HERE IS THE EVIDENCE, NOW SHOW US THE BALLOTS!
ECONOMIC BATTLE PLAN™

According to VotoDetective, in Georgia there were almost 55,000 votes cast against state laws:
- 31,694 votes cast across counties
- 10,414 cast from people who moved out of state
- 13,050 votes cast from Vacant Residences!
URGENT ACTION REQUIRED

Here is the Evidence, Now Show Us the Ballots!

We are in the midst of what some call “the greatest political scandal in history.” According to recent polls, something like 47% of Americans believe that the 2020 election was stolen, a plurality larger than those who believe it was free and fair. And regardless of which camp you find yourself in, everyone has to face the fact that this was an extremely unusual election in many respects.

We saw massive electoral changes and challenges put in place during the Covid-19 pandemic. And we just exited a period in which one side repeatedly challenged the legitimacy of President Trump, first with claims of Russian collusion and then impeachment, and constant media attacks.

The fact is a significant portion of the American population would not view either Trump or Biden as the next legitimate President unless and until we clear up the controversy over the 2020 election. This is absolutely necessary for the proper healing of our nation. It will require courage from all parties.

Your Mission: To lead in a fair and impartial way, and to resolve all of this without further turmoil through a special analysis on the physical ballots in the six key swing states.

“We will offer a simple and elegant way to examine the 2020 election and hopefully, once and for all, find an agreed upon winner.” –Kevin Freeman
SP.1230 (OSINT) Open-Sourced Intelligence Special Report. This is a Special Election Integrity Report with Kevin Freeman.

1. Nearly half of America believes the election was stolen and that is a problem!
   - There should be little wonder as to why nearly half of America believes the election was stolen.
   - Even if you believe that the election was mostly fair, you have to admit that there were many unusual and suspicious things about this election.
   - Denying that will only tear us further apart as a society.

   “Thoughtfully looking at the irregularities and abnormalities can be a way to better understand one another and heal our nation. This is something that every fair-minded American should want.”

2. This is not a Trump vs. Biden issue. It’s not about Democrats vs. Republicans. This is about election integrity and the future of our nation.
   - Joe Biden should want a clear process and so should Donald Trump.
   - But to date, this has not been handled in a bi-partisan, transparent way. And that has created confusion and division.
   - In this briefing, we will walk through the big issues, show evidence that has never been debunked or refuted, and then offer a simple and elegant solution that should erase the doubts and settle the matter for fair-minded individuals.

   “There is good news is that you can play an important role in healing and restoring America.”

3. The Disputes and large anomalies are primarily from just six counties out of 3006 counties in all of America.

   NOTE: The 2020 Presidential election was decided by six counties out of more than 3,000 counties in America.

   These critical counties include the swing states of Pennsylvania, Georgia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Arizona, and Nevada.
• And the voting and counting were not clear and transparent in those six counties, with multiple credible reports of irregularities and some of it being outright fraud.

Yet, the media, social media, and governments have gone out of their way to censor, suppress, or deny any issues. This has not engendered confidence. It has stoked division rather than healing it.

A look at the key issues:

A. Procedural Changes – There were all sorts of procedural changes to this election that have never been done before. These changes stripped out many of the safeguards that every expert on both sides said were necessary prior to this election.

As an example, even Chris Matthews, Barack Obama and Debbie Wasserman Schultz warned about the risks of mail-in ballots unless there were safeguards like true signature verification. You can see for yourself here: [https://www.bitchute.com/video/Ca0fT5OvE1XW/](https://www.bitchute.com/video/Ca0fT5OvE1XW/).

The bi-partisan National Election Defense Coalition was formed in 2013 based on the work of former president Jimmy Carter and James Baker. [Here’s what they said about mass mail-in ballots before the election](https://www.bitchute.com/video/Ca0fT5OvE1XW/):

• “As with any voting system that is not fully transparent, proving mail-in fraud can be difficult or impossible. Once we drop our ballot in the mail, we can’t verify what becomes of it. Additionally, should our ballots arrive in the central aggregating location untampered, they are likely to be counted by the same computerized counters that have been proven vulnerable to error and fraud. Central counting makes fraud on a large scale easier to accomplish and harder to detect.
• Vote by mail cannot provide a secure chain of custody of the ballots. That means the ballots are moved without consistent public oversight, offering opportunities for fraud, mismanagement, and disenfranchisement. Ballots are stored in hundreds of thousands of locations with insufficient security for two to three weeks. The ballots are handled by many anonymous persons throughout the process. It’s possible that an unmarked contest on a ballot can be marked by someone other than the voter when the ballots are opened for counting.

• Let that sink in. As this program is being prepared, those remarks remain on the ElectionDefense.org website and everyone knows them to be true.

• No wonder that, according to the Stanford University Daily earlier this year (https://www.stanforddaily.com/2020/04/24/the-case-against-a-vote-by-mail-election):

   “A 2005 commission led by former President Jimmy Carter (D) and James A. Baker III (R) concluded that mail-in ballots ‘remain the largest source of potential voter fraud.’”
B. Ignoring the bi-partisan reality - Election officials are conveniently ignoring that bi-partisan reality, trying to convince you that this was “the most secure election in history.”

- But did you know that, according to the New York Times, mail in voting accounted for nearly half of all votes across the country in this election? (https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/10/us/mail-voting-absentee.html)

- This is a massive increase in mail-in ballots, never before witnessed in America. Take a look at this chart using data from the US Election Assistance Commission.

- Mail-in ballots voted jumped by nearly 40 million from the last election.
- The important thing to note here is that these new mail-in ballots happened in states without a strong history of large batches of mail-in ballots.
- That means they may not have the experience or safeguards in place that the non-partisan experts say are necessary.

“Remember, even Barack Obama said that honest mail-in voting requires proper signature verification. So did Jimmy Carter in a bi-partisan commission.” –Kevin Freeman
C. Safeguards were Ignored – According to court cases, affidavits, and witnesses, the safeguards were ignored or removed, particularly in those six crucial counties.

- We have testimonies of mail-in ballots without chain of custody.
- We have reports of mail-in ballots cast that were sent to dead voters, or people who moved. Or addresses where the supposed voter didn’t even live.
- Then there’s the risk that the mail-in ballot was intercepted from the mailbox or voted by another person who lives at that address.
- No wonder the bi-partisan commission concluded that mail-in ballots ‘remain the largest source of potential voter fraud.’ Yet nearly half our ballots were cast by mail for the first time in American history.

D. Rejection rates for Mail in Ballots Dropped – Did you know that while first-time mail-in ballots increased more than ever in history, the rejection rate for such ballots fell sharply.

- You would think that with the documented risk of mail-in fraud, combined with a massive increase in first-time mail-in ballots in new areas, we would see higher, rather than lower rejection rates. But we didn’t!

CASE REVIEW:

- Given the fact that mail-in ballots overwhelmingly favored Biden, just using normal rejection rates would have given President Trump the win.

- For example, according to Ballotpedia, the mail-in ballot rejection rate for Pennsylvania in the 2018 election was 4.45% but dropped to just 0.28% this year. In Georgia, the 2018 rate was 3.1% but only 0.6% this year. [https://ballotpedia.org/Election_results,_2020:_Analysis_of_rejected_ballots](https://ballotpedia.org/Election_results,_2020:_Analysis_of_rejected_ballots)

- A lower rejection rate means that more votes were counted for Biden. It’s as simple as that.
- And this is just a small part of the irregularities that we saw in the 2020 election. All of this is documented.
NOTE: Because we don’t have chain of custody or the other safeguards in place, it is virtually impossible to know if the Biden margin is real or fraudulent without thoroughly and properly examining those ballots. That is essentially what the bipartisan NEDC warned in advance of the election.

The good news is that we have a simple way to check the ballots that should be acceptable to all parties. [https://rumble.com/vbvi2j-breaking-inventor-of-qr-code-can-determine-if-ballots-are-legitimate-or-fak.html](https://rumble.com/vbvi2j-breaking-inventor-of-qr-code-can-determine-if-ballots-are-legitimate-or-fak.html)

E. In some cases, the move to mass mail-in ballots was unconstitutional, driven by election officials, not the State legislatures. Sadly, the courts would rather not address it.

It is important to note that the move to mass mail-in ballots was undertaken by election officials in many states, without the explicit permission of the State legislature as the Constitution requires.

This has led to multiple constitutional challenges in court, including one docketed at the Supreme Court that could change the election outcome when heard.

**CAUTION:** Strangely the Supreme Court has chosen to hear the case only after the inauguration.

- Courts do not like getting involved in elections.
- One of the arguments being made that there was no fraud is based on the fact that courts have rejected every case brought by the Trump team.

"Here’s the problem with that line of reasoning: The courts have not looked at the evidence." —Kevin Freeman
• **They have rejected cases based on procedural issues** such as “standing.” One court said the case was brought too soon. Another said it was brought too late. Courts do not want to get involved in political issues, especially related to elections.

• **As a result, we have a constitutional crisis.** The courts refuse to get involved and the unelected election officials have taken control.

• It is so bad that many of the state legislatures have convened hearings to address the problem. In Arizona, for example, the State Senate subpoenaed the election equipment and ballots, but the election officials just refused to comply.

• But that is not at all how it is supposed to be. **According to the Constitution, state Legislatures are the ones responsible for appointing electors who in turn elect the President.**

• Article II, Section 1, Clause 2:

> “Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress...”

Yes, the state legislatures did establish a process for their citizens to vote for President. But in disputed states, there were multiple changes to the rules that the state legislature did not approve. And **some of those legislatures have joined in lawsuits to get their power back. But so far, the courts have found minor reasons to reject those suits.**

• Do you see the sad irony in this? Courts are using minor technicalities to prevent the Constitutional authority granted to the legislature.

• This is especially true where courts have conspired with election officials to allow mass mail-in voting contrary to state law.

• Then, those same election officials and courts oversee any recounts or challenges to the unconstitutional rules they set up.
According to the bi-partisan National Election Defense Coalition (or NEDC), none of these states were even close to prepared for the major changes:

- “Only three states, Oregon, Washington and Colorado, have developed state-wide universal access to VBM, achieved over a years-long transition and testing.

- The rest of the states would need a quantum leap of reorganization to accomplish a wholesale transition; a high bar given the virus has shut down many state and County offices and functions, and most poll workers are elderly and vulnerable to the virus.

- Infrastructure for drastic expansion is deficient, not only in funds, but in available hardware and software technologies for processing VBM at the county and precinct level, as well as in personnel training.”

- In hindsight, the NEDC was right. They provided a list of warnings of what would happen, including:

  ✓ Ballots mailed to wrong address.
  ✓ Unsecured drop-off boxes.
  ✓ Ballots mailed with unusable return envelope.
  ✓ Ballots mailed in large bundles to single mailboxes.
  ✓ Mailed ballots left on lobby floors/insecure locations rather than individual mailboxes.
  ✓ Not all counties extended time they received mail-in ballots.
  ✓ Citizens listed as having voted but report never having received a ballot or casting one.
  ✓ Campaign worker confessed to stealing ballots out of mailboxes on behalf of and “at the direction of” the campaign.
  ✓ Many mailed ballots from outdated registration lists.
  ✓ Ballot alignment errors rendered them uncountable by scanners with faulty software and poor calibration.
We have examples of all of these things happening in 2020. And that is just the tip of the iceberg!

You would think that election officials would be quick to investigate. But they aren’t.

4. **The Immaculate Deception** –

Dr. Peter Navarro documented a slew of problems in the six swing states in a 36-page paper he titled the Immaculate Deception. While the media has attempted to “debunk” the report in general, the truth is that on a point-by-point basis, it holds up, with facts, first-hand witness accounts, and affidavits.

From the report’s introduction:

- “All six battleground states exhibit most, or all, of six dimensions of election irregularities. However, each state has a unique mix of issues that might be considered “most important.” To put this another way, all battleground states are characterized by the same or similar election irregularities; but, like Tolstoy’s unhappy families, each battleground state is different in its own election irregularity way.

- This was theft by a thousand cuts across six dimensions and six battleground states rather than any one single “silver bullet” election irregularity.

- In refusing to investigate a growing number of legitimate grievances, the anti-Trump media and censoring social media are complicit in shielding the American public from the truth. This is a dangerous game that simultaneously undermines the credibility of the media and the stability of our political system and Republic.

- Those journalists, pundits, and political leaders now participating in what has become a Biden Whitewash should acknowledge the six dimensions of election irregularities and conduct the appropriate investigations to determine the truth about the 2020 election.
• If this is not done before Inauguration Day, we risk putting into power an illegitimate and illegal president lacking the support of a large segment of the American people.

• The failure to aggressively and fully investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities assessed in this report is a signal failure not just of our anti-Trump mainstream media and censoring social media but also of both our legislative and judicial branches.

• “...this nation runs the very real risk of never being able to have a fair presidential election again.”

• Looking at one table in Dr. Navarro’s report, we see that there are at least 1.4 million disputed ballots across the six states. Yet, the combined Biden margin of victory is just 313,000. That means that the questionable ballots are 5 times larger than the number needed for a Trump victory.

The kind of things that Dr. Navarro documented match perfectly with what we were warned about mass mail-in ballots:

• He documented a failure to properly verify signatures in Nevada, Pennsylvania, Georgia, and Wisconsin.

• He documented mail-in ballots lacking the proper “outer envelope,” which should have disqualified them.

• He documented a broken “chain of custody” with improper drop boxes.
• He documented mail-in ballots without valid postmarks, or ballots that appear to have been backdated.

• Every one of the things he documented was warned about by the NEDC well in advance of the election. They said that mass mail-in ballots would cause these problems. Yet the rejection rate dropped.

• The Navarro Report also documents the abuse of poll watchers. The law is clear that poll watchers are necessary to assure a free and fair election. Yet we have multiple affidavits of Republican poll watchers being excluded from watching. In some cases, they have sworn under penalty of perjury that they were asked to leave or kept at such distance that they couldn’t do their job.

• Then there is the infamous example where the windows were covered up so the public couldn’t watch the counting.

While the media may claim these have been debunked, the truth is that many poll watchers in the key states have testified or provided affidavits that they were not allowed to do their job in the manner that the state legislature prescribed. This is a clear violation of the Constitution.

Step back a second from the media narrative and ask yourself a couple of questions:

• First, do you think poll watchers are important for fair counting? Your answer should be an unequivocal, “YES!”

• Now ask yourself, what happens if those poll watchers are not allowed to do their job? Does that create the potential for fraud? **OF COURSE, IT DOES!**

• Further evidence has emerged. In fact, there is an amazing video of pure testimonies from Georgia that document many other examples of fraud.

5. Pennsylvania’s own State Legislature is Concerned:

• Just this week, [members of the Pennsylvania State Legislature performed an extensive analysis of the votes cast and the reported results in the 2020 presidential race.](https://www.2020electionaudit.com)
They claim serious irregularities. While the debunkers will no doubt attempt to discredit their findings, here is what they said:

“A comparison of official county election results to the total number of voters who voted on November 3, 2020 as recorded by the Department of State shows ...(a) difference of 202,377 more votes cast than voters voting, together with the 31,547 over- and under-votes in the presidential race, adds up to an alarming discrepancy of 170,830 votes, which is more than twice the reported statewide difference between the two major candidates for President of the United States.

On November 24, 2020, Boockvar certified election results, and Wolf issued a certificate of ascertainment of presidential electors, stating that Vice President Joe Biden received 80,555 more votes than President Donald Trump.

We were already concerned with the actions of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, the Executive branch, and election officials in certain counties contravening and undermining the Pennsylvania Election Code by eliminating signature verification, postmarks, and due dates while allowing the proliferation of drop boxes with questionable security measures and the unauthorized curing of ballots, as well as the questionable treatment of poll watchers, all of which created wholesale opportunities for irregularities in the 2020 presidential election.

However, we are now seeing discrepancies on the retail level which raise even more troubling questions regarding irregularities in the election returns. These findings call into question the accuracy of the SURE system, consistency in the application of the Pennsylvania Election Code from county to county, and the competency of those charged with oversight of elections in our Commonwealth.

These numbers just don’t add up, and the alleged certification of Pennsylvania’s presidential election results was absolutely premature, unconfirmed, and in error.”

This Pennsylvania challenge by legislatures just documents all of the things we’ve been talking about. And as we explained earlier, it is the LEGISLATURE that has constitutional authority to determine the election outcome.

State legislators in each of the swing states have expressed serious concerns about everything we have discussed and even more.
6. Watch out for Big Tech – Mark Zuckerberg spent almost as much as our federal government did on the election.

- There have been questions raised about the reliability of voting machines, the violations of state law in how the election was conducted, illegal ballots, foreign interference, and even the role of billionaires like Mark Zuckerberg throwing money into their state without their oversight.
- Remember, the only Constitutional authority over the electors in a state is the state legislature.
- The election should not be conducted on Mark Zuckerberg’s terms. Yet, his reported $350 million hired and trained election judges, set up temporary polling locations and placed ballot drop boxes that somehow seemed to favor Biden voters. These were not authorized under the rules set by legislatures.

7. VoteDetective has uncovered numerous irregularities and questionable ballots in Georgia.

There were almost 55,000 ballots cast that appear to violate state laws.

- 31,694 ballots cast from outside the county of registration. Under Georgia law, you must reregister when you move to a new county.
- 10,414 ballots appear to have been cast by people who moved out of state and were not residents at the time of the election.
- 13,050 votes were cast from vacant residences.
- When you add these up, these bad ballots far exceed the margin of victory.
- Why wouldn’t Georgia authorities investigate? Fortunately, VoteDetective did and is doing the same type work in each of the swing states.
- When the Georgia legislators learned these facts, they moved to decertify their electors.
8. State Legislators trying to regain their constitutional authority!

- In response, Legislators in all six states have taken one or more actions to regain their Constitutional authority.
- They have held hearings, filed lawsuits, and even sent alternative elector slates to Congress.

“So, when you hear the media and social media trying to deny irregularities, you should realize that they have an agenda. All of this explains why 47% of American voters do not fully trust the election results. And that is bad for democracy. We can’t allow the media to bully people into silence. No amount of “fact checking” or debunking can properly address the legitimate concerns people have.” – Kevin Freeman
9. It’s about understanding the Science.

• In 2012, the National Academy of Sciences published a paper on how to spot election fraud.

• They recommended using statistical analysis to see if there were outliers and irregularities. Many statisticians have done just that, and their findings all point to serious issues. We will have a section in our Battle Plan where you can find their analysis.

• Their work is science. We shouldn’t be science deniers. We need to get to the truth before we install the president.

10. Freedom of Speech threatens all our freedom.

• Here’s what’s bad for freedom: Trying to silence those who have legitimate questions and also undermining the constitutional authority given to state legislatures.

“Don’t give me this line that questioning the election is bad for democracy. The Washington Post published a piece that said denying the election results was tantamount to denying the Holocaust. That’s utter nonsense!”

Don’t forget how many people claimed, falsely I might add, that Russian collusion was responsible for Trump’s 2016 win. We now know that story was floated by the Clinton campaign and amplified by the Biden intelligence community.” –Kevin Freeman

• Sadly, there will be no healing for our nation until we can properly settle what happened in the 2020 election.

11. Fortunately, there is a solution that just may bring America back together again on a free and fair election.

• We had Jovan Hutton Pulitzer in the Economic War Room several weeks ago. He is a pioneer and patent holder in scanning, barcodes, and optical technologies.

• Jovan has the technology to take a stack of ballots, scan them, and quickly determine whether they are real or fake.
The scan can tell if the paper meets Federal standards, if they were folded and mailed, and if they were marked by a human or a device. The scan can even tell where they were printed and if they match the other ballots.

A simple scan could be conducted with the whole world watching under the authority of the state legislators. It could be done with multiple neutral observers.

And we could resolve most of the big questions people have.

Really looking at the ballots in these six counties with a scientific approach is a chance to come together as Americans and truly legitimize this election. You would think both candidates would want that.
Why You Should Care:

- Whether the final results show a Biden or Trump win, America needs a legitimate President.
- We are about to face a constitutional crisis or worse.
- Freedom of Speech is being threatened like never before.
- Free and fair elections may not exist again if we do not ensure election integrity and understand the anomalies now.
- Mail-in ballots were allowed to be cast or mishandled contrary to state law.
- Poll watchers were denied their right to observe. This is well documented and not debunked. This evidence is simply ignored.
- There are multiple issues that could account for more than the difference of this election and the results.
- Courts are afraid to address or consider the scientific evidence.
- While there are multiple examples of election fraud, there is an easy and fair way to determine legal ballots through the paper trial.
- We have made it easy for you to help make a difference and your voice be heard.

Next Steps:

1. Review the links below to see the back up evidence for yourself. We want to provide everyone the information available to make their own decisions.

2. Go to [https://everylegalvote.com](https://everylegalvote.com) and read the thousands of testimonies sent in by people who feel defrauded. Millions of people have visited this website since the election with almost 6 million “actions taken.”

3. We need to petition the right people to do their jobs. Your voice matters! Use the “TAKE ACTION” link at [https://everylegalvote.com](https://everylegalvote.com). With a few mouse clicks, in less than 60 seconds you will add your voice to thousands of others:
   - Demanding that the Attorney General treat all ballots and voting machines as evidence in a Federal proceeding.
   - You will also be able to demand that all of the questionable ballots be properly examined by a digital forensic expert. This can be done very quickly.
• And we will demand that the state legislatures regain their proper constitutional authority over the election. They have every right to examine the ballots and also require that the voting machines be forensically reviewed.

• Demand that our Senators and Representatives question the electoral vote unless and until the ballots have been properly reviewed by the legislators.

• Require that Vice President Pence exclude any questionable electoral votes until the ballots have been examined.

4. 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.

5. Be sure to sign up for our free Economic Battle Plans™ at www.EconomicWarRoom.com

• 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.

√ Follow, like, comment, and share on FB and Twitter. Look for short video segments on FB and Rumble, 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, YouTube or Rumble. 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
Evidence of Election Irregularities
Using Data
Bi-Partisan Proof That Voting Machines Can Be Hacked
About Kill Chain Documentary

Appendix:
The Immaculate Deception - Peter Navarro Report
Open Letter to Department of Justice - EveryLegalVote.com

[] - 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 Rumble page https://rumble.com/c/c-408647
Our XOTV Channel https://xotv.me/channels/233-economic-war-room
Link to all Economic 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/EBRNDWcuwGg

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=DSom2SP8FBO

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

Russ Ramsland on America Can We Talk  https://youtu.be/0K3UHBH30gk

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

War Room: Pandemic Ep S42  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CVZLYXS_u6s&t=1659

Liquid Lunch on Every Legal Vote  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MPTD64bz34

Glenn Beck Interviews Kevin Freeman  https://youtu.be/qF9t05tSesc

Evidence of Election Irregularities

Do We Have Transparent Elections?  https://www.bitchute.com/video/Co0FT50vElXW/

Everything You Need to Know About 2020 Election Fraud, but the Media Won’t Let You Ask | The Stream

McLaughlin Poll: Majority See Vote Fraud as National Problem
https://www.newsmax.com/mlaughlin/electors-voters/2020/12/15/id/1001650/

Pennsylvania Certified Results Found In Error By More Than 200,000 Votes  https://www.citizenfreepress.com/breaking/pennsylvania-certified-results-found-in-error-by-more-than-200000-votes/

Voting by mail and absentee voting | MIT Election Lab
https://electionlab.mit.edu/research/voting-mail-and-absentee-voting
How to Rig an Election — National Election Defense Coalition
https://www.electiondefense.org/how-to-rig-an-election

EXCLUSIVE #StopTheSteal Evidence Dump: Proof Of Voter Fraud In 17 States

Video: Phill Kline—New Amistad Project Election Lawsuit; $500 Million to Increase Votes in Democratic Strongholds?

Who is stealing America?
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APPENDIX

THE IMMACULATE DECEPTION:

Six Key Dimensions of Election Irregularities

The Navarro Report
Executive Summary

This report assesses the fairness and integrity of the 2020 Presidential Election by examining six dimensions of alleged election irregularities across six key battleground states. Evidence used to conduct this assessment includes more than 50 lawsuits and judicial rulings, thousands of affidavits and declarations,\(^1\) testimony in a variety of state venues, published analyses by think tanks and legal centers, videos and photos, public comments, and extensive press coverage.

The matrix below indicates that significant irregularities occurred across all six battleground states and across all six dimensions of election irregularities. This finding lends credence to the claim that the election may well have been stolen from President Donald J. Trump.

![Matrix of Election Irregularities](image)
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From the findings of this report, it is possible to infer what may well have been a coordinated strategy to effectively stack the election deck against the Trump-Pence ticket. Indeed, the observed patterns of election irregularities are so consistent across the six battleground states that they suggest a coordinated strategy to, if not steal the election outright, strategically game the election process in such a way as to “stuff the ballot box” and unfairly tilt the playing field in favor of the Biden-Harris ticket. Topline findings of this report include:

- The weight of evidence and patterns of irregularities are such that it is irresponsible for anyone – especially the mainstream media – to claim there is “no evidence” of fraud or irregularities.

- The ballots in question because of the identified election irregularities are more than sufficient to swing the outcome in favor of President Trump should even a relatively small portion of these ballots be ruled illegal.
• All six battleground states exhibit most, or all, six dimensions of election irregularities. However, each state has a unique mix of issues that might be considered “most important.” To put this another way, all battleground states are characterized by the same or similar election irregularities; but, like Tolstoy’s unhappy families, each battleground state is different in its own election irregularity way.

• This was theft by a thousand cuts across six dimensions and six battleground states rather than any one single “silver bullet” election irregularity.

• In refusing to investigate a growing number of legitimate grievances, the anti-Trump media and censoring social media are complicit in shielding the American public from the truth. This is a dangerous game that simultaneously undermines the credibility of the media and the stability of our political system and Republic.

• Those journalists, pundits, and political leaders now participating in what has become a Biden Whitewash should acknowledge the six dimensions of election irregularities and conduct the appropriate investigations to determine the truth about the 2020 election. If this is not done before Inauguration Day, we risk putting into power an illegitimate and illegal president lacking the support of a large segment of the American people.

• The failure to aggressively and fully investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities assessed in this report is a signal failure not just of our anti-Trump mainstream media and censoring social media but also of both our legislative and judicial branches.

  o Republican governors in Arizona and Georgia together with Republican majorities in both chambers of the State Legislatures of five of the six battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin – have had both the power and the opportunity to investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities presented in this report. Yet, wilting under intense political pressure, these politicians have failed in their Constitutional duties and responsibilities to do so – and thereby failed both their states and this nation as well as their party.

  o Both State courts and Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have failed the American people in refusing to appropriately adjudicate the election irregularities that have come before them. Their failures pose a great risk to the American Republic.

• If these election irregularities are not fully investigated prior to Inauguration Day and thereby effectively allowed to stand, this nation runs the very real risk of never being able to have a fair presidential election again – with the down-ballot Senate races scheduled for January 5 in Georgia an initial test case of this looming risk.
I. Introduction

At the stroke of midnight on Election Day, President Donald J. Trump appeared well on his way to winning a second term. He was already a lock to win both Florida and Ohio; and no Republican has ever won a presidential election without winning Ohio while only two Democrats have won the presidency without winning Florida.

At the same time, the Trump-Pence ticket had substantial and seemingly insurmountable leads in Georgia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin. If these leads held, these four key battleground states would propel President Trump to a decisive 294 to 244 victory in the Electoral College.

Shortly after midnight, however, as a flood of mail-in and absentee ballots began entering the count, the Trump red tide of victory began turning Joe Biden blue. As these mail-in and absentee ballots were tabulated, the President’s large leads in Georgia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin simply vanished into thin Biden leads.

At midnight on the evening of November 3, and as illustrated in Table 1, President Trump was ahead by more than 110,000 votes in Wisconsin and more than 290,000 votes in Michigan. In Georgia, his lead was a whopping 356,945; and he led in Pennsylvania by more than half a million votes. By December 7, however, these wide Trump leads would turn into razor thin Biden leads – 11,779 votes in Georgia, 20,682 votes in Wisconsin, 81,660 votes in Pennsylvania, and 154,188 votes in Michigan.

Table 1: A Trump Red Tide Turns Biden Blue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GEORGIA</th>
<th>PENNSYLVANIA</th>
<th>MICHIGAN</th>
<th>WISCONSIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trump Lead 11/3</td>
<td>356,945</td>
<td>555,189</td>
<td>293,052</td>
<td>112,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biden “Lead” 12/15</td>
<td>11,779</td>
<td>81,660</td>
<td>154,188</td>
<td>20,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Associated Press & Edison/Decision Desk HQ
*Midnight based on state’s time zone

There was an equally interesting story unfolding in Arizona and Nevada. While Joe Biden was ahead in these two additional battleground states on election night – by just over 30,000 votes in Nevada and less than 150,000 votes in Arizona – internal Trump Campaign polls predicted the President would close these gaps once all the votes were counted. Of course, this never happened.

In the wake of this astonishing reversal of Trump fortune, a national firestorm has erupted over the fairness and integrity of one of the most sacrosanct institutions in America – our presidential election system. Critics on the Right and within the Republican Party – including President Trump himself – have charged that the election was stolen. They have backed up these damning charges with more than 50 lawsuits, thousands of supporting affidavits and declarations, and seemingly incriminating videos, photos, and first-hand accounts of all manner of chicanery.
Critics on the Left and within the Democrat Party have, on the other hand, dismissed these charges as the sour grapes of a whining loser. Some of these critics have completely denied any fraud, misconduct or malfeasance altogether. Others have acknowledged that while some election irregularities may have existed, they strenuously insist that these irregularities are not significant enough to overturn the election.

There is a similar Battle Royale raging between large anti-Trump segments of the so-called “mainstream” media and alternative conservative news outlets. Across the anti-Trump mainstream media diaspora – which includes most prominently print publications like the New York Times and Washington Post and cable TV networks like CNN and MSNBC – a loud chorus of voices has been demanding that President Trump concede the election.

These same anti-Trump voices have been equally quick to denounce or discredit anyone – especially anyone within their own circle – that dares to investigate what may well turn out to be THE biggest political scandal in American history. Social media outlets like Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube likewise have been actively and relentlessly censoring anyone who dares to call the results of the election into question.

In contrast, alternative news outlets, primarily associated with the American conservative movement, have provided extensive, in-depth coverage of the many issues of fraud, misconduct, and other irregularities that are coming to light. From Steve Bannon’s War Room Pandemic and John Solomon’s Just the News to Raheem Kassam’s National Pulse, to Newsmax, and One America News Network, Americans hungry for facts and breaking developments have been able to find such critical information only by following this alternative coverage.

That the American public is not buying what the Democrat Party and the anti-Trump media and social media are selling is evident in public opinion polls. For example, according to a recent Rasmussen poll: “Sixty-two percent (62%) of Republicans say it is ‘Very Likely the Democrats stole the election’” while 28% of Independents and 17% of Democrats share that view.

If, in fact, compelling evidence comes to light proving the election was indeed stolen after a fait accompli Biden inauguration, we as a country run the very real risk that the very center of our great American union will not hold.

To put this another way, if the greatest democracy in world history cannot conduct a free and fair election, and if much of the mainstream media of this country won’t even fully investigate what is becoming a growing mountain of evidence calling into question the election result, there is little chance that our democracy and this Republic will survive as we know it. It is therefore critical that we get to the bottom of this matter. That is the purpose of this report.
II. Six Dimensions of Election Irregularities across Six Battleground States

This report assesses the fairness and integrity of the 2020 presidential election across six key battleground states where the Democrat candidate Joe Biden holds a slim lead, and the results continue to be hotly contested. As documented in the extensive endnotes, the evidence used to conduct this assessment includes more than 50 lawsuits and judicial rulings, thousands of affidavits and declarations, testimony presented in a variety of state venues, published reports and analyses by think tanks and legal centers, videos and photos, public comments and first-hand accounts, and extensive press coverage.

From a review and analysis of this evidence, six major dimensions of alleged election irregularities have been identified and assessed on a state-by-state basis across six key battleground states: Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. These six dimensions include outright voter fraud, ballot mishandling, contestable process fouls, Equal Protection Clause violations, voting machine irregularities, and significant statistical anomalies.

The matrix in Table 2 provides an overview of the presence or absence of each of the six dimensions of alleged election irregularities in each of the six battleground states. Column 1 lists each of the six dimensions along with the alleged Biden victory margin and the possible illegal ballots due to election irregularities. Columns 2 through 7 in the matrix then indicate the presence or absence of the election irregularities in any given state.

Note that a checkmark in matrix cell indicates there is widespread evidence in a given state for a particular dimension of election irregularity while a star indicates there is at least some evidence.

Table 2: 2020 Alleged Election Irregularities across the Six Battleground States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outright Voter Fraud</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballot Mishandling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contestable Process Fouls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Protection Clause Violations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Machine Irregularities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Statistical Anomalies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biden “Victory” Margin</td>
<td>10,457</td>
<td>11,779</td>
<td>154,188</td>
<td>33,596</td>
<td>81,660</td>
<td>20,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Illegal Ballots</td>
<td>&gt;100,000</td>
<td>&gt;400,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>&gt;100,000</td>
<td>&gt;600,000</td>
<td>&gt;200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence  * = Some Evidence
Two key points stand out immediately from the matrix. First, significant irregularities appear to be ubiquitous across the six battleground states. Only Arizona is free of any apparent widespread ballot mishandling while only Pennsylvania lacks significant statistical anomalies. The rest of the matrix in Table 2 is a sea of checkmarks and occasional stars.

Second, if one compares the alleged Biden victory margin in Column 7 of the figure with the possible illegal ballots in Column 8, it should be clear that the number of possible illegal ballots dwarfs the alleged Biden victory margin in five of the six states.

For example, the alleged Biden victory margin in Nevada is 33,596 votes yet the number of ballots in question is more than three times that. In Arizona, which has the narrowest alleged Biden victory margin at 10,457 votes, there are nearly 10 times that number of possible illegal ballots; and the ratio of the alleged Biden vote lead to possible illegal ballots is even higher for Georgia.

Only Michigan is the exception to the rule. This is not because it is likely to be a true exception but simply because there remains insufficient estimates of how the various types of irregularities in Michigan translate into possible illegal votes.

Clearly, based on this matrix, the American people deserve a definitive answer as to whether this election was stolen from Donald J. Trump. Absent a thorough investigation prior to Inauguration Day, a cloud and a stain will hang over what will be perceived by many Americans as an illegitimate Biden administration.

The next six sections of this report examine in more detail each of the six dimensions of alleged election irregularities.
III. Outright Voter Fraud

*Outright voter fraud* ranges from the large-scale manufacturing of fake ballots, bribery, and dead voters to ballots cast by ineligible voters such as felons and illegal aliens, ballots counted multiple times, and illegal out-of-state voters. Table 3 provides an overview across the six battleground states of the various types of outright voter fraud that have been alleged to be present.

**Table 3: Outright Voter Fraud in the 2020 Presidential Election**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fake Ballot Manufacturing &amp; Destruction of Legally Cast Real Ballots</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinitely Confined Voter Abuses</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible Voters &amp; Voters Who Voted in Multiple States</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Voters &amp; Ghost Voters</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting Ballots Multiple Times</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Out-of-State Voters</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence  ✗ = Some Evidence

From the figure, we see that different types of fraud may be present in all six states. Let’s more precisely define each of these different types of fraud using examples that are designed to be illustrative rather than exhaustive.

**Bribery**

In a voter fraud context, *bribery* refers to the corrupt solicitation, acceptance, or transfer of value in exchange for official action, such as voter registration or voting for a preferred candidate.\(^1\) At least in Nevada, there is a slam dunk case that such bribery occurred.

What is so stunning about the Nevada case is the brazen disregard for our federal bribery laws. In the Silver State, in an effort orchestrated by the Biden campaign, Native Americans appear to have traded their votes not for pieces of silver but rather for Visa gift cards, jewelry, and other “swag.”\(^2\) According to the Epoch Times, such vote buying schemes also may have occurred in eight other states, including Arizona and Wisconsin.\(^3\)
Fake Ballot Manufacturing and Destruction of Legally Cast Real Ballots

_Fake ballot manufacturing_ involves the fraudulent production of ballots on behalf of a candidate; and one of the most disturbing examples of possible fake ballot manufacturing involves a truck driver who has alleged in a sworn affidavit that he picked up large crates of ballots in New York and delivered them to a polling location in Pennsylvania. ¹⁵ There may be well over 100,000 ballots involved, enough fake ballots alone to have swung the election to Biden in the Keystone State.

Likewise in Pennsylvania, there is both a Declaration and a photo that suggests a poll worker used an unsecured USB flash drive to dump an unusually large cache of votes onto vote tabulation machines. The resultant tabulations did not correlate with the mail-in ballots scanned into the machines. ¹⁶

Arguably the most flagrant example of possible fake ballot manufacturing on behalf of Joe Biden may have occurred at the State Farm Arena in Atlanta, Georgia. The possible perpetrators were caught _in flagrante delicto_ on surveillance video.

In one version of this story, poll watchers and observers as well as the media were asked to leave in the middle of the night after a suspicious water leak. Once the room was cleared, several election officials pulled out large boxes of ballots from underneath a draped table. They then proceeded to tabulate a quantity of fake manufactured ballots estimated to be in the range of tens of thousands. ¹⁷

Note that a large surge in Biden votes following the tabulation of these ballots can be clearly observed after these votes were processed. ¹⁸

Despite what appears to be damning evidence of a possible crime, a spate of stories appeared across the anti-Trump media diaspora dismissing any concerns. According to these whitewash stories, these were regular and authorized ballot boxes, observers in the media were not asked to leave but simply left on their own, and it is perfectly acceptable to count ballots in the absence of observers. ¹⁹ Or so the spin goes.

Of course, this is precisely the kind of incident that should be fully investigated both by Georgia’s Attorney General as well as by the Federal Department of Justice. Yet it remains unclear as to whether such investigations are underway. Meanwhile, the videotape itself, absent an adequate explanation, has contributed to the current climate of skepticism surrounding the fairness and integrity of the election.

Finally, as an example of the possible _destruction of legally cast real ballots_ there is this allegation from a court case filed in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona: Plaintiffs claim that over 75,000 absentee ballots were reported as unreturned when they were actually returned. These absentee ballots were then either lost or destroyed (consistent with allegations of Trump ballot destruction) and/or were replaced with blank ballots filled out by election workers or other third parties. ²⁰
Indefinitely Confined Voter Abuses

*Indefinitely confined voters* are those voters unable to vote in person because of old age or some disability. There are two types of possible abuses associated with such indefinitely confined voters.

The first kind of abuse involves exploiting the elderly or the infirm by effectively hijacking their identities and votes. For example, in Georgia, the family of an elderly man in a nursing home facility discovered that a mail-in ballot had been requested and submitted under his voter registration identity, yet it was done without his consent.21 In a similar situation in Pennsylvania, two parents and their daughter who has Downs Syndrome went to vote in person and discovered that a mail-in ballot had both been requested and submitted for the daughter without her consent.22

The second kind of indefinitely confined voter abuse is far more consequential, at least in the state of Wisconsin. The key allegation here in several court filings is that “bad-faith voters” registering as “indefinitely confined” intentionally broke “Wisconsin election law to circumvent election integrity photo identification requirements.” In a nutshell, they were able to vote without showing a voter identification photo and therefore underwent a far less rigorous I.D. check than would otherwise have been conducted.

This abuse happened, according to one press account, after “clerks in Dane and Milwaukee counties offered illegal advice that encouraged individuals to use indefinite confinement as a way to ignore the state’s photo I.D. requirement.”23 The Trump side has called this correctly an open invitation to fraud; and stories and pictures abound of Wisconsin voters who registered as indefinitely confined but were seen also attending weddings, riding their bikes, going on vacation, and otherwise be anything but confined.24

Here is what is most important about this particular type of election fraud: In the wake of the expanded definition of indefinitely confined voters — a definition ruled legally *incorrect* by the Wisconsin Supreme Court25 — the number of indefinitely confined voters surged from just under 70,000 voters in 2019 to over 200,000 in 2020.26 This 130,000 vote increment of new indefinitely confined voters is more than five times the Biden victory margin in Wisconsin.

Ineligible Voters and Voters Who Vote in Multiple States

*Ineligible voters* include felons deemed ineligible, underage citizens, nonregistered voters, illegal aliens, illegal out-of-state voters, and voters illegally using a post office box as an address.27

In a court filing by the Trump campaign legal team, lead counsel Ray Smith provided a list of more than 70,000 allegedly ineligible voters casting ballots in Georgia in the 2020 election.28 Also in Georgia, over 20,000 people appear to have filed a Notice of Changed Address form to the Georgia state government or had other indications of moving out of state. Yet, these clearly ineligible out-of-state voters appeared to have remained on the voter rolls and voted in the 2020 election.29

As additional data points regarding ineligible out-of-state voters, there are these: Between 80 and 100 self-proclaimed Black Lives Matter-affiliated members from other states have admitted to having voted in Pennsylvania.30
As for those voters who vote in multiple states, one lawsuit claims that roughly 15,000 mail-in or absentee ballots were received in Nevada from voters who were known to have voted in other states.\textsuperscript{31} It is useful to note here that in Nevada, poll workers allegedly were not consistent in their procedures when checking voters in to vote about whether they accepted California or Nevada Voter Identification as proof of eligibility to register to vote.\textsuperscript{32}

**Dead Voters and Ghost Voters**

According to widespread evidence, there was a surprising number of ballots cast across several key battleground states by deceased voters, sparking one wag to quip, in reference to a classic Bruce Willis movie, this was the “Sixth Sense” election – I see dead people voting.

In Pennsylvania, for example, a statistical analysis conducted by the Trump Campaign matching voter rolls to public obituaries found what appears to be over 8,000 confirmed dead voters successfully casting mail-in ballots.\textsuperscript{33} In Georgia – underscoring the critical role any given category of election irregularities might play in determining the outcome – the estimated number of alleged deceased individuals casting votes almost exactly equals the Biden victory margin.

In Michigan, according to one first-hand account offered in a declaration, computer operators at a polling location in Detroit were manually adding the names and addresses of thousands of ballots to vote tabulation systems with voters who had birth dates in 1900.\textsuperscript{34} And in Nevada, a widower since 2017 saw that his deceased wife had successfully cast a mail-in ballot on November 2, 2020, three and a half years after her death.\textsuperscript{35}

It may be useful to note here that dead voters played a critical role in stealing the election from Richard Nixon, a theft orchestrated by Mayor Richard Daley and his Chicago political machine. According to one report “more than 3,000 votes [were] cast in the names of individuals who were dead, and more than 31,000 individuals voted twice in different locations in the city.” President Kennedy’s victory margin in Illinois was less than 9,000 votes.

On the Ghost Voter front, a “Ghost Voter” is a voter who requests and submits a ballot under the name of a voter who no longer resides at the address where that voter was registered. In Georgia for example, it is alleged that over 20,000 absentee or early voters – almost twice the Biden victory margin – cast their ballots after having moved out of state.\textsuperscript{36} In Nevada, a poll worker reported that there were as many as 50 ballots per day being delivered to homes vacated by their former residents.\textsuperscript{37}

**Counting Ballots Multiple Times**

*Counting ballots multiple times* occurs most egregiously when batches of ballots are repeatedly rescanned and re-tabulated in electronic voting machines. It can also happen when the same person votes multiple times within the same day. Evidence of these particular kinds of “ballot stuffing” are present across all six battleground states.
For example, in Wisconsin, poll workers were observed running ballots through tabulation machines more than once.\(^{38}\) In Wayne County, Michigan, Republican poll watchers observed canvassers re-scanning batches of ballots through vote tabulation machines up to 3 to 4 times.\(^{39}\)

In Pennsylvania, a poll worker observed a woman vote twice in the same day by changing her appearance.\(^{40}\) Another poll worker observed people in voting lines in one corner of a polling location voting, and then coming to another polling location at the other side of the building to vote.\(^ {41}\) Still another poll worker witnessed a woman voting twice at voting machines on Election Day.\(^ {42}\)

### IV. Ballot Mishandling

*Ballot mishandling* represents the second major dimension of alleged election irregularities in the 2020 presidential election. As Table 4 illustrates, this is a multifaceted problem across the battleground states. Let’s work our way through this figure starting with the failure to properly check the identification of voters.

#### Table 4: Ballot Mishandling in the Battleground States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Voter I.D. Check</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signature Match Check Abuses</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Naked Ballots” Lacking Outer Envelope</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broken Chain of Custody &amp; Unauthorized Ball Handling or Movements</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ballots Accepted Without Postmarks &amp; Backdating of Ballots</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✔️ = Wide-Spread Evidence  ✔️ = Some Evidence

#### No Voter I.D. Check

It is critical for the integrity of any election for poll workers to properly verify a voter’s identity and registration when that voter comes in to cast an in-person ballot. However, there is at least some evidence of a lack of adequate voter ID check across several of the battleground states.

For example, in Michigan, the chairperson of a polling location permitted an individual to vote without presenting voter identification and another with only a photocopy of a driver’s license.\(^{43}\)
In Nevada, poll workers were instructed to advise people who wanted to register to vote and did not have proper Nevada IDs or Driver’s Licenses to do the following: These unregistered voters could go outside into the parking lot and make an appointment with the Department of Motor Vehicles as late as January 2021 to obtain a Nevada Driver’s License as proof of their identity. They could then bring in confirmation of their DMV appointment in either paper or digital form; and that would be sufficient to allow them to be registered.44

**Signature Matching Abuses**

It is equally critical that ballot counters legally verify mail-in and absentee ballots by checking if the signatures on the outer envelopes match the voters’ registration records.45 Note, however, that a variety of signature matching abuses represent a major issue in Nevada, Pennsylvania, and especially in Georgia.

In Georgia, contrary to state law, the Secretary of State entered into a Consent Decree with the Democrat Party that weakened signature matching to just one verification instead of two. This illegal weakening of the signature match test has called into question more than 1.2 million mail-in ballots cast in Georgia.46

Georgia is not the only state where signature match check abuses have surfaced. Nevada law requires that persons – not machines – review all signatures and ballots. Yet the Clark County Registrar of Voters used a defective signature matching computer system called Agilis to conduct such checks.47 As will be discussed further below, this problem of machines replacing humans contrary to Nevada state law was compounded by the fact that the Agilis system has an unacceptably low accuracy rate, making it easier for illegal ballots to slip through its screen.48

Signature match abuses also surfaced in Wisconsin where mandatory voter information certifications for mail-in ballots were reduced and/or eliminated, again contrary to state law. As noted in one lawsuit, this change “undermined the authority of the state legislature, reduced the security and integrity of the election by making it easier to engage in mail-in ballot fraud and created another standard-less rule in conflict with the clear terms of the Wisconsin Election Code, preventing uniform treatment of absentee ballots throughout the State.‖49

**“Naked Ballots” Lacking Outer Envelope**

A naked ballot is a mail-in or absentee ballot lacking an outer envelope with the voter’s signature on it. It is illegal to accept the naked ballot as the outer envelope provides the only way to verify a voter’s identity.

The illegal acceptance of naked ballots appears to be particularly acute in Pennsylvania as a result of ill-advised “guidance” issued by the Secretary of State – a registered Democrat50 – that such naked ballots be counted.
This issuance of such guidance, in violation of state law, appears to be a blatant attempt by a Democrat politician to boost the count for Joe Biden as it was clear that Democrats would be voting disproportionately higher through mail-in ballots. This incident is especially egregious because when the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rejected this guidance, the Secretary of State refused to issue new guidance directing election officials to NOT count non-compliant mail-in or absentee ballots.

Broken Chain of Custody & Unauthorized Ballot Handling or Movements

The maintenance of a proper chain of custody for ballots cast is the linchpin of fair elections. Chain of custody is broken when a ballot is fraudulently transferred, controlled, or moved without adequate supervision or oversight.

While chain of custody issues can apply to all ballots, the risk of a broken chain of custody is obviously higher for mail-in and absentee ballots. This is because the ballots have to go through more hands.

In the 2020 presidential election, the increased use – often illegal use – of unsupervised drop boxes arguably has enhanced the risk of a broken chain of custody. So, too, has the increased practice of so-called “ballot harvesting” whereby third parties pick up ballots from voters and deliver them to drop boxes or directly to election officials.

Both drop boxes and ballot harvesting provide opportunities for bad actors to insert fraudulent ballots into the election process. That this is a very serious matter is evident in this observation by BlackBoxVoting.org: “In court cases, chain of custody violations can result in refusal to admit evidence or even throwing a case out. In elections, chain of custody violations can result in ‘incurable uncertainty’ and court orders to redo elections.” (emphasis added)

As an example of the drop box problem, in Pennsylvania, ballots were illegally dumped into drop boxes at the Nazareth ballot drop center in violation of state law. Likewise in Pennsylvania, a man caught on videotape and photos came out of an unmarked Jeep extracting ballots from an unsupervised ballot drop-box to bring them into a ballot counting center. That same man was observed to come back with an empty ballot container to place in the unsupervised drop box.

In Wisconsin, the state’s Election Committee illegally positioned five hundred drop boxes for collection of absentee ballots across the state. However, these drop boxes were disproportionately located in urban areas which tend to have much higher Democrat registration, thereby favoring the candidacy of Joe Biden. Note: Any use of a drop box in Wisconsin is illegal by statute. Therefore, the votes cast through them cannot be legally counted in any certified election result.

As an example of ballot harvesting – in this case at the front end of the process – 25,000 ballots were requested from nursing home residents in Pennsylvania at the same time.
As additional examples of a possible broken chain of custody, there are these: Large bins of absentee ballots arrived at the Central Counting Location in Wisconsin with already opened envelopes, meaning that ballots could have been tampered with.\textsuperscript{59} They were nonetheless counted.

Also in Wisconsin, an election worker was observed moving bags of blank ballots into a vehicle and then driving off without supervision.\textsuperscript{60} There is also the previously referenced case whereby a truck driver has offered a firsthand account of moving large quantities of fake manufactured ballots from New York to Pennsylvania.

As a final note on the unauthorized handling or movement of ballots, there is the problem of \textit{illegal ballot counters}. These are persons who not legally permitted and/or certified to be counting ballots.

In one curious case, an individual who worked as an official photographer for Kamala Harris’ campaign in 2019\textsuperscript{61} was alleged to be involved in scanning ballots in Floyd County, Georgia. Ballot counters cannot have any ties to candidates in a presidential election.

\textbf{Ballots Accepted Without Postmarks and Backdating of Ballots}

Across all of the battleground states, it is against state law for poll workers to count either mail-in or absentee ballots that lack postmarks. It is also illegal to backdate ballots so that they may be considered as having met the election deadline for the receipt and counting of such ballots. There is some evidence of these irregularities in several of the battleground states.

For example, in Wisconsin, according to one Declaration, employees of the United States Postal Service (USPS) in Milwaukee were repeatedly instructed by two managers to backdate late-arriving ballots so they could still be counted.\textsuperscript{62} In addition, the USPS was alleged to have backdated as many as 100,000 ballots in Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{63}

Similarly, in Detroit, Michigan, as noted in a court case, poll workers were instructing ballot counters to backdate absentee ballots so they could be counted.\textsuperscript{64} One poll watcher also observed ballots in Michigan being run through vote tabulation machines without postmarks on them.\textsuperscript{65}
V. Contestable Process Fouls

Contestable process fouls represent the third dimension of election irregularities in the 2020 presidential election. The various forms such process fouls can take are illustrated in Table 5 across the six battleground states.

Table 5: Contestable Process Fouls in the Battleground States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abuses of Poll Watchers &amp; Observers</th>
<th>ARIZONA</th>
<th>GEORGIA</th>
<th>MICHIGAN</th>
<th>NEVADA</th>
<th>PENNSYLVANIA</th>
<th>WISCONSIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail-In &amp; Absentee Ballot Rules Violated Contrary to State Law</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Not Properly Registered Allowed to Vote</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Campaigning at Poll Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballots Cured by Poll Workers or Voters Contrary to Law</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 ✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence  * = Some Evidence

Abuses of Poll Watchers and Observers

Central to the fairness and integrity of any election is the processes by which observers monitor the receipt, opening, and counting of the ballots. You can see in the Table 5 that poll watcher and observer abuses were present across all six battleground states.

In Georgia, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, poll watchers and observers were denied entry to ballot counting centers by Judges of Elections and other poll workers. This was despite presenting proper certification and identification.

In Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, and Pennsylvania, Republican poll watchers were also forced inside confined areas, thereby limiting their view. In some cases, this confinement was enforced by local law enforcement.
Across these four battleground states, Republican poll watchers were also directed to stand at unreasonably lengthy distances from ballot counters. In Michigan – arguably the “first among equals” when it comes to observer abuses – poll workers put up poster boards on the windows of the room where ballots were being processed and counted so as to block the view. In Pennsylvania, tens of thousands of ballots were processed in back rooms where poll observers were prohibited from being able to observe at all.

This is an extremely serious matter because it is these poll watchers and observers who represent the frontline defenders of a fair election process. Their job is to make sure all ballots are handled properly and tabulated accordingly. They seek to answer questions like: Is there a signature match process being conducted? Does each ballot have an outer envelope or is it a naked ballot? Are ballots being run more than once through the tabulation machines?

When poll watchers or observers are barred from viewing or forced to view from unacceptably large distances, these watchdogs cannot accurately answer these questions. They, therefore, cannot fulfill their critical watchdog function.

**Mail-In Ballot and Absentee Ballot Rules Violated Contrary to State Law**

In Georgia, more than 300,000 individuals were permitted to vote who had applied for an absentee ballot more than 180 days prior to the Election Day. This is a clear violation of state law.

In both Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, Democrat election officials acted unilaterally to accept both mail-in and absentee ballots after Election Day. State Republicans have argued this is contrary to state law.

In Pennsylvania, absentee and mail-in ballots were accepted up to three days after Election Day. On November 7th, in anticipation of a legal challenge, the United States Supreme Court ordered that the approximately 10,000 absentee and mail-in ballots that had arrived past November 3rd be separated from ballots that had arrived on Election Day. This direction notwithstanding, a poll watcher reported on November 7th that, in Delaware County, ballots received the previous night were not being separated from ballots received on Election Day, contrary to state law.

Wisconsin state law does not permit early voting. Nonetheless, city officials in the Democrat stronghold of Madison, Wisconsin assisted in the creation of more than 200 “Democracy in the Park” illegal polling places.

These *faux* polling places were promoted and supported by the Biden campaign. They provided witnesses for absentee ballots and acted in every way like legal polling places. Moreover, they received ballots outside of the limited 14-day period preceding an election that is authorized by statute for in-person or absentee balloting. These were clear violations of state law.
Voters Not Properly Registered Allowed to Vote

One of the jobs of poll workers is to ensure that in-person voters are legally registered and are who they say they are. Across at least three of the six battleground states – Georgia, Nevada, and Wisconsin – this job may not have been effectively done.

In Wisconsin, for example, officials refused to allow poll watchers to challenge the qualifications of people applying to vote or require proof of such persons’ qualifications. In Georgia, more than 2,000 individuals appear to have voted who were not listed in the State’s records as having been registered to vote.

In Pennsylvania, a poll watcher observed poll workers taking individuals whose names did not appear in voter registration books back into a separate area that was unobserved by any poll watchers. There, these apparently unregistered voters met with a Judge of Elections who allegedly told them: “you go back in, tell them this is your name, and you can vote.”

Illegal Campaigning at Poll Locations

Poll workers are supposed to remain politically neutral. When a poll worker displays bias for one political candidate over another at a polling location, this is contrary to state law. Unfortunately, this law appears to have been repeatedly violated in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

For example, in Pennsylvania, poll workers were wearing paraphernalia from a group called “Voter Protection.” This is a 100% Democrat-funded Political Action Committee dedicated to Democrat redistricting in Pennsylvania; and the wearing of its paraphernalia constitutes illegal campaigning at the polls.

In a similar type of illegal campaigning in Michigan, poll workers were allowed to wear Black Lives Matter shirts and were seen carrying tote bags of President Obama paraphernalia. In addition, poll workers with Biden and Obama campaign shirts on were allowed on the ballot counting floor.

In Wisconsin, representatives from the Biden campaign were outside with clipboards talking to voters on their way in to vote. They were clearly inside the prohibited perimeter for electioneering. Poll workers did nothing to address this illegal campaigning despite the objections of observers.

Ballots Cured by Poll Workers or Voters Contrary to Law

Under prescribed circumstances, both poll workers and voters may fix ballots with mistakes or discrepancies. This process is known as “ballot curing.”

In nineteen states, poll workers must notify voters if there are errors or discrepancies on their ballots and allow them to “cure” or correct any errors so their votes will count. However, in states that do not allow curing, ballots with discrepancies such as missing or mismatched signatures must be discarded.
In Pennsylvania, and contrary to state law, poll workers were trained to allow voters to cure or “correct” their ballots. According to one court filing, Democrat-controlled counties in Pennsylvania participated in pre-canvass activities prior to Election Day “by reviewing received mail-in ballots for deficiencies.” Such discrepancies included “lacking the inner secrecy envelope or lacking a signature of the elector on the outer declaration envelope.” Voters were then notified so that they could cure their ballots – a clear violation of state law.

Numerous other examples of illegally cured ballots abound. For example, in Wisconsin, tens of thousands of ballots were observed to be corrected or cured despite election observer objections.

In Pennsylvania, poll workers sorted approximately 4,500 ballots with various errors into bins. Poll workers then re-filled out the 4,500 ballots so that they could be read by tabulation machines, an action contrary to state law.

In Michigan, poll workers altered the dates on the outer envelopes of the ballots so that they would be able to count them. Michigan poll workers also filled out blank ballots to “correct” mail-in and absentee ballots according to what they believed the “voter had intended.”

VI. Equal Protection Clause Violations

The Equal Protection Clause is part of the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and a fundamental pillar of the American Republic. This Equal Protection Clause mandates that no State may deny its citizens equal protection of its governing laws.

Table 6 illustrates three major alleged violations of the Equal Protection Clause in the 2020 presidential election. As the table illustrates, each violation was observed to occur across all six battleground states.

### Table 6: Equal Protection Clause Violations in the Six Battleground States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Standards of Certification &amp; I.D. Verification Applied to In-Person Voters</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Standards of Ballot Curing</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential &amp; Partisan Poll Watcher Treatment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence  * = Some Evidence
Higher Standards of Certification & I.D. Verification Applied to In-Person Voters

The first alleged violation focuses on the application of higher standards of certification and voter identification for in-person voters than mail-in and absentee ballot voters. In effect, these higher standards disproportionately benefited the candidacy of Joe Biden because President Trump had a much higher percentage of in-person voters than mail-in and absentee voters. Indeed, mail-in and absentee ballots were largely skewed for Joe Biden across the country by ratios as high as 3 out of 4 votes in some states.97

Note here that much of the alleged fraud and ballot mishandling focused on mail-in voters and absentee ballots. Therefore, the lower the level of scrutiny of these voters, the more illegal votes for Joe Biden relative to Donald Trump could slip in. It should likewise be noted here that this particular violation of the Equal Protection Clause was further enabled by poll watchers being denied meaningful observation.

Perhaps the most egregious examples of this particular violation of the Equal Protection clause occurred in Georgia and Michigan. Georgia, for example, requires ID for voting in-person and Michigan will only allow provisional voting without an ID. However, in both Georgia and Michigan, a valid ID is not required to vote by mail so long as the person has already registered in a previous election.

These procedures are ripe for fraud. In fact, there is evidence that election fraudsters targeted voters who had voted in past elections but not voted in more recent ones. These fraudsters could then cast ballots on behalf of these infrequent voters with little likelihood they would be caught. Numerous affidavits, however, detail persons arriving to vote at polls only to be informed that records indicate they had already voted. At least fourteen such affidavits have been made by Georgians.

As a further example, in Wisconsin, mail-in ballots were accepted without witness signatures placed properly in the allocated envelope location.98 A comparable process for in-person voting would have resulted in the invalidation of the vote.

Different Standards of Ballot Curing

As a second major violation of the Equal Protection Clause, likewise observed across all six battleground states, different standards for correcting mistakes on ballots (ballot curing) were applied across different jurisdictions within the states. Often, jurisdictions with predominantly Democrat registration were more expansive about allowing the curing of ballots than jurisdictions with predominantly Republican registration.

In Pennsylvania, there was a clear difference between how ballots were – or were not – cured in Republican counties versus Democrat counties. When Pennsylvania’s Secretary of State Kathy Boockvar issued illegal guidance authorizing counties to cure ballots, this illegal guidance was not followed in at least eight different Republican counties.99 Meanwhile, ballots were cured in Democrat counties under this illegal guidance.100
In Arizona, there likewise was a clear difference between how in-person voters were treated versus mail-in ballots. On the one hand, mail-in voters had up to 5 days to “cure” or “fix” invalid mail-in ballots sent prior to Election Day. On the other hand, in-person voters in Maricopa County, for example, had to deal with poll workers who did not know how to work electronic voting machines properly. This resulted in thousands of in-person votes being marked incorrectly and disregarded rather than cured.

**Differential and Partisan Poll Watcher Treatment**

In most states, political party candidates and ballot issue committees are able to appoint poll watchers and observers to oversee the ballot counting process. Such poll watchers and observers must be registered voters and present certification to the Judge of Elections in order to be able to fulfill their duties at a polling location.

Such certified poll watchers should be free to observe at appropriate distances regardless of their party affiliation. Yet in key Democrat strongholds, e.g., Dane County in Wisconsin and Wayne County in Michigan, which yielded high Biden vote counts, Republican poll watchers and observers were frequently subject to different treatment ranging from denial of entry to polling places to harassment and intimidation.

For example, in Georgia, a certified poll watcher witnessed other poll workers at a polling location discussing how they should not speak to her due to her party affiliation. In Pennsylvania, a Republican poll watcher was harassed and removed from the polling location due to his party affiliation. In Wisconsin, a Republican poll watcher was prevented from observing due to the fact that polling locations were not allowing Republicans in.

Note the synergy here between the problem of the process foul involved with denying access to certified poll watchers (discussed in the previous section) and the violation of the Equal Protection Clause such conduct entails when such denial, harassment, and intimidation differs by party affiliation.
VII. 2020 Election Voting Machine Irregularities

Perhaps no device illustrates that technology is a double-edged sword than the machines and associated software that have come to be used to tabulate votes across all 50 states. Types of voting equipment include optical scanners used to process paper ballots, direct recording electronic systems which voters can use to directly input their choices, and various marking devices to produce human-readable ballots.

Two main types of voting machine irregularities have been alleged in the 2020 presidential election. As Table 7 illustrates, these types of irregularities include large-scale voting machine inaccuracies together with inexplicable vote switching and vote surges, often in favor Joe Biden.

Table 7: 2020 Voting Machine Irregularities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large-Scale Voting Machine Inaccuracies</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inexplicable Vote Switching and Vote Surges In Favor of Biden</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Wide-Spread Evidence  * = Some Evidence

Large-Scale Voting Machine Inaccuracies

Much has been made about the shadowy genesis of a company called Dominion which provides voting machines and equipment to 28 states. According to critics, Dominion’s roots may be traced to an effort by the Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez to rig his sham elections. Dominion is also alleged to have ties to the Clinton Foundation, while the Smartmatic software used in the Dominion machines is alleged to have links to the shadowy anti-Trump globalist financier George Soros.

The controversy swirling over Dominion and Smartmatic notwithstanding, one of the biggest problems with machine inaccuracies may be traced to a company called Agilis. Nevada election officials in Clark County, a Democrat stronghold in Nevada, used Agilis signature verification machines to check over 130,000 mail-in ballot signatures.

According to a court case filed in the First Judicial District Court in Carson City, the Agilis machines used a “lower image quality than suggested by the manufacturer.” Clark County Election Department officials also lowered the accuracy rate below the manufacturer’s recommendations, making the whole verification process unreliable.
In a test run, it was proven that, at the manufacturer’s setting, the Agilis machine already had a high tolerance for inaccuracies—as high as 50% non-matching. In other words, half of the ballots that might be moved through the machine would be impossible to verify; and Clark County officials lowered that threshold even further.\textsuperscript{115}

As a final comment on this case, there is also the broader legal matter that the Agilis machines were used to “entirely replace signature verification by election personnel.” This is contrary to Nevada state law.

As noted in a court case: “In violation of Nevada law, the Clark County Election Department allows the Agilis machine to solely verify 30% of the signatures accompanying the mail-in ballots without ever having humans inspect those signatures.”\textsuperscript{116}

A similar problem has been alleged in a court filing in Arizona with a software known as the Novus 6.0.0.0. In cases where ballots were too damaged or illegible to be read by vote tabulation machines, Novus was used in an attempt to cure or restore the ballots. The system would do so by trying to read the applicable scans of the original rejected ballots. However, as noted in a court case filed by Kelli Ward, Chairwoman of the Arizona Republican Party: “the software was highly inaccurate, and it often flipped the vote.”\textsuperscript{117}

**Inexplicable Vote Switching and Vote Surges In Favor of Biden**

As a further complication to the Novus software problem in Arizona referenced above, the software was not only highly inaccurate. According to observers, and as an example of inexplicable vote switching, “the software would erroneously prefill ‘Biden’ twice as often as it did ‘Trump.’”\textsuperscript{118}

At least one instance of a large and inexplicable vote switching and vote surge in favor of Joe Biden took place in Antrim County, Michigan – and it is associated with the controversial aforementioned Dominion-Smartmatic voting machine hardware-software combo.\textsuperscript{119} In this Republican stronghold, 6,000 votes were initially, and incorrectly, counted for Joe Biden. The resulting vote totals were contrary to voter registration and historical patterns and therefore raised eyebrows. When a check was done, it was discovered that the 6,000 votes were actually for Donald J. Trump.

A subsequent forensic audit of the Antrim County vote tabulation found that the Dominion system had an astonishing error rate of 68 percent.\textsuperscript{120} By way of comparison, the Federal Election Committee requires that election systems must have an error rate no larger than 0.0008 percent.\textsuperscript{121}

Perhaps even more troubling given concerns over hackers and Dominion’s alleged ties to bad foreign actors, the records that would have allowed the detection of remote internet access went missing from the Antrim County system. This was in direct violation of Michigan state law,\textsuperscript{122} which requires retention of voting records for 22 months -- such information was in place for previous election years, but not this election. At the very least, the results of this audit indicates the need for further investigation of the Dominion system across other states in the country.
In Georgia, there were numerous "glitches" with the Dominion machines where the results would change. The most notable of these changes was a 20,000 vote surge for Biden and 1,000 vote decrease for Trump.123

VIII. Statistical Anomalies in the Six Battleground States

The 2020 presidential election appears to feature at least four types of statistical anomalies that raise troubling questions. Table 8 illustrates the incidence of these statistical anomalies across the six battleground states. As you can see from the table, Wisconsin and Georgia are characterized by the highest degree of statistical anomalies, with three of the four anomalies present. Nevada and Arizona show two anomalies present while Michigan has at least one. Let’s take a more granular look now at each of these types of statistical anomalies.

Table 8: Statistical Anomalies in the Battleground States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Statistical Anomalies in the Battleground States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARIZONA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Changes In Absentee Ballot Rejection Rates From Previous Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessively High Voter Turnout (at times exceeding 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistically Improbable Vote Totals Based on Party Registration &amp; Historical Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusual Vote Surges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dramatic Changes in Mail-in and Absentee Ballot Rejection Rates from Previous Elections

It is routine across the 50 states for mail-in-and absentee ballots to be rejected for any number of reasons. These reasons may include: the lack of a signature or adequate signature match, a late arrival past a deadline, the lack of an external envelope that verifies voter-identification (a naked ballot), or if voters provide inaccurate or incomplete information on the ballots.

In the 2020 presidential race, Joe Biden received a disproportionately high percentage of the mail-in and absentee ballots. Perhaps not coincidentally, we saw a dramatic fall in rejection rates in Pennsylvania, Nevada, and especially Georgia.
For example, in Nevada, the overall rejection rate dropped from 1.6% in 2016 to 0.58% in 2020. In Pennsylvania, the 2016 rejection rate of 1.0% dropped to virtually nothing at 0.28%. The biggest fall in the overall absentee ballot rejection rate came, however, in Georgia. Its rejection rate fell from 6.8% in 2016 to a mere 0.34% in 2020.

These dramatically lower rejection rates point to a conscious effort by Democrat election officials across these key battleground states to subject mail-in and absentee ballots to a lower level of scrutiny. That this kind of government conduct and gaming of our election system may have contributed to tipping the scales in favor of Joe Biden can be illustrated in this simple calculation:

In the 2020 race, Georgia election officials received 1,320,154 mail-in and absentee ballots. If these ballots had been rejected at the 2016 rate of 6.8% instead of the 2020 rate of 0.34%, there would have been 81,321 ballots rejected instead of the 4,489 ballots that were actually rejected.

Under the conservative assumption that 60% of these mail-in and absentee ballots went to Joe Biden, this dramatic fall in the rejection rate provided Joe Biden with an additional 16,264 votes. That’s more than the margin of the alleged Biden victory in Georgia.

Excessively High Voter Turnout (at times exceeding 100%)

When there are more ballots cast than registered or eligible voters, fraud has likely taken place. During the 2020 presidential election, excessively high voter turnout occurred across all six swing states.

In analyzing this problem, it is important to distinguish between states that have same-day registration and those that don’t. States with same-day registration can plausibly have voter turnout that is higher than 100%. However, is impossible for that to happen in states without same-day registration without fraud having taken place.

Consider, then, Arizona which does not allow same-day voter registration. According to testimony from an MIT-trained mathematician, Candidate Biden may have received a weighted 130% total of Democrat votes in Maricopa County to help him win the state due to an algorithm programmed into the Dominion voting machines used there.

Although Michigan does allow same-voter registration, voter turnout was still abnormally high. Here again, the Dominion voting system has been implicated. To wit:

Cybersecurity executive and former NASA analyst, Russ Ramsland, testified that in Wayne County, Michigan, where Dominion Voting Systems equipment was used, 46 out of 47 precincts in the county displayed greater than a 96% voter turnout. 25 out of those precincts showed a 100% voter turnout.
Wisconsin, which also allows same-day voter registration, also reported abnormally high voter turnout when compared to 2016 numbers. For example, Milwaukee reported a record 84% voter turnout during the 2020 presidential election versus 75% in 2016. Of the city’s 327 voting wards, 90 reported a turnout of greater than 90%. Statistically Improbable Vote Totals Based on Party Registration and Historical Patterns

The 2020 presidential election was characterized by strong partisan voting patterns consistent with historical patterns. As a rule, heavily Republican jurisdictions voted heavily for President Trump and heavily Democrat jurisdictions voted heavily for Joe Biden.

In some cases, however, there were instances where these partisan and historical patterns were violated. It is precisely in such instances where either outright fraud or machine inaccuracies or manipulations are most likely to be operative.

As one example of such statistically improbable vote totals, there are the results in Arizona’s Fifth Congressional District. In one precinct in the suburb of Queen Creek, the vote percent for President Trump dropped dramatically relative to 2016, from 67.4 to 58.5 percent. This was attributed to an “unusually high” number of duplicate ballots.

Unusual Vote Surges

Several unusual vote surges took place in the very early hours of the morning of November 4th in Georgia, Michigan, and Wisconsin. An analysis conducted by the Voter Integrity Project of The New York Times publicly reported data on Election Day that showed several vote “spikes” that were unusually large in size with unusually high Biden-to-Donald Trump ratios. Such spikes or surges could well indicate that fraudulent ballots had been counted.

In Georgia, for example, an update at 1:34 AM on November 4th showed 136,155 additional ballots cast for Joe Biden, and 29,115 additional votes cast for President Trump. An update in Michigan at 3:50 AM on November 4th showed an update of 54,497 additional votes cast for Joe Biden, and 4,718 votes cast for President Trump. And an update in Wisconsin at 3:42 AM on November 4th showed 143,379 additional ballots cast for Joe Biden, and 25,163 votes cast for President Trump.
IX. A State-By-State Analysis and Signal Failure of Our Legislative and Judicial Branches

All happy families are alike; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.

– Anna Karenina, by Leo Tolstoy

It should be clear at this point that all six battleground states suffer from most or all of the six dimensions of election irregularities documented in this report. However, like Tolstoy’s unhappy families, it is also true that each battleground state is different in its own election irregularity way. That is, each battleground state may be characterized by a unique mix of issues that, impressionistically, might be considered “most important” in swinging that state for Joe Biden.

Consider Arizona, a state with the lowest alleged Biden victory margin at 10,457 votes. This is a state with statistically improbable high voter turnouts in Maricopa and Pima counties; widespread ballot mishandling; and 1.6 million mail-in ballots (which tended towards Biden) subjected to much lower standards of certification and ID verification than in-person voters (who tended towards Trump).

In Georgia, the alleged Biden victory margin was just 11,779 votes. What perhaps jumps out most in the Peach State is the illegal Consent Decree that effectively gutted the signature match requirements for millions of mail-in ballots. There is also the quite unresolved fake ballot manufacturing matter of the roughly 100,000 ballots that were mysteriously pulled, in the dead of night, out from underneath tables and expeditiously tabulated. Of course, we saw that Georgia’s electoral version of a Three-card Monte sleight-of-hand led to a strong Biden vote surge.

Of all of the six battleground states which suffered from numerous observer and poll watcher abuses, Michigan must rank as “first among equals.” With its “board up the windows” and “rough up the observers” tactics, Detroit in Wayne County was the center of this “see no evil” universe. When two local Republican officials tried to withhold certification of the votes in this county for practices such as these and demanded an audit, they were subject to extreme intimidation and “doxing” and quickly capitulated.

As for Nevada, this is a state likewise with a very narrow alleged victory margin for Joe Biden – 33,596 votes. Here, voting machine irregularities associated with the Agilis machine have called into question as many as 130,000 votes. There may also be an unusually large number of ballots cast by out-of-state voters and others who did not meet residency requirements. Of course, the brazen bribery of Native Americans to vote for Joe Biden is a dark stain on the state and the Democrat Party.

In Pennsylvania, an equally brazen Democrat Secretary of State issued illegal guidance for the acceptance of naked ballots and ignored direction from the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to fix the matter. She allowed ballots to be illegally cured in contravention of state law and pushed the legal envelope for accepting ballots after Election Day.
In the Keystone State, and as with Georgia’s Three-card Monte, shuffle fake ballots out from underneath a table scandal, there is also the equally unresolved matter of possible fake ballot manufacturing. Recall, here, the testimony of a truck driver who swears he picked up as many as 100,000 fake manufactured ballots in New York and delivered them to Pennsylvania. Both the tractor-trailer and the ballots involved remain unaccounted for – and what might have been in this tractor-trailer were enough ballots alone to swing the election to Joe Biden.

Finally, in Wisconsin, the mother of all contestable process fouls is arguably that of the roughly 170,000 mail-in ballots entering the tabulation process under the guise of absentee ballots in clear violation of state law. That’s more than eight times the number of ballots of the alleged Biden victory margin of 20,682 votes.

In Wisconsin, there is likewise the large-scale abuse associated with an overly expansive definition of “indefinitely confined voters.” Recall here that the increment of new indefinitely confined voters in the 2020 election in Wisconsin was more than five times the alleged Biden victory margin.

****

While Democrat Party government officials cheated and gamed the electoral process across all six battleground states, many Republican government officials – from governors and state legislators to judges – did little or nothing to stand in their way.

Consider that the Republican Party controls both chambers of the State Legislatures in five of the six battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. These State Legislatures clearly have both the power and the opportunity to investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities presented in this report. Yet, wilting under intense political pressure, these politicians have failed in their Constitutional duties and responsibilities to do so – and thereby failed both their states and this nation as well as their party.

The same can be said for the Republican governors in two of the six battleground states – Arizona and Georgia. Both Arizona’s Doug Ducey and Georgia’s Brian Kemp have cowered in their Governor’s mansions and effectively sat on their hands while their states have wallowed in election irregularities.

The judicial branch of the American government should be the final backstop for the kind of issues examined in this report. Yet both our State courts and Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have failed the American people in refusing to properly adjudicate the election irregularities that have come before them. Their failures likewise pose a great risk to the American Republic.
Concluding Observations

From the findings of this report, it is possible to infer what may well have been a coordinated strategy to effectively stack the election deck against the Trump-Pence ticket. Indeed, the patterns of election irregularities observed in this report are so consistent across the six battleground states that they suggest a coordinated strategy to, if not steal the election, then to strategically game the election process in such a way as to unfairly tilt the playing field in favor of the Biden-Harris ticket.

A major part of this “stuff the ballot box” strategy has been aptly summarized in a complaint filed before the US Supreme Court by the State of Texas:

*Using the COVID-19 pandemic as a justification, [Democrat] government officials [in Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin] usurped their legislatures’ authority and unconstitutionally revised their state’s election statutes. They accomplished these statutory revisions through executive fiat or friendly lawsuits, thereby weakening ballot integrity.*

According to the Texas complaint – which the Supreme Court sadly refused to hear – the goal of this strategy was to flood the battleground states “with millions of ballots to be sent through the mails, or placed in drop boxes, with little or no chain of custody.” At the same time, Democrat government officials also sought to “weaken the strongest security measures protecting the integrity of the vote signature verification and witness requirements.”

The findings of the assessment conducted in this report are consistent with the Texas complaint. Key takeaways include:

- The weight of evidence and patterns of irregularities uncovered in this report are such that it is irresponsible for anyone – especially the mainstream media – to claim that there is “no evidence” of fraud or irregularities.

- The ballots that have come into question because of the identified election irregularities are more than sufficient to swing the outcome in favor of President Trump should even a relatively small portion of these ballots be ruled illegal.

- While all six battleground states exhibit most, or all, six dimensions of election irregularities, each state has a unique mix of issues that might be considered “most important.” To put this another way, all battleground states are characterized by the same or similar election irregularities; but, like Tolstoy’s unhappy families, each battleground state is different in its own election irregularity way.

- This was theft by a thousand cuts across six dimensions and six battleground states rather than any one single “silver bullet” election irregularity.
• In refusing to investigate a growing number of legitimate grievances, the anti-Trump media and censoring social media are complicit in shielding the American public from the truth. This is a dangerous game that simultaneously undermines the credibility of the media and the stability of our political system and Republic.

• Those journalists, pundits, and political leaders now participating in what has become a Biden Whitewash should acknowledge the six dimensions of election irregularities and conduct the appropriate investigations to determine the truth about the 2020 election. If this is not done before Inauguration Day, we risk putting into power an illegitimate and illegal president lacking the support of a large segment of the American people.

• The failure to aggressively and fully investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities assessed in this report is a signal failure not just of our anti-Trump mainstream media and censoring social media but also of both our legislative and judicial branches.

  o Republican governors in Arizona and Georgia together with Republican majorities in both chambers of the State Legislatures of five of the six battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin\textsuperscript{148} – have had both the power and the opportunity to investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities presented in this report. Yet, wilting under intense political pressure, these politicians have failed in their Constitutional duties and responsibilities to do so – and thereby failed both their states and this nation as well as their party.

  o Both State courts and Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have failed the American people in refusing to appropriately adjudicate the election irregularities that have come before them. Their failures pose a great risk to the American Republic.

• If these election irregularities are not fully investigated prior to Inauguration Day and thereby effectively allowed to stand, this nation runs the very real risk of never being able to have a fair presidential election again – with the down-ballot Senate races scheduled for January 5 in Georgia an initial test case of this looming risk.
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To: William Barr / Jeffrey Rosen, 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.
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Every Legal Vote Coalition
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENCLOSEMENT 1</th>
<th>SAMPLE OF FRAUD STORIES SUBMITTED TO EVERYLEGALVOTE.COM FROM AZ &amp; MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENCLOSEMENT 1</td>
<td>Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ &amp; MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE</td>
<td>LASTNAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAME</strong></td>
<td><strong>LASTNAME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LASTNAME</th>
<th>FIRSTNAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>VOTED</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>555-1234</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jsmith@email.com">jsmith@email.com</a></td>
<td>123 Main St, Anytown, AZ</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENCLOSURE 1**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LASTNAME</th>
<th>FIRSTNAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>VOTED</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>555-4321</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbrown@email.com">jbrown@email.com</a></td>
<td>456 Oak St, Anytown, MI</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>FRAMES TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>SKYRITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>WESTAPLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>MAIL BALLOTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>MAIL BALLOTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>SKYRITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Youngtown</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>SHAPES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>SHAPES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>SHAPES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>SHAPES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My name is Fernando. I live in the city of Tempe, Arizona. I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. During the 2020 election cycle, I noticed an unusual number of mail-in ballots being processed in my area. I immediately reported this to the election authorities and they confirmed that there was indeed a problem.

I am a member of the Arizona election board. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.

I am a member of the Arizona State Bar. I have observed a number of irregularities in the vote-counting process. In particular, I have noticed that some ballots were not being counted correctly. I have also observed that some ballots were being counted more than once.

As a member of the Arizona State Bar, I have a responsibility to ensure that the election process is fair and just. I urge everyone to report any irregularities that they observe to the proper authorities.
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ENCLOSURE 1

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>LASTNAME</th>
<th>FIRSTNAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sample@sample.com">sample@sample.com</a></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>123-456-7890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE | COUNTY | FAUX TYPE |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>WAYNE</td>
<td>DOMINATION MACHINES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am forwarding this email to you because I believe the information contained herein is important. The information in this email was provided by a reader of EveryLegalVote.com who is a resident of Wayne County, Michigan.

The reader provided the following information:

- **Title:** Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI
- **Source:** EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
- **Page:** 9

The email contains several paragraphs of text that describe fraudulent activities observed during the election process in Wayne County, Michigan. The text includes details about vote counting machines, potential ballot tampering, and other activities that are alleged to have occurred during the election.

The reader believes that the information contained in the email is important for understanding the potential fraud that occurred during the election.

I, [Your Name], have reviewed the information provided by the reader and believe that it is relevant to our investigation.

[Additional comments or questions]

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Contact Information]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENCLOSEMENT 1: Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ &amp; MI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- **EveryLegalVote.com** - A Citizens Coalition
- **Page 10**

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:User01@gmail.com">User01@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>123-456-7890</td>
<td>Michigan election overhaul makes the issue of election official...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The explanation was that 153,739 votes were cast in Michigan, but only 153,739 ballots were counted. It turned out that for every vote received by the Michigan State Officials, there was a vote that was not counted. The purpose of this is to ensure that all votes are counted and that the democratic process is followed. The Michigan election overhaul is a significant step towards ensuring that the democratic process is followed and that all votes are counted. This is an important step towards ensuring that the democratic process is followed and that all votes are counted.

---

**ENCLOSURE 1**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:User02@gmail.com">User02@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>123-456-7890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The explanation was that 153,739 votes were cast in Michigan, but only 153,739 ballots were counted. It turned out that for every vote received by the Michigan State Officials, there was a vote that was not counted. The purpose of this is to ensure that all votes are counted and that the democratic process is followed. The Michigan election overhaul is a significant step towards ensuring that the democratic process is followed and that all votes are counted. This is an important step towards ensuring that the democratic process is followed and that all votes are counted.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>1ST THUMB</th>
<th>TESTIMONY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>FRAD TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gmail.com</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>12345</td>
<td>67899</td>
<td>I found a dead voter on the street and called the police. They confirmed it was a dead person.</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>DEAD VOTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mail.com</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>98765</td>
<td>45678</td>
<td>My vote was stolen by a stranger who barged into my home while I was voting.</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>DEAD VOTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email.com</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>56789</td>
<td>23456</td>
<td>I received a ballot in the mail but never submitted one.</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>DEAD VOTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email2.com</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>78901</td>
<td>32109</td>
<td>I was registered to vote but never received a ballot.</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>DEAD VOTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gmail.com</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>10987</td>
<td>65432</td>
<td>I was registered but never voted.</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Maricopa</td>
<td>DEAD VOTERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enclosure 1**

ENCLOSURE 1

Sample of Fraud Stories Submitted to EveryLegalVote.com from AZ & MI
Enclosure 1

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>TESTIMONY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mail.com</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>555-1234</td>
<td>I received a phone call from John Jackson saying he was the elected representative to the Arizona legislature and he wanted to discuss my ballot and the ballot fraud in Arizona. I asked him to send me a receipt and he stopped calling me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email.com</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>555-5678</td>
<td>I received an email from Sanders saying he was the elected representative to the Michigan legislature and he wanted to discuss my ballot and the ballot fraud in Michigan. I asked him to send me a receipt and he stopped calling me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone.com</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>555-9876</td>
<td>I received a phone call from Thompson saying he was the elected representative to the Michigan legislature and he wanted to discuss my ballot and the ballot fraud in Michigan. I asked him to send me a receipt and he stopped calling me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition

Page 13
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/](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 then 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.
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 CoHo 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.
ENCLOSURE 3

Five States and The Election Irregularities and Issues - December 8, 2020

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.
Infographic: What Happened in Atlanta on Election Night

BY PETR SVAB  December 1, 2020 Updated December 9, 2020
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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...

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 illegals. 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.

---

** 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 packs 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 the new rule. County spokeswoman Jessica Corbitt declined to answer questions posed by The Epoch Times for this article.

---

** 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 records request about the burst pipe only received a brief text message exchange about the incident, describing it as "highly exaggerated...a slow leak" 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.

---

** 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 filed 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 Wanda "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 Pierrot 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/absentee ballots the county received.”
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 in it 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. Ranton agreed with this.
description, saying the workers who were removing absentee ballots from the outer envelopes had mostly stopped working by that point.

The monitors were tasked by the local Trump campaign field organizer to find out how many ballots were processed and how many were left. They asked county spokesperson Regina Waller, who was on site, about this, but she didn’t get them an answer, so they eventually left shortly after 10:30 p.m., they said.

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 top, and one man in a black jacket.

The monitors indicated they were under the impression that work at the arena had concluded. Cobbett, the county spokeswoman, 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 two citizens 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 paper 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 takes stacks of paper out of it. Freeman then starts placing the stacks on another scanner.

At one point, it appears that 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 a light blue top 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, with some help from one of the women in yellow, takes stacks of paper out of it and starts scanning them at another machine.

Edison Research election results feed data published by The New York Times show that between 11:15 p.m. and 12:03 a.m. Fulton County added 46,442 votes to its tally, about 21 percent for Trump. All of them were early-voting ballots. Edison also provided state-level vote count updates but didn’t specify where the votes in individual updates came from, and no up-to-date numbers were provided for midnight when the votes matched 46,442.

Its possible the Fulton batch was split into two updates—one of 22,355 votes 12:14 a.m., of which 28 to 63 percent were for Biden, and an update of 23,487 votes at 12:18 a.m., of which 98 to 100 percent were for Biden. These two add up to 46,842.

Overall, about 29 percent of the early vote in the county went to Trump.

The available security footage continues at 12:50 a.m., when the workers are no longer manning the scanners and appear to be wrapping up.

All at 12:53 a.m., only Moss is left in the room. The footage then jumps to about 1:41 a.m., when three people are seen coming in. One seems to be vacuuming, but the three left again within three minutes.
ENCLOSURE 4
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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, Trevin McKay, 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 State Farm Arena with ballots.”

OFFICIALS RESPOND

The available footage doesn’t show the exact moment the boxes, are 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 majority of the staff left, but from the information we have processing area was never closed to observers,” she said.

A Georgia secretary of state spokesperson said in a statement that its “Investigator” and an “Independent monitor appellate the State Election Board ... both observed scanning until it was halted for the night around midnight.” Newsmax reported.

It’s not clear who the monitor and investigator were, as the shows only five people in the room at certain times, one of whom was Moss, while the other four were engaged in the scanning.

Sterling also acknowledged that there was an “82-minute” period when no monitor was present.
Our Republican observers and members of the news media departed State Farm when they announced they were shutting down for the night and would resume counting at 8:30 a.m. the next day.

David Shafer, chairman, Georgia Republican Party

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
DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1207338110 - Source: PubMed
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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 elections 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]. 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 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 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 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 2. With probability 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 . Figure 3 compares the observed and modeled fingerprint plots for the winning parties in Russia, Uganda and Switzerland. Model results are shown for and (fair elections) and for best fits to the data (see SOM) for and . To describe the smearing from the main peak to the upper right corner, an incremental fraud probability around is needed for the case of . This means fraud in about 64% of the districts. In the second peak around the 100% turnout scenario there are roughly districts with a 100% of votes for . Representing an electorate of more than two million people. Best fits yield , 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 3. The fraud parameters for the data in figure 3 are and .

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 edfs 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 \( f_i = f_r = 0 \)). 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.

It can be said with almost certainty that an election does not represent the will of the people, if a substantial fraction (\( f_i \)) 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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FIG. 4. The ballot stuffing mechanism can be visualized by considering the cumulative number of votes as a function of turnout. Each country's election winner is represented by a curve which typically takes the shape of a sigmoid function reaching a plateau. In contrast to the other countries, Russia and Uganda do not tend to develop this plateau but instead show a pronounced increase (boost) close to complete turnout. Both irregularities are indicative of the two ballot stuffing modes being present.

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 \( \bar{a} = 1/n \sum (V_i/N_i) \) with standard deviation \( \sigma_a \), the mean fraction of votes \( \bar{v} \) for the winning party is \( \bar{v} = 1/n \sum v_i \) with standard deviation \( \sigma_v \). 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 \( a_i \) 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 \( \sigma_v^L \) (\( \sigma_v^R \)) from \( v \) is introduced. \( \sigma_v^R \) 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 peak in the election fingerprints, see figure 1 in the main text. The larger \( \sigma_v^R \), the more inflated the vote results due to urn stuffing, in contrast to \( \sigma_v^L \) which quantifies the scatter of the voters' actual preferences. They can be estimated from the data by

\[
\sigma_v^L = \sqrt{\langle (v_i - v)^2 \rangle_{v_i < v}}, \tag{1}
\]

\[
\sigma_v^R = \sqrt{\langle (v_i - v)^2 \rangle_{v_i > v}}. \tag{2}
\]

Similarly the extreme fraud width \( \sigma_x \) can be estimated, i.e. the width of the peak around 100% votes. We found that \( \sigma_x = 0.075 \) 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.](image)

![FIG. 2. A stylized version of an empirical vote distribution function shows how \( v \), \( \sigma_v^L \), \( \sigma_v^R \) and \( \sigma_x \) are derived from the election results. \( v \) is the maximum of the distribution function. \( \sigma_v^L \) measures the distribution width of values to the left of \( v \), i.e. smaller than \( v \). The incremental fraud width with \( \sigma_v^R \) measures the distribution width of values to the right of \( v \), i.e. larger than \( v \). The extreme fraud width \( \sigma_x \) is the width of the peak at 100% votes.](image)
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 \( f_v \) and \( f_e \), 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_v )</th>
<th>( f_e )</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 ± 0.00</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bmi.gov.at/cms/BMI_wahlen/nationalrat/start">http://www.bmi.gov.at/cms/BMI_wahlen/nationalrat/start</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>parliament (2011)</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>0.70 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.17 ± 0.10</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td><a href="http://pxweb2.stat.fi/databse/StatFin/vsa/evsa/Eduusk">http://pxweb2.stat.fi/databse/StatFin/vsa/evsa/Eduusk</a></td>
<td></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>0.31 ± 0.01</td>
<td><a href="http://ciikr.ru/">http://ciikr.ru/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>parliament (2007)</td>
<td>96172</td>
<td>0.70 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.04</td>
<td><a href="http://ciikr.ru/">http://ciikr.ru/</a></td>
<td></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>0.04 ± 0.05</td>
<td><a href="http://ciikr.ru/">http://ciikr.ru/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>parliament (2008)</td>
<td>8112</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.60 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.00 ± 0.00</td>
<td><a href="http://www.infoelectoral.mir.es/">http://www.infoelectoral.mir.es/</a></td>
<td></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>0.05 ± 0.00</td>
<td><a href="http://www.portal-stat.admin.ch/nrz/files/data/01b2.xml">http://www.portal-stat.admin.ch/nrz/files/data/01b2.xml</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>president (2014)</td>
<td>23968</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.15</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.20</td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.01</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ec.or.ug/results.html">http://www.ec.or.ug/results.html</a></td>
<td></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 ± 0.00</td>
<td><a href="http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/elections/results">http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/elections/results</a></td>
<td></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 ± 0.00</td>
<td><a href="http://nationalatlas.gov/atlaspdf.html#eldisp">http://nationalatlas.gov/atlaspdf.html#eldisp</a></td>
<td></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 ± 0.00</td>
<td><a href="http://nationalatlas.gov/atlaspdf.html#eldisp">http://nationalatlas.gov/atlaspdf.html#eldisp</a></td>
<td></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 S1. 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>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (2010)</td>
<td>0.8</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>

Intensions reasonably well. For a visualization of \( \sigma_{\nu}^2 \), \( \sigma_{\bar{\nu}}^2 \) and \( \sigma_{\bar{v}} \) see figure S2.

While \( f_v \) and \( f_e \) measure how many districts incremental and extreme fraud occur, \( \sigma_{\nu}^2 \) and \( \sigma_{\bar{v}} \) quantify how intense these activities are, if they occur. To get an estimate for the width of the distribution of turnout often the model is specified by the following parameter \( \alpha > 0 \). For \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) the winning candidate is prevalent. In the following \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma) \) 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 \( i \), \( \alpha_i^{(m)} \), is \( \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma) \).
- A fraction of \( \nu_i^{(m)} \in \mathcal{N}(\nu, \sigma_{\nu}^2) \) people vote for the winning party.
- With probability \( f_v \) incremental fraud takes place. In this case the district is assigned a fraud intensity \( x_i \in \mathcal{N}(0, \sqrt{\sigma_{\nu}^2}) \). 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, \( (1 - \alpha_i^{(m)})N_i \), which are added to the winning party. Votes for the opposition are wrong counted for the winning party with a rate \( x_i^2 \) (where \( \alpha \) is an exponent). To summarize, if incremental fraud takes place the winning party receives \( N_i \left( \alpha_i^{(m)} + x_i (1 - \alpha_i^{(m)}) + x_i^2 (1 - \nu_i^{(m)}) \right) \) votes.
- With probability \( f_e \) extreme fraud takes place. In this case opposition votes are canceled and added to the winning party with probability \( y_i \in 1 - \mathcal{N}(1, \sigma) \) (i.e. the above with \( y_i \) replacing \( x_i \)).
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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 \( f_e = 0.51, f_r = 0.01 \) (2003), \( f_e = 0.50, f_r = 0.04 \) (2007) and \( f_e = 0.64, f_r = 0.05 \) (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, \( f_i \) 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 \( pdf(v_i^{(m)}) \) is calculated for each set of \( (f_i, f_e, \alpha) \) values where \( f_i, f_e \in \{0, 0.01, 0.02, \ldots \}, \alpha \in \{0, 0.1, \ldots, 5\} \). We report values for the fraud parameters where the statistic

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

assumes its minimum, see Table I for \( f_i \) 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 \( f_i \) is not close to zero, say \( f_i > 0.1 \). 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 \( f_i \) 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 \( f_i \) 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. 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 Michigan 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=KIIJ46HdqKg&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 [https://EpochTimes.com Wisconsin Lawmakers Seeking to Figure Out Whether Nov. 3 Election Was Fair and Accurate](https://EpochTimes.com Wisconsin Lawmakers Seeking to Figure Out Whether Nov. 3 Election Was Fair and Accurate)

Vote Irregularities in Pennsylvania and Georgia: Data Expert [The Epoch Times.com Vote Irregularities in Pennsylvania and Georgia: Data Expert](The Epoch Times.com Vote Irregularities in Pennsylvania and Georgia: Data Expert)
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 G 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/lkCzLr981u0HBM/#_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/graphs/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 moved 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_link f_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-CzhylnJtgND4gTViGtbSH3VSlVlyuqCHNVwICbbzW9MyQgkDFQ

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?
ENCLOSURE 10

Non-State Actor Influence Example - Open Society Foundation (Geo ge Soros)

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.

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

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

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.
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.

![2013 Budget Goals and Background Public Sphere](chart.png)
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=IwAR0uTML0i9p9jMcu3YKdrZedn-9YAvT17RGY2AKHM2IUBBSo8FqB8tWTHH8

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_even_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>State/County</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.time.com/2018/03/20/george-soros-buys-state-attorneys/">https://www.time.com/2018/03/20/george-soros-buys-state-attorneys/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armin Ayala</td>
<td>State Attorney</td>
<td>Orange &amp; Chocula counties</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nationalreview.com/2018/05/george-soros-derails-legislation/">https://www.nationalreview.com/2018/05/george-soros-derails-legislation/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rula Bilberry</td>
<td>Running for DA</td>
<td>Loudoun, Virginia</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td><a href="https://www.dailyjournal.org/2018/06/15/liberal-virginia-prosecutor-investigation/">https://www.dailyjournal.org/2018/06/15/liberal-virginia-prosecutor-investigation/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesa Brooten</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><a href="https://www.sfgate.com/politics/article/Soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/">https://www.sfgate.com/politics/article/Soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve Jones 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/2018/06/30/soros-aimed-at-los-angeles/">https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/2018/06/30/soros-aimed-at-los-angeles/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Holshouser</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Delaware County</td>
<td>$95,000.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><a href="https://capitalresearch.org/article/soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/">https://capitalresearch.org/article/soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Gonzales</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>Bexar County, Texas</td>
<td>$68,000.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/2018/04/26/soros-aimed-at-los-angeles/">https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/2018/04/26/soros-aimed-at-los-angeles/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Brakos</td>
<td>State Attorney</td>
<td>Chicago, Cook County</td>
<td>$1,050,000.00</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/08/15/soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/">https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/08/15/soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Ogg</td>
<td>District Attorney ****</td>
<td>Harris County, Texas</td>
<td>$858,000.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><a href="https://www.houstonchronicle.com/politics/article/Soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/">https://www.houstonchronicle.com/politics/article/Soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Link: https://blogg.com/2020/08/31/list-of-soros-backed-district-attorneys/  

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

The U.S. Supreme Court, political, cultural and judicial activism –  

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

---

**Insight and capacity:** OSEPI will team up with OSIFE to run a two-level strategy to reduce the number of opponents of the open society who get elected. While OSIFE works on local campaigns to turn out the vote, OSEPI will engage pan-European parties to influence their manifestos and campaigning tactics. Many EU countries have electoral lists for European elections, so a small increase in turnout can reduce dramatically the representation that extremist parties win. Through its Foresight Program, OSEPI has created compelling data and analysis that is waking politicians and campaign managers of liberal parties from complacency. We will highlight dangers in key constituencies; use our research network to develop social media tools to support election campaigning in favour of pluralism and diversity; show politicians and officials how to frame open society concerns in ways that majority populations can identify with; and work with other OSF programs (particularly OSIFE and RIO) to make these tools available to grantees. After the 2014 election, we will caucus MEPs and officials to limit the ability of xenophobic and anti-system parties

---

**IV. Countering Xenophobia in the European election campaigns and in the EU institutions over their 2014-19 term**

OSEPI commissioned research (with OSIFE) ahead of the European election to monitor online debate and analyse discrepancies between ‘elite’ rhetoric and the larger public. The papers explored the reasons for support for xenophobic populist parties, and the implications of a substantial increase of xenophobic populist MEPs for the EU institutions. They were discussed during a lunch with Herman van Rompuy in April, and a dinner debate with the Polish Permanent Representation in May. The final pilot on challenging hate speech in the parliament was held in April and received support from MEPs. The project has informed ongoing OSF discussions on how to challenge hate speech in Europe. OSEPI commissioned a briefing paper on how to set-up and manage an effective intergroup in the European Parliament, with a view to encouraging an effective Anti-Racism and Discrimination Intergroup.

---

**3. Shared Frameworks**

**Drones:** Martin has held several exploratory meetings with EU officials and experts on drones. He participated in a

---

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.

**Not Shocking: George Soros Funds Progressive War on Israel**

The billionaire's agenda is to destroy the Jewish state.

By Abraham H. Miller - 08/07/2016 12:39pm

Link: [https://observer.com/2016/08/not-shocking-george-soros-funds-progressive-war-on-israel/](https://observer.com/2016/08/not-shocking-george-soros-funds-progressive-war-on-israel/)

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

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)
EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Executive Order on Imposing Certain Sanctions in the Event of Foreign Interference in a United States Election

Issued on: September 12, 2018

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 any 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 may 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=click&event=2WFy7fTEmb1B1p2D0mYeXt2D0mWbGluZ2lkPW9uMTppMDE5Ljk2OWkiWjQuIjY4NzBvZ2D1NTE2UUEJLUV7D0YMDExMTRAOG4SNQ5MDY0M1ZkXQ&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=ZWFMzPTEmbxNzcZDWmXXYpZD0mbWFpbGlzb28kPTwvMDE5LjktN3kwaXJlc3NhZ2VpZD10REhUVEJEUVTCoYMD4NjQ5MDY0MSZk) or visit the FBI’s webpage on combating foreign influence (http://links.govdelivery.com/track?type=click&enid=ZWFzPTEmbXNpZD0mYXYpZD0mbWFpbGlzb28kPTwvMDE5LjktN3kwaXJlc3NhZ2VpZD10REhUVEJEUVTCoYMD4NjQ5MDY0MSZk influence)
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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/13368884545338428418

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. Significantly, 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 the School Board Member for Central Lake Schools (3) votes]
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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]:


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://rcmich.org/publications/statewide-ballot-proposal-20-1-michigan-natural-resources-trust-fund](https://rcmich.org/publications/statewide-ballot-proposal-20-1-michigan-natural-resources-trust-fund)

12. A Proposed Initiated **Ordinance to Authorize One (1) Marijuana (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](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 issued 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].
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 caused 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.

![RCV Profile screen](image)

Figure 11-3: RCV Profile screen

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]:

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
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]:

EveryLegalVote.com - A Citizens Coalition
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]:

---
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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.
10. 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
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12/07/20 18:52:30] Files skipped: 64799
12/07/20 18:52:30] Files filtered: 0
12/07/20 18:52:30] Emails indexed: 0
12/07/20 18:52:30] Unique words found: 5325413
12/07/20 18:52:30] Variant words found: 3597634
12/07/20 18:52:30] Total words found: 23946085
12/07/20 18:52:30] Avg. unique words per page: 33.43
12/07/20 18:52:30] Peak physical memory used: 2949 MB
12/07/20 18:52:30] Peak virtual memory used: 8784 MB
12/07/20 18:52:30] Errors: 10149

Dated: December 13, 2020

Russell Ramsland