior notice to such persons of measures to be taken pursuant to this order would render those measures ineffectual. I therefore determine that for these measures to be effective in addressing the national emergency declared in this order, there need be no prior notice of a listing or determination made pursuant to section 2 of this order.
Sec. 10. Nothing in this order shall prohibit transactions for the conduct of the official business of the United States Government by employees, grantees, or contractors thereof.

Sec. 11. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by IEEPA as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may re-delegate any of these functions to other officers within the Department of the Treasury consistent with applicable law. All agencies of the United States Government are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order.

Sec. 12. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to submit the recurring and final reports to the Congress on the national emergency declared in this order, consistent with section 401(c) of the NEA (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)) and section 204(c) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)).

Sec. 13. This order shall be implemented consistent with 50 U.S.C. 1702(b)(1) and (3).

Sec. 14. (a) Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

(i) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof; or

(ii) the functions of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget relating to budgetary, administrative, or legislative proposals.

(b) This order shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.

(c) This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, its departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person.

DONALD J. TRUMP
Joint Statement of ODNI, DOJ, FBI and DHS: Combating Foreign Influence in U.S. Elections, October 19, 2018

FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN U.S. ELECTIONS IS A THREAT TO OUR DEMOCRACY. IDENTIFYING AND PREVENTING THIS INTERFERENCE IS A TOP PRIORITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. WE BELIEVE THE GREATEST STRENGTH OF OUR SOCIETY IS AN ENGAGED AND INFORMED PUBLIC. ADVERSARIES TARGET U.S. ELECTIONS TO DIVIDE AMERICA ALONG POLITICAL LINES AND INFLUENCE KEY POLICY DECISIONS THAT ARE IN THEIR NATIONAL INTEREST.

FOREIGN INFLUENCE

We are concerned about ongoing campaigns by Russia, China and other foreign actors, including Iran, to undermine confidence in democratic institutions and influence public sentiment and government policies. These activities also seek to influence voter perceptions and decision making in the 2018 and 2020 U.S. elections.

Elements of these campaigns can take many forms, including using social media to amplify divisive issues, sponsoring specific content in English-language media like RT and Sputnik, seeding disinformation through sympathetic spokespersons regarding political candidates and disseminating foreign propaganda.

ELECTION INFRASTRUCTURE

Currently, we do not have any evidence of a compromise or disruption of infrastructure that would enable adversaries to prevent voting, change vote counts or disrupt our ability to tally votes in the midterm elections. Increased intelligence and information sharing among federal, state and local partners has improved our awareness of ongoing and persistent threats to election infrastructure. Some state and local governments have reported attempts to access their networks, which often include online voter registration databases, using tactics that are available to state and non-state cyber actors. Thus far, state and local officials have been able to prevent access or quickly mitigate these attempts.

ADDRESSING THE THREAT

Foreign powers have long sought to exploit America’s free and open political system, but as the President recently stated, we will not tolerate foreign interference in our elections. The Executive Order on Imposing Certain Sanctions in the Event of Foreign Interference in a United States Election (http://links.govdelivery.com/track?track_code=7WdFpTVEMb3zixggZ0tewY7wOzc2RjhoWfob6iu2ekwi7wMTfpMDE5LjI2NDk4kJwQzXuim+1c3NhZ2Vve201NFZDUUJ6LUN7Ct1MDE4MTA0G64GJQ5MDY6M52K_ action=executive-order-imposing-certain-sanctions-event-foreign-interference-united-states-election), which President Trump signed on September 12, makes clear that the U.S. government will not hesitate to defend our electoral processes or punish those who interfere in it.

The Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Homeland Security and other relevant Intelligence Community components continue to work closely together in order to develop the most up-to-date picture of the threat. Additionally, we want to thank state and local officials for their vigilance and proactive approach in sharing information on cyber threats targeting state and local election infrastructure. We will continue to work with state and local election officials to increase the security and resilience of their systems and remain committed to supporting their actions to counter any threat to or attack on the 2018 midterm elections and beyond.
While the U.S. government is tirelessly working to identify and counter threats to the electoral process, the American public, government officials and political candidates and their campaigns can mitigate adversarial efforts by following sound cyber security guidelines and being responsible consumers of information, in particular from social media platforms. For more information please see the DHS checklist and voter security information sheet (http://links.govdelivery.com/track?type=click&enid=ZWFzPTEmbXVhZ2Nvbmd1c2VyaWVudG9zLmFkb2JvbGVzdGluZ3J5b3JkLnB1bSwvb2ZpbGVzaG9tYmFyb3NlcnNldCBhbiB0byB0aGUgZm9yIHRoZSBBaGFuZ3J5b3JkLnB1bSw=) or visit the FBI’s webpage on combating foreign influence (http://www.fbi.gov/investigate/cyber).
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A. WHO WE ARE

1. My name is Russell James Ramsland, Jr., and I am a resident of Dallas County, Texas. I hold an MBA from Harvard University, and a political science degree from Duke University. I have worked with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), among other organizations, and have run businesses all over the world, many of which are highly technical in nature. I have served on technical government panels.

2. I am part of the management team of Allied Security Operations Group, LLC (ASOG). ASOG is a group of globally engaged professionals who come from various disciplines to include Department of Defense, Secret Service, Department of Homeland Security, and the Central Intelligence Agency. It provides a range of security services, but has a particular emphasis on cybersecurity, open source investigation and penetration testing of networks. We employ a wide variety of cyber and cyber forensic analysts. We have patents pending in a variety of applications from novel network security applications to SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) protection and safe browsing solutions for the dark and deep web. For this report, I have relied on these experts and resources.

B. PURPOSE AND PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

1. The purpose of this forensic audit is to test the integrity of Dominion Voting System in how it performed in Antrim County, Michigan for the 2020 election.

2. We conclude that the Dominion Voting System is intentionally and purposefully designed with inherent errors to create systemic fraud and influence election results. The system intentionally generates an enormously high number of ballot errors. The electronic ballots are then transferred for adjudication. The intentional errors lead to bulk adjudication of ballots with no oversight, no transparency, and no audit trail. This leads to voter or election fraud. Based on our study, we conclude that The Dominion Voting System should not be used in Michigan. We further conclude that the results of Antrim County should not have been certified.
3. The following is a breakdown of the votes tabulated for the 2020 election in Antrim County, showing different dates for the tabulation of the same votes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>Total Votes Cast</th>
<th>Biden</th>
<th>Trump</th>
<th>Third Party</th>
<th>Write-In</th>
<th>Total Votes for President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 3</td>
<td>22,082</td>
<td>16,047</td>
<td>7,769</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 5</td>
<td>22,082</td>
<td>18,059</td>
<td>7,289</td>
<td>9,783</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 21</td>
<td>22,082</td>
<td>16,044</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>9,748</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15,949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The Antrim County Clerk and Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson have stated that the election night error (detailed above by the vote "flip" from Trump to Biden, was the result of human error caused by the failure to update the Mancelona Township tabulator prior to election night for a down ballot race. We disagree and conclude that the vote flip occurred because of machine error built into the voting software designed to create error.

5. Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson's statement on November 6, 2020 that "[t]he correct results always were and continue to be reflected on the tabulator totals tape . . . ." was false.

6. The allowable election error rate established by the Federal Election Commission guidelines is of 1 in 250,000 ballots (.0008%). We observed an error rate of 68.05%. This demonstrated a significant and fatal error in security and election integrity.

7. The results of the Antrim County 2020 election are not certifiable. This is a result of machine and/or software error, not human error.

8. The tabulation log for the forensic examination of the server for Antrim County from December 6, 2020 consists of 15,676 individual events, of which 10,667 or 68.05% of the events were recorded errors. These errors resulted in overall tabulation errors or ballots being sent to adjudication. This high error rates proves the Dominion Voting System is flawed and does not meet state or federal election laws.

9. These errors occurred after the Antrim County Clerk provided a re-provisioned CF card with uploaded software for the Central Lake Precinct on November 6, 2020. This means the statement by Secretary Benson was false. The Dominion Voting System produced systemic errors and high error rates both prior to the update and after the update; meaning the update (or lack of update) is not the cause of errors.
10. In Central Lake Township there were 1,222 ballots reversed out of 1,491 total ballots cast, resulting in an 81.96% rejection rate. All reversed ballots are sent to adjudication for a decision by election personnel.

11. It is critical to understand that the Dominion system classifies ballots into two categories, 1) normal ballots and 2) adjudicated ballots. Ballots sent to adjudication can be altered by administrators, and adjudication files can be moved between different Results Tally and Reporting (RTR) terminals with no audit trail of which administrator actually adjudicates (i.e. votes) the ballot batch. This demonstrated a significant and fatal error in security and election integrity because it provides no meaningful observation of the adjudication process or audit trail of which administrator actually adjudicated the ballots.

12. A staggering number of votes required adjudication. This was a 2020 issue not seen in previous election cycles still stored on the server. This is caused by intentional errors in the system. The intentional errors lead to bulk adjudication of ballots with no oversight, no transparency or audit trail. Our examination of the server logs indicates that this high error rate was incongruent with patterns from previous years. The statement attributing these issues to human error is not consistent with the forensic evaluation, which points more correctly to systemic machine and/or software errors. The systemic errors are intentionally designed to create errors in order to push a high volume of ballots to bulk adjudication.

13. The linked video demonstrates how to cheat at adjudication:

https://mobile.twitter.com/KanekoaTheGreat/status/1336888454538428418

14. Antrim County failed to properly update its system. A purposeful lack of providing basic computer security updates in the system software and hardware demonstrates incompetence, gross negligence, bad faith, and/or willful non-compliance in providing the fundamental system security required by federal and state law. There is no way this election management system could have passed tests or have been legally certified to conduct the 2020 elections in Michigan under the current laws. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures – Michigan requires full compliance with federal standards as determined by a federally accredited voting system laboratory.

15. Significant, the computer system shows vote adjudication logs for prior years; but all adjudication log entries for the 2020 election cycle are missing. The adjudication process is the simplest way to manually manipulate votes. The lack of records prevents any form of audit accountability, and their conspicuous absence is extremely suspicious since the files exist for previous years using the same software. Removal of these files violates state law and prevents a meaningful audit, even if the Secretary wanted to conduct an audit. We must conclude that the 2020 election cycle records have been manually removed.
16. Likewise, all server security logs prior to 11:03 pm on November 4, 2020 are missing. This means that all security logs for the day after the election, on election day, and prior to election day are gone. Security logs are very important to an audit trail, forensics, and for detecting advanced persistent threats and outside attacks, especially on systems with outdated system files. These logs would contain domain controls, authentication failures, error codes, times users logged on and off, network connections to file servers between file accesses, internet connections, times, and data transfers. Other server logs before November 4, 2020 are present; therefore, there is no reasonable explanation for the security logs to be missing.

17. On November 21, 2020, an unauthorized user unsuccessfully attempted to zero out election results. This demonstrates additional tampering with data.

18. The Election Event Designer Log shows that Dominion ImageCast Precinct Cards were programmed with new ballot programming on 10/23/2020 and then again after the election on 11/05/2020. These system changes affect how ballots are read and tabulated, and our examination demonstrated a significant change in voter results using the two different programs. In accordance with the Help America Vote Act, this violates the 90-day Safe Harbor Period which prohibits changes to election systems, registries, hardware/software updates without undergoing re-certification. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures – Michigan requires full compliance with federal standards as determined by a federally accredited voting system laboratory.

19. The only reason to change software after the election would be to obfuscate evidence of fraud and/or to correct program errors that would de-certify the election. Our findings show that the Central Lake Township tabulator tape totals were significantly altered by utilizing two different program versions (10/23/2020 and 11/05/2020), both of which were software changes during an election which violates election law, and not just human error associated with the **Dominion Election Management System**. This is clear evidence of software generated movement of votes. The claims made on the **Office of the Secretary of State** website are false.

20. The Dominion ImageCast Precinct (ICP) machines have the ability to be connected to the internet (see Image 11). By connecting a network scanner to the ethernet port on the ICP machine and creating Packet Capture logs from the machines we examined show the ability to connect to the network, Application Programming Interface (API) (a data exchange between two different systems) calls and web (http) connections to the Election Management System server. Best practice is to disable the network interface card to avoid connection to the internet. This demonstrated a significant and fatal error in security and election integrity. Because certain files have been deleted, we have not yet found origin or destination; but our research continues.
21. Because the intentional high error rate generates large numbers of ballots to be adjudicated by election personnel, we must deduce that bulk adjudication occurred. However, because files and adjudication logs are missing, we have not yet determined where the bulk adjudication occurred or who was responsible for it. Our research continues.

22. Research is ongoing. However, based on the preliminary results, we conclude that the errors are so significant that they call into question the integrity and legitimacy of the results in the Antrim County 2020 election to the point that the results are not certifiable. Because the same machines and software are used in 48 other counties in Michigan, this casts doubt on the integrity of the entire election in the state of Michigan.

23. DNI Responsibilities: President Obama signed Executive Order on National Critical Infrastructure on 6 January 2017, stating in Section 1. Cybersecurity of Federal Networks, "The Executive Branch operates its information technology (IT) on behalf of the American people. The President will hold heads of executive departments and agencies (agency heads) accountable for managing cybersecurity risk to their enterprises. In addition, because risk management decisions made by agency heads can affect the risk to the executive branch as a whole, and to national security, it is also the policy of the United States to manage cybersecurity risk as an executive branch enterprise." President Obama’s EO further stated, effective immediately, each agency head shall use The Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity (the Framework) developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology," Support to Critical Infrastructure at Greatest Risk. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the heads of appropriate sector-specific agencies, as defined in Presidential Policy Directive 21 of February 12, 2013 (Critical Infrastructure Security and Resilience) (sector-specific agencies), and all other appropriate agency heads, as identified by the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall: (i) identify authorities and capabilities that agencies could employ to support the cybersecurity efforts of critical infrastructure entities identified pursuant to section 9 of Executive Order 13636 of February 12, 2013 (Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity), to be at greatest risk of attacks that could reasonably result in catastrophic regional or national effects on public health or safety, economic security, or national security (section 9 entities);

This is a national security imperative. In July 2018, President Trump strengthened President Obama’s Executive Order to include requirements to ensure US election systems, processes, and its people were not manipulated by foreign meddling, either through electronic or systemic manipulation, social media, or physical changes made in hardware, software, or supporting systems. The 2018 Executive Order. Accordingly, I hereby order:
Section 1. (a) Not later than 45 days after the conclusion of a United States election, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of any other appropriate executive departments and agencies (agencies), shall conduct an assessment of any information indicating that a foreign government, or any person acting as an agent of or on behalf of a foreign government, has acted with the intent or purpose of interfering in that election. The assessment shall identify, to the maximum extent ascertainable, the nature of any foreign interference and any methods employed to execute it, the persons involved, and the foreign government or governments that authorized, directed, sponsored, or supported it. The Director of National Intelligence shall deliver this assessment and appropriate supporting information to the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Homeland Security.

We recommend that an independent group should be empaneled to determine the extent of the adjudication errors throughout the State of Michigan. This is a national security issue.

24. Michigan resident Gustavo Delfino, a former professor of mathematics in Venezuela and alumni of University of Michigan, offered a compelling affidavit [Exhibit 2] recognizing the inherent vulnerabilities in the SmartMatic electronic voting machines (software which was since incorporated into Dominion Voting Systems) during the 2004 national referendum in Venezuela (see attached declaration). After 4 years of research and 3 years of undergoing intensive peer review, Professor Delfino’s paper was published in the highly respected “Statistical Science” journal, November 2011 issue (Volume 26, Number 4) with title "Analysis of the 2004 Venezuela Referendum: The Official Results Versus the Petition Signatures.” The intensive study used multiple mathematical approaches to ascertain the voting results found in the 2004 Venezuelan referendum. Delfino and his research partners discovered not only the algorithm used to manipulate the results, but also the precise location in the election processing sequence where vulnerability in machine processing would provide such an opportunity. According to Prof Delfino, the magnitude of the difference between the official and the true result in Venezuela estimated at 1,370,000 votes. Our investigation into the error rates and results of the Antrim County voting tally reflect the same tactics, which have also been reported in other Michigan counties as well. This demonstrates a national security issue.

C. **PROCESS**

We visited Antrim County twice: November 27, 2020 and December 6, 2020.

On November 27, 2020, we visited Central Lake Township, Star Township, and Mancelona Township. We examined the Dominion Voting Systems tabulators and tabulator roles.
On December 6, 2020, we visited the Antrim County Clerk’s office. We inspected and performed forensic duplication of the following:

1. **Antrim County Election Management Server** running **Dominion Democracy Suite 5.5.3-002**;

2. **Compact Flash** cards used by the local precincts in their **Dominion ImageCast Precinct**;

3. **USB memory sticks** used by the **Dominion VAT** (Voter Assist Terminals); and

4. **USB memory sticks** used for the Poll Book.

**Dominion** voting system is a Canadian owned company with global subsidiaries. It is owned by Staple Street Capital which is in turn owned by UBS Securities LLC, of which 3 out of their 7 board members are Chinese nationals. The Dominion software is licensed from Smartmatic which is a Venezuelan owned and controlled company. Dominion Server locations have been determined to be in Serbia, Canada, the US, Spain and Germany.

D. **CENTRAL LAKE TOWNSHIP**

1. On November 27, 2020, part of our forensics team visited the Central Lake Township in Michigan to inspect the **Dominion ImageCast Precint** for possible hardware issues on behalf of a local lawsuit filed by Michigan attorney Matthew DePerno on behalf of William Bailey. In our conversations with the clerk of **Central Lake Township** Ms. Judith L. Kosloski, she presented to us "two separate paper totals tape" from Tabulator ID 2.
   - One dated "Poll Opened Nov. 03/2020 06:38:48" (Roll 1);
   - Another dated "Poll Opened Nov. 06/2020 09:21:58" (Roll 2).

2. We were then told by Ms. Kosloski that on November 5, 2020, Ms. Kosloski was notified by Connie Wing of the County Clerk's Office and asked to bring the tabulator and ballots to the County Clerk's office for re-tabulation. They ran the ballots and printed “Roll 2”. She noticed a difference in the votes and brought it up to the clerk, but canvassing still occurred, and her objections were not addressed.

3. Our team analyzed both rolls and compared the results. Roll 1 had **1,494** total votes and Roll 2 had **1,491** votes (Roll 2 had 3 less ballots because 3 ballots were damaged in the process.)

4. "Statement of Votes Cast from Antrim" shows that only **1,491** votes were counted, and the 3 ballots that were damaged were not entered into final results.
5. Ms. Kosloski stated that she and her assistant manually refilled out the three ballots, curing them, and ran them through the ballot counting system - but the final numbers do not reflect the inclusion of those 3 damaged ballots.

6. This is the most preliminary report of serious election fraud indicators. In comparing the numbers on both rolls, we *estimate* **1,474 votes changed** across the two rolls, between the first and the second time the exact same ballots were run through the County Clerk’s vote counting machine - which is almost the same number of voters that voted in total.

- **742 votes were added to School Board Member for Central Lake Schools (3)**
- **657 votes were removed from School Board Member for Ellsworth Schools (2)**
- 7 votes were added to the total for **State Proposal 20-1 (1)** and out of those there were 611 votes moved between the Yes and No Categories.

7. There were incremental changes throughout the rolls with some significant adjustments between the 2 rolls that were reviewed. This demonstrates conclusively that votes can be and were changed during the second machine count after the software update. That should be impossible especially at such a high percentage to total votes cast.

8. For the **School Board Member for Central Lake Schools (3)** there were **742 votes** added to this vote total. Since multiple people were elected, this did not change the result of both candidates being elected, but one does see a change in who had most votes. If it were a single-person election this would have changed the outcome and demonstrates conclusively that votes can be and were changed during the second machine counting. That should be impossible.

[Image 1]:

![Image of Recount and Election Results]
9. For the **School Board Member for Ellsworth Schools (2)** [Image 2]
   - Shows **657 votes being removed** from this election.
   - In this case, only **3** people who were eligible to vote actually voted. Since there were **2** votes allowed for each voter to cast.
   - The recount correctly shows **6** votes.

   But on election night, there was a major calculation issue:

   [Image 2]:

   ![Recount 11/6 Election 11/3]

10. In **State Proposal 20-1 (1)**, [Image 3] there is a major change in votes in this category.
    - There were **774 votes for YES** during the election, to **1,083 votes for YES** on the recount a change of **309 votes**.
    - **7** votes were added to the total for **State Proposal 20-1 (1)** out of those there were **611** votes moved between the Yes and No Categories.

   [Image 3]:

   ![Image 3]
11. **State Proposal 20-1 (1)** is a fairly technical and complicated proposed amendment to the Michigan Constitution to change the disposition and allowable uses of future revenue generated from oil and gas bonuses, rentals and royalties from state-owned land. Information about the proposal: [https://crcmich.org/publications/statewide-ballot-proposal-20-1-michigan-natural-resources-trust-fund](https://crcmich.org/publications/statewide-ballot-proposal-20-1-michigan-natural-resources-trust-fund)

12. A Proposed Initiated **Ordinance to Authorize One (1) Marihuana (sic) Retailer Establishment Within the Village of Central Lake (1)**. [Image 4]

- On election night, it was a tie vote.
- Then, on the rerun of ballots 3 ballots were destroyed, but only one vote changed on the totals to allow the proposal to pass.

When **3 ballots were not counted** and **programming change on the tabulator was installed** the proposal **passed with 1 vote being removed from the No vote**.

[Image 4]:
13. On Sunday December 6, 2020, our forensics team visited the Antrim County Clerk. There were two USB memory sticks used, one contained the software package used to tabulate election results on November 3, 2020, and the other was programmed on November 6, 2020 with a different software package which yielded significantly different voting outcomes. The election data package is used by the Dominion Democracy Suite software & election management system software to upload programming information onto the Compact Flash Cards for the Dominion ImageCast Precinct to enable it to calculate ballot totals.

14. This software programming should be standard across all voting machines systems for the duration of the entire election if accurate tabulation is the expected outcome as required by US Election Law. This intentional difference in software programming is a design feature to alter election outcomes.

15. The election day outcomes were calculated using the original software programming on November 3, 2020. On November 5, 2020 the township clerk was asked to re-run the Central Lake Township ballots and was given no explanation for this unusual request. On November 6, 2020 the Antrim County Clerk, Sheryl Guy issued the second version of software to re-run the same Central Lake Township ballots and oversaw the process. This resulted in greater than a 60% change in voting results, inexplicably impacting every single election contest in a township with less than 1500 voters. These errors far exceed the ballot error rate standard of 1 in 250,000 ballots (.0008%) as required by federal election law.

- The original election programming files are last dated 09/25/2020 1:24pm
- The updated election data package files are last dated 10/22/2020 10:27 am.
16. As the tabulator tape totals prove, there were large numbers of votes switched from the November 3, 2020 tape to the November 6, 2020 tape. This was solely based on using different software versions of the operating program to calculate votes, not tabulate votes. This is evidenced by using same the Dominion System with two different software program versions contained on the two different USB Memory Devices.

17. The Help America Vote Act, Safe Harbor provides a 90-day period prior to elections where no changes can be made to election systems. To make changes would require recertification of the entire system for use in the election. The Dominion User Guide prescribes the proper procedure to test machines with test ballots to compare the results to validate machine functionality to determine if the Dominion ImageCast Precinct was programmed correctly. If this occurred a ballot misconfiguration would have been identified. Once the software was updated to the 10/22/2020 software the test ballots should have been re-run to validate the vote totals to confirm the machine was configured correctly.

18. The November 6, 2020 note from The Office of the Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson states: "The correct results always were and continue to be reflected on the tabulator totals tape and on the ballots themselves. Even if the error in the reported unofficial results had not been quickly noticed, it would have been identified during the county canvass. Boards of County Canvassers, which are composed of 2 Democrats and 2 Republicans, review the printed totals tape from each tabulator during the canvass to verify the reported vote totals are correct."

   • Source: https://www.michigan.gov/sos/0,4670,7-127-1640_9150-544676--00.html

19. The Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson's statement is false. Our findings show that the tabulator tape totals were significantly altered by utilization of two different program versions, and not just the Dominion Election Management System. This is the opposite of the claim that the Office of the Secretary of State made on its website. The fact that these significant errors were not caught in ballot testing and not caught by the local county clerk shows that there are major inherent built-in vulnerabilities and process flaws in the Dominion Election Management System, and that other townships/precincts and the entire election have been affected.

20. On Sunday December 6, 2020, our forensics team visited the Antrim County Clerk office to perform forensic duplication of the Antrim County Election Management Server running Dominion Democracy Suite 5.5.3-002

21. Forensic copies of the Compact Flash cards used by the local precincts in their Dominion ImageCast Precinct were inspected. USB memory sticks used by the Dominion VAT (Voter Assist Terminals) and the USB memory sticks used for the Poll Book were forensically duplicated.
22. We have been told that the ballot design and configuration for the Dominion ImageCast Precinct and VAT were provided by ElectionSource.com which is owned by MC&E, Inc of Grand Rapids, MI.

E. MANCELONA TOWNSHIP

1. In Mancelona township, problems with software versions were also known to have been present. Mancelona elections officials understood that ballot processing issues were not accurate and used the second version of software to process votes on 4 November, again an election de-certifying event, as no changes to the election system are authorized by law in the 90 days preceding elections without re-certification.

2. Once the 10/22/2020 software update was performed on the Dominion ImageCast Precinct the test ballot process should have been performed to validate the programming. There is no indication that this procedure was performed.

F. ANTRIM COUNTY CLERK’S OFFICE

1. Pursuant to a court ordered inspection, we participated in an onsite collection effort at the Antrim County Clerk’s office on December 6, 2020. [Image 5]:

Among other items forensically collected, the Antrim County Election Management Server (EMS) with Democracy Suite was forensically collected. [Images 6 and 7].
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The EMS (Election Management Server) was a:

Dell Precision Tower 3420.

Service Tag: 6NB0KH2

The EMS contained 2 hard drives in a RAID-1 configuration. That is the 2 drives redundantly stored the same information and the server could continue to operate if either of the 2 hard drives failed. The EMS was booted via the Linux Boot USB memory sticks and both hard drives were forensically imaged.

At the onset of the collection process we observed that the initial program thumb drive was not secured in the vault with the CF cards and other thumbdrives. We watched as the County employees, including Clerk Sheryl Guy searched throughout the office for the missing thumb drive. Eventually they found the missing thumb drive in an unsecured and unlocked desk drawer along with multiple other random thumb drives. This demonstrated a significant and fatal error in security and election integrity.

G. FORENSIC COLLECTION

We used a built for purpose Linux Boot USB memory stick to boot the EMS in a forensically sound mode. We then used Ewfacquire to make a forensic image of the 2 independent internal hard drives.

Ewfacquire created an E01 file format forensic image with built-in integrity verification via MD5 hash.

We used Ewfverify to verify the forensic image acquired was a true and accurate copy of the original disk. That was done for both forensic images.

H. ANALYSIS TOOLS
X-Ways Forensics: We used X-Ways Forensics, a commercial Computer Forensic tool, to verify the image was usable and full disk encryption was not in use. In particular we confirmed that Bit locker was not in use on the EMS.

Other tools used: PassMark – OSForensics, Truxton - Forensics, Cellebrite – Physical Analyzer, Blackbag-Blacklight Forensic Software, Microsoft SQL Server Management Studio, Virtual Box, and miscellaneous other tools and scripts.

I. SERVER OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY

1. Our initial audit on the computer running the Democracy Suite Software showed that standard computer security best practices were not applied. These minimum-security standards are outlined the 2002 HAVA, and FEC Voting System Standards – it did not even meet the minimum standards required of a government desktop computer.

2. The election data software package USB drives (November 2020 election, and November 2020 election updated) are secured with bitlocker encryption software, but they were not stored securely on-site. At the time of our forensic examination, the election data package files were already moved to an unsecure desktop computer and were residing on an unencrypted hard drive. This demonstrated a significant and fatal error in security and election integrity. Key Findings on Desktop and Server Configuration: - There were multiple Microsoft security updates as well as Microsoft SQL Server updates which should have been deployed, however there is no evidence that these security patches were ever installed. As described below, many of the software packages were out of date and vulnerable to various methods of attack.

   a) Computer initial configuration on 10/03/2018 13:08:11:911
   b) Computer final configuration of server software on 4/10/2019
   c) Hard Drive not Encrypted at Rest
   d) Microsoft SQL Server Database not protected with password.
   e) Democracy Suite Admin Passwords are reused and share passwords.
   f) Antivirus is 4.5 years outdated
   g) Windows updates are 3.86 years out of date.
   h) When computer was last configured on 04/10/2019 the windows updates were 2.11 years out of date.
   i) User of computer uses a Super User Account.
3. The hard drive was not encrypted at rest – which means that if hard drives are removed or initially booted off an external USB drive the files are susceptible to manipulation directly. An attacker is able to mount the hard drive because it is unencrypted, allowing for the manipulation and replacement of any file on the system.

4. The Microsoft SQL Server database files were not properly secured to allow modifications of the database files.

5. The Democracy Suite Software user account logins and passwords are stored in the unsecured database tables and the multiple Election System Administrator accounts share the same password, which means that there are no audit trails for vote changes, deletions, blank ballot voting, or batch vote alterations or adjudication.

6. Antivirus definition is 1666 days old on 12/11/2020. Antrim County updates its system with USB drives. USB drives are the most common vectors for injecting malware into computer systems. The failure to properly update the antivirus definition drastically increases the harm cause by malware from other machines being transmitted to the voting system.

7. Windows Server Update Services (WSUS) Offline Update is used to enable updates the computer – which is a package of files normally downloaded from the internet but compiled into a program to put on a USB drive to manually update server systems.

8. Failure to properly update the voting system demonstrates a significant and fatal error in security and election integrity.

9. There are 15 additional updates that should have been installed on the server to adhere to Microsoft Standards to fix known vulnerabilities. For the 4/10/2019 install, the most updated version of the update files would have been 03/13/2019 which is 11.6.1 which is 15 updates newer than 10.9.1

This means the updates installed were 2 years, 1 month, 13 days behind the most current update at the time. This includes security updates and fixes. This demonstrated a significant and fatal error in security and election integrity.

- Wed 04/10/2019 10:34:33.14 - Info: Starting WSUS Offline Update (v. 10.9.1)
- Wed 04/10/2019 10:34:33.14 - Info: Used path "D:\WSUSOFFLINE1091_2012R2_W10\cmd" on EMSSERVER (user: EMSADMIN)
- Wed 04/10/2019 10:34:35.55 - Info: Medium build date: 03/10/2019
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- Found on c:\Windows\wsusofflineupdate.txt
- *WSUS Offline Update (v.10.9.1) was created on 01/29/2017
  *WSUS information found here https://download.wsusoffline.net/

10. Super User Administrator account is the primary account used to operate the Dominion Election Management System which is a major security risk. The user logged in has the ability to make major changes to the system and install software which means that there is no oversight to ensure appropriate management controls – i.e. anyone who has access to the shared administrator user names and passwords can make significant changes to the entire voting system. The shared usernames and passwords mean that these changes can be made in an anonymous fashion with no tracking or attribution.

J. ERROR RATES

1. We reviewed the Tabulation logs in their entirety for 11/6/2020. The election logs for Antrim County consist of 15,676 total lines or events.
   - Of the 15,676 there were a total of 10,667 critical errors/warnings or a 68.05% error rate.
   - Most of the errors were related to configuration errors that could result in overall tabulation errors or adjudication. These 11/6/2020 tabulation totals were used as the official results.

2. For examples, there were 1,222 ballots reversed out of 1,491 total ballots cast, thus resulting in an 81.96% rejection rate. Some of which were reversed due to "Ballot's size exceeds maximum expected ballot size".
   - According to the NCSL, Michigan requires testing by a federally accredited laboratory for voting systems. In section 4.1.1 of the Voluntary Voting Systems Guidelines (VVSG) Accuracy Requirements a. All systems shall achieve a report total error rate of no more than one in 125,000.

   https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac_assets/1/28/VVSG.1.1_VQL.1.FINAL1.pdf

   In section 4.1.3.2 Memory Stability of the VVSG it states that Memory devices used to retain election management data shall have demonstrated error free data retention for a period of 22 months.

   In section 4.1.6.1 Paper-based System Processing Requirements subsection a. of the VVSG it states "The ability of the system to produce and receive electronic signals from the scanning of the ballot, perform logical and numerical operations upon these data, and reproduce the contents of memory when required shall be sufficiently free of error to enable
satisfaction of the system-level accuracy requirement indicated in Subsection 4.1.1."

- These are not human errors; this is definitively related to the software and software configurations resulting in error rates far beyond the thresholds listed in the guidelines.

3. A high "error rate" in the election software (in this case 68.05%) reflects an algorithm used that will weight one candidate greater than another (for instance, weight a specific candidate at a 2/3 to approximately 1/3 ratio). In the logs we identified that the RCV or Ranked Choice Voting Algorithm was enabled (see image below from the Dominion manual). This allows the user to apply a weighted numerical value to candidates and change the overall result. The declaration of winners can be done on a basis of points, not votes. [Image 8]:

choice voting results are evaluated on a district per district basis and each district has a set number of points (100). Elimination and declaration of winners is done on basis of points, not votes.

![Figure 11-3: RCV Profile screen](image)

4. The Dominion software configuration logs in the Divert Options, shows that all write-in ballots were flagged to be diverted automatically for adjudication. This means that all write-in ballots were sent for "adjudication" by a poll worker or election official to process the ballot based on voter "intent". Adjudication files allow a computer operator to decide to whom to award those votes (or to trash them).

5. In the logs all but two of the Override Options were enabled on these machines, thus allowing any operator to change those votes. [Image 9]:
6. In the logs all but two of the Override Options were enabled on these machines, thus allowing any operator to change those votes. This gives the system operators carte blanche to adjudicate ballots, in this case 81.96% of the total cast ballots with no audit trail or oversight. [Image 10]:

7. On 12/8/2020 Microsoft issued 58 security patches across 10+ products, some of which were used for the election software machine, server and programs. Of the 58 security fixes 22, were patches to remote code execution (RCE) vulnerabilities. [Image 11]:
8. We reviewed the Election Management System logs (EmsLogger) in their entirety from 9/19/2020 through 11/21/2020 for the Project: Antrim November 2020. There were configuration errors throughout the set-up, election and tabulation of results. The last error for Central Lake Township Precinct 1 occurred on 11/21/2020 at 14:35:11 System.Xml.XmlException System.Xml.XmlException: The ` ` character, hexadecimal value 0x20, cannot be included in a name. Bottom line is that this is a calibration that rejects the vote (see picture below). [Image 12]:

![Diagram of Democracy Suite EM System Workflow](image-url)
Notably 42 minutes earlier on Nov 21 2020 at 13:53:09 a user attempted to zero out election results. Id:3168 EmsLogger - There is no permission to {0} - Project: User: Thread: 189. This is direct proof of an attempt to tamper with evidence.

9. The Election Event Designer Log shows that Dominion ImageCast Precinct Cards were programmed with updated new programming on 10/23/2020 and again after the election on 11/05/2020. As previously mentioned, this violates the HAVA safe harbor period.

Source: C:\Program Files\Dominion Voting Systems\Election Event Designer\Log\Info.txt


- Dominion Imagecast Precinct Cards Programmed with New Ballot Programming dated 10/22/2020 on 10/23/2020 and after the election on 11/05/2020

Excerpt from 2020-11-05 showing “ProgramMemoryCard” commands.
Analysis is ongoing and updated findings will be submitted as soon as possible. A summary of the information collected is provided below.

10|12/07/20 18:52:30| Indexing completed at Mon Dec 7 18:52:30 2020
12|12/07/20 18:52:30| INDEX SUMMARY
12|12/07/20 18:52:30| Files indexed: 159312
ENCLOSURE 13

Antrim Michigan Forensics Report REVISED PRELIMINARY SUMMARY, v2

12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Files skipped: 64799
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Files filtered: 0
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Emails indexed: 0
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Unique words found: 5325413
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Variant words found: 3597634
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Total words found: 239446085
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Avg. unique words per page: 33.43
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Peak physical memory used: 2949 MB
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Peak virtual memory used: 8784 MB
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Errors: 10149
12/12/07/20 18:52:30] Total bytes scanned/downloaded: 1919289906

Dated: December 13, 2020

Russell Ramsland