


PART I of A SPECIAL REPORT on the 2020 Presidential Election Results

First Edition



“No, You have not gone crazy in thinking something just is NOT RIGHT about the 2020 Presidential Election Results. And you are NOT a conspiracy-theorist for possibly believing the election was ‘rigged’ and there was coordinated fraud involved. Here is the evidence, in a handy and concise format, that you need to know and share with others.”

Author: Billy Parker

Date of Report: July 16, 2021 (rev 8-19-21)

Available Through: ForFreeAndFairElections.com

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>Credentials and Acknowledgments</i> | <i>III</i> |
| <i>Comments from a Past President</i> | <i>IV</i> |
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 2 Voter “Fraud” | 4 |
| Chapter 3 Mail-in Voting | 8 |
| Chapter 4 Switching of Votes | 12 |
| Chapter 5 Other Studies | 17 |
| Chapter 6 Comparison of Studies | 22 |
| Chapter 7 Role of Media and Big Tech | 27 |
| Chapter 8 Some Final Thoughts | 30 |
| Appendix | 35 |
| End Notes | 36 |

Credential and Acknowledgments

I have an undergraduate Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration, with a concentration in Finance from **East Carolina University** (ECU) in Greenville, NC in the year 1984. My first 2 ½ years of this 4 year degree were spent at **North Carolina State University** (NCSU) in Raleigh, NC. In my professional life, I worked as a real estate appraiser for the **Birch Appraisal Group** in Raleigh, NC. In more recent years, I have gone into the marketing and promotional business, mainly to do with collegiate apparel; but of late, it has been all politically related.

My forte is numbers. One of the few “A’s” that I made in college was in statistics. All the anomalies in the 2020 Presidential Election concerned me greatly, leading me to believe the election was rigged and fraudulent. This atrocity is likely the biggest scandal in American History. It must NOT remain covered up. It must be exposed and thus the purpose of this Special Report.

While this is a partisan matter, I really strived to produce an “objective” report. I want to reach out and give acknowledgement and thanks to all those individuals as well as organizations that made this Special Report possible. Just some of these identities include the following in alphabetical order:

2020ElectionIrregularities.com

ABC News – This Week

CBS News – 60 Minutes

Commission on Federal Election Reform

Ben Turner at Fraud Spotters

Federal Election Commission

FOX News

Glenn Beck – Radio and BlazeTV.com

John Solomon – Just the News

Maria Bartiromo – Sunday Morning Futures

NPR – National Public Radio

Quinn Scanlan of ABC News

Peter Navarro – Trump Administration

(Dr.) Robert Epstein – AIBRT.org

Russell Ramsland, Jr. of Allied Security Operations Group – Antrim, MI Forensics Report

Statistical Team of Jared Black, Ray Blehar, Tony Cox, Tom Davis, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steven Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al

The Epoch Times

The Heritage Foundation

Tucker Carlson – Tucker Carlson Tonight

U.S. Census Bureau

Witness Testimony at U.S. Senate Hearing, Dec. 16, 2020

I want to give a special thanks to the website of **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**. They have done a tremendous job of digging into details of the 2020 election. They are referenced throughout this Special Report as a credible source of information. They have done a thorough and comprehensive study and have made available to the American public information of election fraud with the following categories of **Statistical Anomalies, Voting Machine, Mail-in Fraud, Suspicious Conduct, Misconceptions, Reports**, and **Videos** relating to the 2020 election.

I want to also single out and give special thanks to a certain **group of unpaid volunteers** – mainly a team of statisticians, who have published numerous reports involving the 2020 election. This group’s main interest is in *“assuring election integrity when American citizens legally express their preferences for their representatives.”* This group of people are “contributors” to various reports. The names include Jared Black, Ray Blehar, Tony Cox, Tom Davis, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steven Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al. While not all worked on each one of the group’s published reports, individuals contributed their time to the reports that involve their area of knowledge and expertise. Some of the reports that this group has published and will be referenced in this Special Report include the following:


- **2020 Presidential Election Startling Vote Spikes (rev 1-6-21)**
- **2020 Presidential Election Contrast Analysis (US and 48 States)**
- **Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 2-27-21)**

Comments from A Past President

Ronald Reagan, our 40th President, is famous for making the following statement:

“Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn’t pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children’s children what it was once like in the United States where men were free.”

We should never, never forget these words!



To Defend Freedom . . .

“We mutually pledge to each other our Lives,
our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.”



Billy Parker

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

This is Part I of a three (3) part series investigating the 2020 Presidential Election:

Part I involves defining Voter Fraud; taking a look at some of the “other” more insightful reports regarding the election; and then comparing these reports to one another as well as to other data sources in order to come to a specific conclusion about the 2020 election.

Part II is an examination of the 2020 election at the macro level. This involves a discussion that centers on the “American Political Pendulum” and how inconsistent (a real statistical anomaly) the 2020 election was as compared to other elections in the modern era of American Politics. We shall discover what happened in 2020 just does not happen unless something nefarious is taking place.

And **Part III** (not yet fully written) in this series of Special Reports will be an encyclopedia style report for each of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia – so you can look up and decide for yourself if there was (is) election fraud in your state.

But let me begin here by briefly telling how I came to this point of investigating and writing these reports on the 2020 Presidential Election.

Being on the frontline of the 2020 election, I instinctively knew something was wrong the day following November 3rd when the results then pointed to Joe Biden as the winner. You see, I’m in the marketing and promotional business. And for a couple of weeks leading up to the election, I was out in the field selling Donald Trump T-shirts. Of course I was targeting my business to people who would be for Trump, but I was also canvassing a cross-section of the population; and I could clearly tell ALL the energy was on Trump’s side. I ran into very few people who favored Joe Biden! The campaign rallies I witnessed on television also told a similar story.

We all saw it with our own eyes. When Donald Trump held campaign rallies, he attracted tens of thousands of people. Joe Biden, on the other hand, conducted a campaign mostly “from the basement of his home;” and when he did hold rallies, he was barely able to attract more than a handful of people. While Trump had his detractors, he championed successful domestic and foreign policies with his administration. Before Covid, he oversaw the strongest economy ever. By all possible measures, Trump was a successful president. It just wasn’t possible that Donald Trump didn’t win re-election. I immediately knew something wasn’t right about this picture!

In the days and weeks following the election, my eyes and ears were glued to the television and radio, trying to figure out what really happened. Conservative media aired many stories involving possible election fraud: For example, a City of Detroit worker swore she witnessed thousands of ballots being falsified; and nearly three quarters of Detroit’s precincts had mismatched voting totals. In Georgia, there were signed affidavits by people swearing they saw suspicious mail-in ballots, almost uniformly cast for Biden. The ballots were in pristine condition and had no creases on them, meaning the ballots had not been mailed in envelopes as required. In Pennsylvania, voters said their absentee votes weren’t counted or someone else requested their mail-in ballot. And numerous Republican poll observers in multiple states said they were improperly ejected and not allowed to watch the counting of votes, as required by law!

And how could we forget the story of Jesse Morgan, a truck driver who was working for a U.S. Postal Service subcontractor and had been instructed to transport, up to, an estimated 288,000 completed ballots across state lines. His truck-load of ballots went from Bethpage, New York to Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The truck (and ballots) then disappeared from a USPS depot in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, after Morgan dropped off the cargo and was instructed to leave.

These were only a small sampling of some of the election fraud stories I was hearing. While these individual cases were all quite disturbing, I found of particular interest were the stories involving statistical anomalies – things that just don’t happen during an American election. With my being a numbers type person, I could relate and understand these stories involving numbers. Many of the stories that I was hearing about anomalies and problems with voting machines were on the Glenn Beck Radio Program. Glenn seemed to cover this in detail going on for several months.

Believing the election was being “stolen,” I drove from where I reside here in Raleigh, North Carolina to Washington D.C. for the rally on January 6 to protest and to have my voice heard as a citizen. In fact, this is the reason that 99.9% of the people who attended the rally went to Washington on that day – just everyday patriotic citizens who wanted their voices heard on a very critical and crucial day in the political process, on the day of the Certification of the Electoral College Vote by Congress. We have all heard versions of what happened that day, but I was a personal witness to the events. I do not condone the violence that occurred – the break-in and trespassing of the United States Capitol Building. It should be noted however that the violence that did happen involved only a very small portion of the crowd, and I believe even the word “riot” is a bit extreme to describe the event. And the characterization of the event as an “insurrection” is insincere and frankly absurd. Nobody brought weapons nor did anybody there go with the intent to try to overthrow the government. If they had, one might think that they would have at least brought arms and weapons to overthrow the most powerful nation on earth, but they didn’t. There was no arrest for fire-arm violations. The only one person that day who actually got killed (at the hands of another person) was NOT any of the Capitol police, as previously had been (falsely) alleged; but rather, it was an unarmed patriot – Air Force veteran from San Diego, Ashli Babbitt. The mainstream media and those in the Democrat Party outright lie when they say it was an insurrection. Comparing it to 9-11 or the attack on Pearl Harbor is again absurd. I’ll give you a much more fitting analogy of what happened on January 6th. With my being an East Carolina University Alumni where we can get a bit rowdy, the event at the Capitol was like part of a crowd of ECU Pirates getting out of control at a football game after a major upset victory when we tear down the goalpost (just ask an NC State Alumni). Such fun and hoopla at the Capitol Building was not really a “riot;” but rather, it was a Tea Party event where just some of the Patriots got a little out-of-hand. Nancy Pelosi and those of her ilk have personally insulted and slandered me in calling me and others a “domestic terrorist.”

(While there have been many jailed as part of a huge nation-wide dragnet, we are now learning that some co-conspirators of the January 6th attacks have not been charged because they were undercover FBI agents. At least 20 organizers and participants of the violence appear to have been in contact with the FBI prior to the event. In essence, these people were agitators of the violence employed by the government.¹)

It took me a while to get over the January 6th event and try to get a proper perspective on things, especially with all the news stories – some being fabricated lies by the Media and Big Tech. Still, I was pretty upset about the election and determined to do something about the situation. January 20th was Inauguration Day; and on that same day, I sent an Open Letter to Glenn Beck requesting that he put all the election fraud evidence and anomalies that he covered on his radio programs into a file to be freely accessible on his website as well as to be available to the public. Well, I never heard back from Glenn Beck. Then in February, I (as a private citizen) began my own research and personal investigation into the anomalies and “fraud” of the 2020 Presidential Election results. It turned into a much bigger project than I ever imagined with endless hours of research and calculating of numbers. After months of reading reports and analyzing election results from every possible angle, this Part 1 of the Special Report series is the beginning odyssey into what I found.

And yes, I believe the 2020 election was rigged and there was mass voter fraud – widespread enough to impact the outcome and erase Joe Biden’s lead. We have all become familiar with the term “Battleground States,” the six states of Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin where the most egregious levels of fraud seem to have taken place. But I’m here to tell you, it was all over the nation; the Democrat Party played a full court press to try to get Donald Trump out of office. The vote manipulation was in states one might not expect like Maine, Missouri and Ohio. Democrats even attempted mass fraud in predominantly “Red” states such as Florida, Kentucky, Kansas, South Carolina, and Texas. Sure, most states didn’t experience suitcases of ballots dragged from beneath the table in the dead of night; but there seemed to be at least some level of “fraud” in nearly every state of the Union. And I believe the fraud has been building in our electoral system for decades, to where it is almost part of the bedrock and foundation in some states. This trend, I believe, began in the 1990s when foreign money began to infiltrate into political campaigns. Remember, there were numerous stories of the ChiComs (Chinese Communist) giving money to Bill Clinton in his 1996 re-election campaign. And in 2004, I have found election anomalies that indicate to me that John Kerry attempted mass voter manipulation to try to throw that election. The fraud just wasn’t mass and wide-spread enough to actually defeat George W. Bush; but I believe they tried. The Democrats hated Bush then as much as they hate Donald Trump now. I wouldn’t put anything past the Democrat Party. They have engaged in such nefarious activities in recent years that it makes Watergate seem like child’s play. In 2016, I believe the Democrats were so confident that they would win the election with Hillary Clinton that they didn’t really attempt a mass voter-fraud campaign in that election. But after that upset, they then had four long years to plot and plan.

This is a serious problem and undermines the foundation of our democracy. Election integrity is essential to a democratic-representative Republic. Citizens must be able to legally express their preferences for their representatives in order for such a Republic to survive. Voter fraud undermines everything that is sacred to our system and to Freedom itself. Without voter integrity and transparency, citizens become untethered from their government; and if things get bad enough, it will lead to a civil war.

Without meaningful reform, this will happen again – that is a promise. Some say that we can wait until the next election to straighten things out and that Donald Trump can simply run again in 2024. I say to that: Even if Trump gets 90% of the legitimate vote in 2024, he still loses – that is simply what happens when the system is rigged! If nothing is done about this situation, the Left will be only emboldened the next time around. They have already brazenly passed the H.R. 1 bill in the House of Representatives, under the leadership of Nancy Pelosi, to make mail-in balloting permanent – a system for easy cheating. I frankly don't believe we have four more years or even two years, for that matter. This is the reason I have stopped my business for making a living for myself in order to put all my energies, as a private citizen, to try to make a difference and to educate my fellow citizens with this series of Special Reports.

CHAPTER 2

Voter “Fraud”

We begin with a general discussion of Voter “Fraud.” Let’s start by asking ourselves the following questions:

- What is a precursor to finding fraud and/or what is one to look for?
- What is and isn’t actual voter fraud?
- What are the different types of voter fraud?

We will now attempt to answer these questions and examine some of the nefarious activities that took place in the 2020 election.

Statistical Anomalies:

A **statistical anomaly** is when the actual result, under a given set of assumptions, is different from the expected result. It is the extremely low chances or likelihood of an event happening on its own due to statistical data (i.e. past history) proving otherwise.

Statistical anomalies alone involving *voting results* are **not** proof of voter fraud but such circumstances can definitely point to situations that merit closer examination. And of course, significant anomalies in voting results, that cannot be explained by chance or likelihood, are usually strong indicators of vote manipulation and even “fraud.”

Statistics are a precursor to look for evidence; and such evidence includes eyewitness testimony and forensic analysis. While statistical-based evidence alone doesn’t prove something nefarious took place as with like the 2020 election results, it does add to other evidence and numerical coincidences that raises serious questions about election integrity.

There has been an array of evidence to give credence to the statistical anomalies found in the 2020 elections. Since November 3rd, there have been thousands of instances of citizens alleging voter fraud; and hundreds of these have become affidavits (sworn testimony) alleging voting irregularities which are available in public court dockets in a number of states across this great land. Many witnesses came to testify at a U.S. Senate Hearing on December 16, 2020 – mostly from the states of Pennsylvania, Nevada, and Wisconsin. And there have been legislature hearings into election fraud in the states of Arizona (Nov. 30), Georgia (Dec. 3 & 30), Michigan (Dec. 1 & 2), Pennsylvania (Nov. 25), and Wisconsin (Dec. 11). While these states grabbed the headlines, hearings also occurred in other states as well. In addition to the eyewitness accounts at these hearings, there have even been actual audits conducted in a few of the counties across the nation. These audits have provided solid forensic proof of vote manipulation.

As of January 24th 2021, there were a total of 81 court cases involving the 2020 election: In 45 cases, President Trump was the plaintiff; in 34 cases, Trump was not the plaintiff; in 2 cases, Trump was the defendant; and in 72 cases, illegal voting was alleged.² Some of these cases have since been dismissed, but Senator Rand Paul from Kentucky makes note that this does not nullify or disqualify that there wasn’t fraud. When being interviewed on “This Week” of ABC News, Senator Paul stated: “The debate over whether or not there was fraud should occur. We never had any presentation in court where we actually looked at the evidence. Most of the cases were thrown out for lack of standing, which is a procedural way of not actually hearing the question.”³

Statistical anomalies such as irregularities and inconsistencies in the 2020 Election happened at both the macro level (the nation at large) and at the micro level (individual cases state-by-state). Let’s consider just some of the actual anomalies reported in the news at these two levels:

1. “Sudden increases in votes (spikes) in the middle of the night in key swing states were found to favor Biden at extraordinarily improbable rates. Some states have more votes than people who voted. This series of highly unusual events raises the possibility — in our view, the probability — that it was not all just a series of coincidences but can instead be explained by fraud that must at least be thoroughly investigated.”⁴

2. “Republican House candidates won 27 out of the 27 races that were considered “toss-ups” by the New York Times, and it is extremely rare for an incumbent president to win seats in the house and lose re-election. No presidential incumbent in the past 100 years has increased his vote and lost re-election. No incumbent that has won over 75% of the primary vote (Trump received 94%) has ever lost re-election.”⁵
3. “Biden lost 18 of 19 bellwether counties[nationally], which predicted the winner of the presidential race every time since 1980. Biden got nearly 12 million more votes than President Obama did in 2008, yet he had fewer votes than Obama in 70.7% of counties (2,228 out of 3,152).”⁶
4. “In Michigan, Republican led Democrats 41% to 39% in both requested and returned mail-in ballots, yet after the final tally, Biden led Trump 69.1% to 29.6% in mail-in votes according to Edison data on the *New York Times* website.”⁷
5. Record Low Mail-in Ballot Rejection Rate: In past elections, a nationwide overall 1-2% of absentee ballots were rejected for errors, typically because a voter failed to sign their ballot’s envelope or because their signature didn’t match the one on file. If a voter didn’t fix the mistake, their ballot was deemed invalid. “In Pennsylvania, according to statistics on Ballotpedia, the rejection rate was 0.95% in 2016. It was 4.45% in 2018. But it dropped dramatically to just 0.28% in 2020. This drop is obviously irregular, unexpected, and absent a legitimate explanation.”⁸
 “In, Georgia, in 2016, the rejection rate was 6.42%; in 2018, it was 3.10%. But in the 2020 presidential election, it dropped dramatically to only 0.60%. Another battleground state, Nevada, also saw a record low rejection rate of 0.58%, down from 1.60% in 2016 and 2.05% in 2018.”⁹
6. Donald Trump made major in-roads into the Minority Vote with his economic policies, with nearly all Americans in every social-economic and racial groups seeing dramatic increases in income and standard of living. But consider the following:
 “Now a 95%-100% vote for any candidate can be taken as prima facia evidence of election malfeasance . . . Jewish Americans vote typically 80/20 Democrat/Republican. Black Americans vote typically 90/10 Dem/Rep. In 2020, the ratios are said to have moved more to Trump’s favor – 70/30 and 85/15 respectively.” But strangely in some areas and precincts controlled by the Democrat machine, the ratio was 95/5 – a highly unusual anomaly.¹⁰

Without a doubt, there is ample evidence, both with court dockets and statistical data that point to the need to further investigate for voter fraud in this past election.

Definition of Voter “Fraud”:

While investigating voter fraud in my home state of North Carolina, I received an email from a volunteer poll watcher citing what he considered to be voter “fraud.” While wishing to remain anonymous, this person is a highly credible source; I have known this individual for numerous years and know him to be an honest person. He writes to me as follow:

“Is it fraud when a woman brings in 6 guys from a halfway house who don't even know where they are, and takes them in to vote for President? (Biden, of course!) They were in there a short time, so the assumption is they only voted the top line.”

“That's where [name of the voting precinct] I observed this lady with my own eyes. . . If you were there, you would know what's really going on.”

“Another example is the buses that Dems bring in with folks from Senior Centers. The outside BOE guys give them their ballots and then step off the bus to wait. Meanwhile, the driver ‘helps’ them fill out the ballot. Again, if you were at the site, you would see the fraud. Then the buses cycle back around to another place to pick more seniors up. This is why Dems are so desperate to increase early voting hours, so they can run the buses full time. We don't do this for some reason, only Dems.”

Most precincts in America are within walking distance of one’s residence. I personally believe that if one can’t get to a polling place by their own inertia (walking or driving one’s own car) and presenting proper identification (at least 2 forms, with one being a picture ID), then I don’t think one deserves to be able to vote. I certainly don’t believe that political parties should be rounding up bus-loads of people and taking them to the polls. But as

disturbing as to what this poll watcher describes, I have to admit that this probably doesn't meet the legal definition of actual "fraud" – it certainly however pushes the envelope. This type of nefarious activity, I believe, happens in probably every state.

But, what exactly is voter "fraud"? To help answer this question, let's consider what the group of unpaid volunteers (referenced in the *Acknowledgment* section of the beginning of this Special Report) had to say about the matter. They published a report called, *Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 2-27-21)*. This team of mainly statisticians rarely uses the term "fraud" in describing irregularities, anomalies, and malfeasance involving voting results. Beginning on Page 3 of the *Critique*, they address the issue of "fraud" and choose to rarely use the term for two reasons:

1) Analysis of election integrity is a *legal* matter. The *legal* definition of "fraud" is not the same as is understood by the public when they use that word. In other words, the *legal* word fraud is a subset of the public's meaning of the word fraud – so it is disingenuous to use a key term that could be misunderstood.

2) "Fraud is too narrow a description of the documented election irregularities anyway.

For example, if election officials "correct" an incomplete ballot, is that fraud? They claim to be (and maybe believe they are) acting within their rights – even though that is disputable and the subject of some lawsuits. Further, if they truly believe that such corrections were on the up-and-up, to assure transparency they would have gone to lengths to carefully document all such alterations. Unfortunately, that rarely happened. Worse, there is ample evidence that government officials blocked investigator's access to election systems and deleted logs to *prevent* effective audits (and transparency). So, again, were their actions and omissions fraud?

Another example is in Central New York where they likely had the most closely contested election in the country. In the House of Representatives race, out of 300k± ballots cast there was a difference of 20± votes. This resulted in one of the extremely rare situations where a judge actually looked closely at the election process, and how ballots were handled, tabulated, etc. In a damning ruling he determined that in this one district (NY-22), that election officials had engaged in **nine (9) illegal actions!** That said, he took pains to say that none of them (*legally*) amounted to fraud.¹¹

While it is good to be cognizant of what the term "fraud" entails, I however choose to use the term mostly understood by the public. I understand the legal implications of possibly using the word; I just believe in calling a Spade a "Spade." And please understand that when I use the word "fraud" in this Special Report, I am specifically referring to as follows:

"when votes are added to the ballot box from people who don't have a legal right to vote and/or when votes are fictionally fabricated; and in addition to adding votes to the ballot box, fraud also involves the illegally switching of votes from one candidate to another after a citizen has already cast their vote."

So when I talk of voter "fraud" in these Special Reports, I hope I convey a clear understanding of the matter!

Types of Voter Fraud:

The Heritage Foundation is one of the most influential conservative public policy organizations in the United States. Voter Fraud and knowing the different types are certainly a subject matter that the people over at this conservative think tank have some knowledge. On their website, they give a list of 9 categories of voter fraud.¹² Let's take a look:

Fraudulent Use Of Absentee Ballots: Requesting absentee ballots and voting without the knowledge of the actual voter; or obtaining the absentee ballot from a voter and either filling it in directly and forging the voter's signature or illegally telling the voter who to vote for.

Ineligible Voting: Illegal registration and voting by individuals who are not U.S. citizens, are convicted felons, or are otherwise not eligible to vote.

Impersonation Fraud At The Polls: Voting in the name of other legitimate voters and voters who have died, moved away, or lost their right to vote because they are felons, but remain registered.

Buying Votes: Paying voters to cast either an in-person or absentee ballot for a particular candidate.

Ballot Petition Fraud: Forging the signatures of registered voters on the ballot petitions that must be filed with election officials in some states for a candidate or issue to be listed on the official ballot.

Duplicate Voting: Registering in multiple locations and voting in the same election in more than one jurisdiction or state.

False Registrations: Voting under fraudulent voter registrations that either use a phony name and a real or fake address or claim residence in a particular jurisdiction where the registered voter does not actually live and is not entitled to vote.

Altering The Vote Count: Changing the actual vote count either in a precinct or at the central location where votes are counted.

Illegal "Assistance" At The Polls: Forcing or intimidating voters—particularly the elderly, disabled, illiterate, and those for whom English is a second language—to vote for particular candidates while supposedly providing them with “assistance.”

Depending upon the group or organization, you will likely get a slight variation of the above listed items. A number of these nine items however fall into two (2) broader categories of problematic types of voter fraud:

- **Mail-in Voting**
- **Switching of Votes**

Both of these presented extraordinary challenges in the 2020 election and warrant a further in-depth analysis. We therefore devote the next two chapters to these two major disturbing areas where voter fraud seems to occur at exceptionally high levels.

Mail-in Voting

*“Concern over mail-in ballot fraud is not new. In 2005, the Commission on Federal Election Reform, co-chaired by former President **Jimmy Carter** and former Secretary of State **James Baker**, stated, “Absentee ballots remain the largest source of potential voter fraud.” Many European countries ban their use for this very reason. Yet amidst the pandemic, over 65 million mail-in ballots were returned in the 2020 election, nearly double the number returned in 2016.”*¹³

*“In Nevada, a lawsuit alleges that 15,000 people voted by mail multiple times—casting ballots both in Nevada and other states. Thousands of mail-in ballots were “cast” by deceased people.”*¹⁴

*“Multiple poll observers testified that many ballots’ signatures didn’t match the ones on file but were still counted. Multiple postal workers claimed that management had told postal employees to backdate late mail-in ballots so that they would count in the election. Record high number of mail-in ballots went through the adjudication process this year, where multiple poll watchers saw ballots altered.”*¹⁵

Problematic Areas of Mail-in Voting:

Under the auspices of Covid, we altered how we conducted elections in 2020. Instead of everyone going to their polling precincts to vote, huge increases in Mail-in votes took place. Regular Absentee voting, where people who honestly can’t make it to the polls on Election Day, has been available in all the states for many years. But Mail-in voting, where any person can request a ballot for simple convenience, is a rather new phenomenon in American politics. This is a two-edged sword. Mail-in ballots legitimately increase the number of citizens who participate in the election process. But there is an illegitimate aspect also – Mail-in ballots opens the door wide-open to election fraud.

This type of voting is subjected to higher rates of fraud due to lack of I.D. verification, individuals submitting ballots multiple times without being detected, and voting under the identity of another individual. This system also encourages possible “Ballot Harvesting,” a practice of allowing unscrupulous individuals to collect ballots from voters and delivering those bundles, via the mail or use of drop boxes, to then be counted by election officials. (Problems arise with use of drop boxes by failing to provide adequate security, oversight, and supervision – anyone can go and stuff them with fraudulent votes.)

Let’s consider some specific instances of fraud as the result of mail-in voting:

1. Ballots Altered in the Adjudication Process: An unusually high number of mail-in ballots were reported to have been adjudicated in the 2020 Election. These are where ballots are flagged for a possible error or there was a question about the voter’s choice of candidates. An adjudication panel then reviewed the ballot and determined the voter’s intent – often this involves unknown operators who voted the ballots as they pleased.

In **Georgia**, Fulton County Election Director Richard Barron told C-SPAN that, “We’ve scanned 113,130. We’ve adjudicated over 106,000.” This meant 94% of the ballots were adjudicated, which sounded very alarming. Also, county spokesman Joe Sorenson of Gwinnett County stated that as many as 80,000 absentee ballots were flagged for an “adjudication” process.¹⁶

In **Michigan**, Andrew Sitto, a volunteer poll watcher, observed the ballot duplication process at TCF Center. He testified, “Poll workers change duplicate ballots to straight democrat ticket... I witnessed employees taking their pen and filling in the democrat straight ticket when it is not.”¹⁷

2. Backdating of Mail-in Ballots: A number of U.S. Postal Service (USPS) employees have provided sworn affidavits that they were directed to back-date ballots with postmarks set to the previous day, November 3, to make it appear that the ballots were postmarked on time.

In **Wisconsin**, former U.S. Postal Service subcontractor Ethan Pease claimed that he was ordered to backdate ballots received too late so that they could be lawfully counted. And he testified how a senior USPS employee told him on November 4, 2020, that 100,000 ballots were missing, and his post office had dispatched employees to search for the missing ballots at 4 a.m. and only recovered seven or eight at UMS.¹⁸

In **Michigan**, another USPS employee was instructed on November 4th “to collect any ballots they could find in mailboxes and collection boxes, and separate them at the end of the day so that they could be hand stamped with the previous day’s date. Multiple witnesses testified at a Michigan Senate Oversight Committee Hearing on Dec. 1, 2020, that a large batch (up to 50,000) of ballots arrived at the TCF Center in Detroit around 3:30 am on Nov. 4, “with no chain of custody, no accountability, and no transparency.”¹⁹

3. Record Low Mail-in Ballot Rejection Rate: As stated previously, the rejection rate for absentee and mail-in ballots nationwide in past elections was an overall 1-2%. For **Pennsylvania** in 2020, it dropped to a dramatic just 0.28%; in **Georgia**, it sank to 0.60%, and in **Nevada**, it was 0.58% - just pass the vote through, no matter if it is fraudulent or not!²⁰

This was often the result of **signatures not matching**. In **Arizona**, Dr. Judith Burns, a Maricopa County Tabulation Center poll watcher, testified at a public hearing that in the signature verification room, according to her observation, “Most of the signatures the poll workers were comparing did not match. Many of the signatures on the envelope were simply scribbles.” And GOP Chairwoman Linda Brickman testified, “There were at least 30 ballots that I saw at one time, that were signed by the same handwriting but on different voters’ names.” She went on to say, “When I asked if the county attorney would be alerted for possible fraud, I was told ‘no,’ that supervisors would take care of it.”²¹

4. Thousands of Absentee Votes “Cast” by Deceased People: By checking state databases and matching voter information with death records, data researchers found that a surprisingly large number of deceased people cast absentee ballots across several key battleground states.

In **Michigan**, Richard Baris, director of Big Data Poll, alleged that about 10,000 voters whose names and dates of birth (DOB) matched death records in the Social Security Death Index (SSDI) were marked in the mail voting database as having returned ballots.²²

Robert Cushman, a Detroit poll watcher at TCF Center, stated in a sworn affidavit that thousands of mail-in ballots from people who weren’t properly registered to vote were added to vote counts. Poll operators were adding names and addresses to the poll book with made-up birth dates, such as 1/1/1900. He said in the affidavit: “When I asked what the possible justification was to counting ballots from unknown, unverified ‘persons,’ I was told by election supervisors that the Wayne County Clerk’s Office had ‘checked them out.’... When I asked about this impossibility of each ballot having the same birthday occurring in 1900, I was told that was the instruction that came down from the Wayne County Clerk’s Office.”²³

In **Pennsylvania**, former New York City mayor Rudy Giuliani told an election hearing that they found over 8,000 confirmed dead voters successfully cast mail-in ballots by matching voter data to public obituaries.²⁴

And in **Georgia**, Ray Smith, an attorney for the Trump campaign, testified at a Georgia Senate hearing on December 3rd that 10,315 dead people voted in this past election.²⁵

5. An Extremely High Percentage of Votes for Joe Biden: In **Georgia** during the Dekalb County recount on November 15, poll watcher Mark Amick told the Georgia Senate committee that he noticed the count numbers from a box of ballots, **10,707 for Biden and 13 for Trump**, to be significantly wrong. He raised his concerns to the workers, manager, and county election director, and eventually, the ballots were counted again. “The total for Biden ended up being 1,081, not 10,707 as initially submitted and signed off on by the two counters to be going into the system. So 9,626 vote difference, pretty significant,” said Amick.²⁶

Susan Voyles, who worked at Fulton County’s Sandy Springs poll station said in a sworn affidavit that she noticed an unusual batch of ballots in which the sheets had no signs of use or markings, and approximately 98 percent were marked for Joe Biden and only two were marked for President Donald Trump.²⁷

Debbie Fisher, a poll observer in Cobb County, testified that she was part of the voter review for the Nov. 16 hand recount, and reviewed 298 military ballots in Cobb County on that day. And of those, somewhere between 80 and 90 percent were going in favor of Biden. She said: “I find that statistically impossible.” In that part of Cobb County, she said, traditionally, voters typically cast ballots for Republicans—not Democrats—based on her

experience in prior elections. She also said 93% of military ballots in Fulton County were for Biden, which she found statistically impossible too.²⁸

6. Thousands of Illegal Votes by People Who Moved Out of State: Multiple expert analysts and witnesses reported that a large number of people were found to have received and submitted a mail-in ballot under the name of a voter who has moved out of state and no longer resides at the address where that voter was registered.

In **Georgia**, the Voter Integrity Project verified that 20,311 absentee voters cast their ballots after having moved out-of-state, and these voters appeared to have remained on the voter rolls in the 2020 election. And the count of out-of-state voters and those registered in other states, among the six “Battleground States” are as follows: **Arizona** – 5,726; **Michigan** – 13,048; **Nevada*** – 8,443; **Pennsylvania** – 14,328; **Wisconsin** – 6,848.²⁹

*But in a lawsuit involving the state of Nevada, the number of out-of-state voters who were also known to have voted in other states was at least 15,000 in Nevada.³⁰

7. Dramatic Increase in ‘Indefinitely Confined’ Voters: Mostly in three heavily Democratic counties of **Wisconsin** (Milwaukee, Dane, and Menominee), the number of voters self-reported as “indefinitely confined” increased dramatically by 238 percent from **72,000 the previous year to 243,900 in 2020**. The term refers to a type of absentee ballot registration where the voter wouldn’t need to present the ID normally required for an absentee ballot. Wisconsin law regarding voter ID provides exceptions for individuals who declare as “indefinitely confined” either due to age, physical illness, infirmity, or disability. In the past, this has only applied to individuals who effectively cannot leave their residence to vote.³¹

States that Used Mail-in Voting:

While some states already had some form of mail-in voting, many more expanded the use of mail-in voting in the 2020 election. This was done in various degrees. Some states “proactively” sent applications to vote by mail to all registered voters as with “universal” balloting. And some states just loosened restrictions around who is qualified to cast a vote by mail and/or what they needed to provide in order to do so. There are **38 states** plus the District of Columbia that had either existing laws or made it easier in 2020 to vote by mail-in balloting. These states fall into basically one or more of the following three categories:

- Already had predominantly vote-by-mail elections
- Made some changes to make it easier & more accessible to cast ballots from home
- Or proactively sent mail-in ballots to registered and/or all active “voters.”

A list of these 38 states plus the District of Columbia that allowed mail-in voting, to some degree, in the 2020 General Election are as follows:

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Alabama | Hawaii | Nebraska | Pennsylvania |
| Arizona | Illinois | Nevada | Rhode Island |
| Arkansas | Iowa | New Hampshire | South Carolina |
| California | Kentucky | New Jersey | Texas |
| Colorado | Maryland | New Mexico | Utah |
| Connecticut | Massachusetts | New York | Vermont |
| Delaware | Michigan | North Carolina | Washington |
| District of Columbia | Minnesota | Ohio | West Virginia |
| Florida | Missouri | Oklahoma | Wisconsin |
| Georgia | Montana | Oregon | |

In an article by Quinn Scanlan of **ABC News** released on Sept. 22, 2020 entitled “*Here’s how states have changed the rules around voting amid the coronavirus pandemic,*” the reporter details and categorizes each of these states and tells what changes were made to the state voting laws (some by judicial or executive fiat). Regarding those states that basically implemented “universal” mail-in balloting, Ms. Scanlan reports:

“Five states were already slated to proactively send mail-in ballots to registered voters – Hawaii, Colorado, Oregon, Utah and Washington. While it’s Hawaii’s first election cycle doing this, all five of these states have a predominantly vote-by-mail system.

In addition to those five states, California, Nevada, New Jersey, Vermont and the District of Columbia have decided to mail ballots to all active voters. In Montana, Democratic Gov. Steve Bullock is allowing

any county to hold all-mail elections if they want to. All counties were given this option for the primary and did so, and 45 of the state's 56 counties, including the most populous, have opted to do this for the general election. Return ballot postage will be paid for. The counties doing this will mail ballots on Oct. 9 and in-person voting will still be available. In Nebraska, 11 counties will be proactively mailing ballots to voters, which is allowed under state law in any counties with less than 10,000 residents.

. . . In addition to the states sending ballots, others have opted to proactively send absentee ballot applications to voters. Nine states are currently planning to do this: Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Rhode Island and Wisconsin.

Additionally, the rest of Nebraska's 93 counties that are not sending ballots will be sending applications to voters."³²

Switching of Votes

In recent years, we have witnessed the high-tech phenomenon of “switching of votes” for a candidate after the vote has been cast by a citizen. This is being done at the voting machine level, through hacking into voting systems, and even at the board of election level.

Voting Machines – In General:

“A trio of companies — ES&S of Omaha, Nebraska; Dominion Voting Systems of Denver and Hart InterCivic of Austin, Texas — sell and service more than 90 percent of the machinery on which votes are cast and results tabulated. Experts say they have long skimmed on security in favor of convenience...”³³

“The businesses also face no significant federal oversight and operate under a shroud of financial and operational secrecy despite their pivotal role underpinning American democracy.”³⁴

“On Jan. 9, 2020, the U.S. House of Representatives held a hearing on election security featuring the top three voting machine vendors (ES&S, Dominion, Hart). It turned out that all three vendors use specific components that come from China.”³⁵

The 2020 presidential election saw multiple vote switching incidents. Much of the publicity has centered around the Dominion Voting Machine. But **machine-vote manipulation** seems to be a problem with nearly all of these type machine manufacturers. “ES&S, Hart, Smartmatic and others face similar problems and are equally compromised.”³⁶ All share a common GEMS-based software that allows for algorithms to distribute votes resulting in fractionalized voting as opposed to simply counting whole votes. This opens the door to enormous capabilities to shift votes using various programmed algorithms by either inside or outside threat actors. From one of the few actual audits done at the county level, the forensic investigation of Antrim, Michigan, we know the algorithm, as evident from the Dominion logs, was turned on.³⁷

The authors of the **Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 2-27-21)** cited the adjudication process as creating another set of problems involving the voting machines. The contributors of the *Critique* make note of the following on Page 17 of their report:

“The adjudication rates found by the same Antrim (Michigan) investigation showed enormous rate of errors (68%) generated by the machines, allegedly by ‘human error’ but clearly intrinsic to the machine software. . . This confirms that the problems uncovered in Antrim (Michigan) also existed in Georgia, where massive numbers of ballots were sent to adjudication from whence unknown operators voted them as they pleased.”³⁸

And not only is there a problem with algorithms, but there seems to be a number of vulnerabilities with the voting machines. The authors of the *Critique* investigated this matter and gave the following warning also on Page 16 of their report about the 2020 General Election. They cited the sources of vulnerabilities as being:

“. . . were accessed by unknown actors, machine programming errors were introduced from sources unknown, and network security vulnerabilities exploited by sources domestic and foreign. In short, there were widespread problems of machine-altered results across multiple voting company’s platforms.”³⁹

During the 2020 election in Georgia at a State Senate hearing on Dec. 30, a group of data scientists presented that 12,173 votes were allegedly switched from Trump to Biden on election night in Bibb County, Georgia, and over 30,000 Trump's votes removed in other counties in Georgia.⁴⁰

In **Michigan**, GOP Chairwoman Laura Cox said at a press conference on Nov. 6 that "in Antrim County, ballots were counted for Democrats that were meant for Republicans, causing a 6,000 vote swing against our candidates. The county clerk came forward and said, 'tabulating software glitched and caused a miscalculation of the votes.'"⁴¹

And in **Arizona**, GOP chairwoman Linda Brickman testified before members of the Arizona State Legislature what she personally observed in the duplication room, "I observed, with my Democratic partner, the preparation of a new ballot, since the original one was soiled, or wouldn't go through the tabulators. I read her a Trump Republican ballot, and as soon as she entered it into the system, the ballot defaulted on the screen to a Biden Democratic ballot." She remarked that when she reported the issue to election supervisors, others in the room also commented that they had "witnessed the same manipulation." Mrs. Brickman has submitted her testimony in a sworn affidavit under penalty of perjury. Maricopa County is the only county in Arizona that uses Dominion Voting Systems.⁴²

In prior elections, problems started to pop up with these voting machines in the switching of votes:

One of the earliest reports of this happened in **2012**. During the municipal election in Palm Beach, **Florida**, software "shortcomings" led to votes being assigned to the wrong candidates, and wrong winners being declared.⁴³

During **2018** in Richland County, **South Carolina**, "Voters are reporting the final voting submission page did not reflect their intended vote, saying their vote 'flipped.'" The Richland County Elections Director expressed that the problems were caused by a calibration issue with the voting machines. State Election Commissioner Chris Whitmire said it is very common for voters to make "unintended selections."⁴⁴ Similar problems were also found in **Indiana** during 2018.⁴⁵

For the state of **Pennsylvania** in **2018**, the New York Times reported: "Vote totals in a Northampton County judge's race showed one candidate, Abe Kassis, a Democrat, had just 164 votes out of 55,000 ballots across more than 100 precincts. Some machines reported zero votes for him. In a county with the ability to vote for a straight-party ticket, one candidate's zero votes was a near statistical impossibility. Something had gone quite wrong." "With clearly faulty results in at least the judge's election, officials began counting the paper backup ballots generated by the same machines. The paper ballots showed Mr. Kassis winning narrowly, 26,142 to 25,137, over his opponent, the Republican Victor Scomillio."⁴⁶

Voting Machines – Dominion:

Texas has three times rejected the use of ballot counting software from the company **Dominion Voting Systems** (DVS), according to a report from the Secretary of State's (SOS) office dated January 2020.

One examination report commissioned by the Attorney General of Texas concluded: "Computer systems should be designed to prevent or detect human error whenever possible and minimize the consequences of both human mistakes and equipment failure. Instead, the [DVS] Democracy Suite 5.5-A is fragile and error-prone. In my opinion, it should not be certified for use in Texas. If certification should be granted, it should be with the condition that all open network and USB ports be sealed."⁴⁷

One of the most incriminating evidence of switching of votes by Dominion Voting Systems comes in the **AUDIT of Antrim County, Michigan**. This 28-page audit is available on-line and is called **Antrim Michigan Forensics Report (REVISED PRELIMINARY SUMMARY, v2 – Dated 12/13/2020)**.

Allied Security Operations Group (ASOG) was hired and performed this forensic audit. Russell James Ramsland, Jr. of ASOG conducted the audit for client, Bill Bailey, and attorney, Matthew DePerno of the DePerno Law Offices, PLLC; the audit was of the machinery used in the 2020 election.


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

"[They] concluded 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 [their] study, [they] concluded that [the] Dominion Voting System should not be used in Michigan. [They] further conclude that the results of Antrim County should NOT have been certified."⁴⁸

The contributors of the *Critique* looked into the effect that Dominion Voting System had on the 2020 election. They collected Democratic votes for 2016 and 2020 at the county-level. They subsequently regressed the growth in those votes between 2016 and 2020 on an indicator for whether the county in 2020 had Dominion, controlling for the usual demographic characteristics. They found a coefficient of 0.025 (p-value = 0.037) on the Dominion indicator, implying that counties that have Dominion experienced a 2.5 percentage point increase in Democratic votes, relative to their counterparts. Moreover, that coefficient was obtained from regressions on the restricted sample of battleground states.⁴⁹

This is very similar to what **Ben Turner, CEO of Fraud Spotters**, also found in his analysis. For *those Counties* across the nation that used Dominion, there was an average of **2 to 3 percent shift for Biden**. And for the nation at large, the effect appears to be somewhere **between 1.0% and 1.6%**.⁵⁰

On Mr. Turner’s website, he provides a map showing the counties across the nation that used Dominion Voting Systems in the 2020 Presidential Election. Below is a copy of that map:



The list of states that, on some level, used the Dominion Voting System is as follows:

- | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Alaska | Illinois | Missouri | Pennsylvania |
| Arizona | Iowa | Nevada | Tennessee |
| California | Kansas | New Jersey | Virginia |
| Colorado | Louisiana | New Mexico | Washington |
| Florida | Massachusetts | New York | Wisconsin |
| Georgia | Michigan | Ohio | |

As one can see from the map, some states used Dominion almost state-wide in nearly all the counties; and, some states only used Dominion in just some of the counties. There are a few states that used Dominion in only one or two counties; but it is noteworthy that some of those counties represent major metropolitan cities for those states. For instance, the two counties in Tennessee are where Nashville and Chattanooga are located; in Illinois, it is where Chicago is located; and in Arizona, it is where Phoenix is located.

Hacking:

*“Academic computer scientists began hacking them with ease more than a decade ago, and not much has changed.” “Hackers could theoretically wreak havoc at multiple stages of the election process. They could alter or erase lists of registered voters to sow confusion, secretly introduce software to flip votes, scramble tabulation systems or knock results-reporting sites offline.”*⁵¹

Apparently, hacking into voting systems has been around for some time – making our democracy very vulnerable. **2020ElectionIrregularities.com** states the following on their webpage “**Voting Machine**”:

“In 2017, DEFCON featured a Voting Machine Hacking Village (“Voting Village”) to highlight cyber vulnerabilities in U.S. election infrastructure—including voting machines, voter registration databases, and election office networks. As a result, every piece of equipment in the Voting Village was effectively breached in some manner. The first voting machine to fall—an AVS WinVote model—was hacked and taken control of remotely in a matter of minutes.

In 2019, DEFCON allowed hackers to test voting equipment made by ES&S and Dominion, including e-poll books, optical scan paper voting devices, and direct recording electronic voting machines. The report indicated that “Voting Village participants were able to find new ways, or replicate previously published methods, of compromising every one of the devices in the room in ways that could alter stored vote tallies, change ballots displayed to voters, or alter the internal software that controls the machines.”⁵²

And considering the lead up to the 2020 election, this website states:

“Texas has rejected Dominion Voting Systems (DVS) three times for security and efficiency concerns. In an affidavit in the Sydney Powell lawsuit, cybersecurity expert Dr. Navid Keshavarz-Nia stated that the U.S. Intelligence community had developed tools to manipulate vote tallies in foreign voting systems, and these tools were used by nefarious operators to influence voting systems in the United States by covertly accessing them and altering the results in real-time and without leaving an electronic fingerprint. On Oct. 8, 2020, DVS’s parent company received \$400 million raised by UBS Securities LLC, whose three out of four board members at the time were Chinese.”⁵³

The authors of the *Critique* also address the issue of hacking of the 2020 election. In an alarming case involving the “Red” state of Texas, the team brings forth the following evidence:

“In Texas, based on a tip from cyber experts who examined and were alarmed by the Dallas County central server logs from the 2018 election, in 2020 cyber experts from Openrecords.org captured a computer hack (they believed there were at least 3 hacks) in real time in the Dallas General Election. They did it by capturing the daily downloads of the Daily Vote Roster posted by Dallas County that uses ES&S equipment, managed by Barcelona-based Scytl and tied into Clarity Elections/Scytl election reporting network (Dominion, Smartmatic, and Hart are also tied into Clarity Election/Scytl). The Open Records people had a simple methodology that proved beyond any doubt that a massive computer hack(s) with vote tampering took place in Dallas.

Between October 6th and October 30th, Open Records saw the county actually purge 56,974 votes (absentee and early voting in-person) after they were cast and then create 50,529 new votes using previously purged state voter id numbers. In one case, 10 full blocks of a street in Highland Park had their votes purged and then selectively replaced at random over the following days. Overall, 5,690 votes with state voter id numbers were purged and never re-appeared.

Cybersecurity evidence is filed in SCOTUS dockets on the vulnerabilities inherent in these machines, showing that Edison Research used an unencrypted VPN and that their platform was accessed by foreign adversaries, namely the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and Iran. The statistical evidence is also corroborated by whistleblowers, including Eric Coomer who unintentionally admitted on video rigging the election for Biden – perhaps the catalyst for getting Dominion more attention above the other platforms.”⁵⁴

If need be, we might have to go back to just pen and paper – no machines in conducting elections here in the United States. Election integrity and survival of our democracy is that important!

Board of Election Level:

It is believed that voter fraud and the switching of votes goes all the way up to the level of the Board of Election in some states. There seems to have been some funny business going on with the 2020 election where I reside, here in the state of North Carolina. And while the switching of votes could have been the result of hacking, this nefarious activity that happened is actually believed to have taken place at the level of the NC Board of Election. We have a Republican legislature but a Democrat governor here in North Carolina – and the board of elections falls under the control of the governor. A patriotic citizen who goes by the name of “**Major Dave**” and is active in North Carolina politics has produced a YouTube video where he provides credible evidence of election fraud and tells exactly how the switching of votes took place at the NC Board of Election. You can watch this video by doing a YouTube search (while it is still available) of “**2020 NC General Election Wrap Up – YouTube**” and here’s the link: <https://youtu.be/DTBirZj9SVc> . And here is a partial transcript of the voter fraud evidence provided by Major Dave:

“Please set aside everything you’ve heard about Dominion, vote-switching software, or suitcases of ballots dragged from beneath the table in the dead of night. There’s no evidence that any of that took place in North Carolina. But what did take place is far simpler, but much harder to detect: Data Manipulation to fabricate an outcome! There is no way of knowing if certain people voted or not; but rather, someone else just used their name and voting record to fabricate a digital ballot for this election as if they did. There are two (2) independent data streams that make up our election data. One comes from the Poll Book Laptop at the precinct one-stop site that indicates who voted, where, when and by what method. The other comes from the ballot tabulation machine that contains the candidate’s names and number of votes they received. They must remain separate in order to preserve the secrecy of our ballot. But what to exist to protect us on one hand also offers great opportunities for mischief. Now while protecting our privacy, it affords those with ill intent the ability to manipulate the data in the vote stream, without there being any direct correlation between the two. As long as you have enough valid ballots on the Poll Book side, frankly you can make the numbers appear to be anything you wish in the result stream, as long as they do not exceed that number of valid ballots.”⁵⁵

Major Dave provides visual evidence of how certain votes from one county, using the voter ID number, are then switched to other counties. He shows how the numbers shifted and changed in the days following the election – thousands of votes. “Only tweaking the outcome on the ballot tabulation machine side, now the task came to tweak the Poll Book side, to make it all look legitimate.” Major Dave sums this all up by calling it “DIGITAL BALLOT BOX STUFFING – to fabricate an outcome!” I highly recommend everyone who is concerned with voter fraud to take time and watch this little-over-20-minute video.⁵⁶

Anyone who is an election official and guilty of voter fraud, especially such as this, should face serious jail time.

And here’s a little tidbit that may mean something or it might not mean anything: In going back over a number of election cycles, I found something rather interesting about North Carolina in one of the many analysis studies I have done. Comparing the 2020 results to results of two decades ago, specifically to 1996, I found North Carolina is ranked the 3rd highest state in the nation for Voter Participation Increase. The state went from 33.6% in 1996 to 52.1% in 2020 in the percent of the state population that votes. That is an 18.5 point jump in 24 years, which represents a **55.1% increase** ($18.5 \div 33.6$).

This begs the question, where did all this increase in new votes come from? Is it possible that some of this huge increase is the result of fraudulent votes?

(For the record, the two other top vote-getter states are as follows: Nevada was number one, going from 27.6% of the population who voted in 1996 all the way up to 44.8% in 2020. That is a 17.2 point jump, representing a 62.3% increase. South Carolina was number two in this analysis study of mine; it went from 30.2% of the population who voted in 1996 up to 48.2% in 2020. For South Carolina, that is an 18.0 point jump, representing a 59.6% increase.)

Other Studies

There have been a number of studies and analysis of the 2020 Presidential Election. Of these, there were two particularly insightful reports involving hard numbers of voter fraud. One was of a comprehensive study of the six (6) “Battleground” swing states; and the other was of a specific type of vote fraud for fourteen (14) states. These two reports are a “must read” in order to have a credible discussion of voter fraud in the 2020 election.

Volume Three of the Navarro Report:

This is “one of the more comprehensive documents summarizing alleged voter fraud, and it provides quantitative data for 26 different categories of voting irregularities and illegalities.”⁵⁷



Peter Navarro was a member of the Trump Administration. He produced a series of reports following the election that demonstrates President Trump had good faith in believing the 2020 Presidential Election were stolen, and there was widespread fraud and election irregularities. Evidence used in the preparation of the Navarro Reports includes more than 50 lawsuits and judicial rulings, thousands of affidavits and declarations, testimony in a variety of state venues, published analyses by think tanks and legal centers, videos and photos, public comments, and extensive press coverage. For a copy of these reports, go to www.peternavarro.com.

As Mr. Navarro states: “There was no single ‘silver bullet’ that allegedly won the election for Biden; instead it was ‘death by a thousand irregularities’ in any given battleground state; and, most importantly with respect to the question as to whether the election may well have been stolen, the narrow alleged Biden ‘victory’ margins in each of the six battleground states were dwarfed by the number of potentially illegal ballots.”⁵⁸

Peter Navarro unequivocally states the importance of a free and fair election in discussing what happened in 2020. He says the following:

“Absent a full investigation, we as a nation run the risk of institutionalizing a rigged electoral system with which a large segment of America will no longer have faith in. That’s why clearing the air about the 2020 presidential election is not just about Donald J. Trump but rather about something much larger and of far more importance – the future of our election system, the public perception of that system, and ultimately the future of our free and democratic Republic.”⁵⁹

Volume Three of the Navarro Report is a 14-page report, documented with 52 noted Endnotes. The broader goal of the report is to provide investigators with a well-documented tally of potentially illegal votes on a state-by-state and category-by-category basis. This is done for the six battleground states of **Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin** with a checklist of 26 different categories of voter fraud. Mr. Navarro also compares the margin of victory numbers to the numbers of potentially illegal votes. In his report, Mr. Navarro produces a separate table of all this investigative data for each of the six states (six tables for the six states); and he also provides one master table – containing all 6 states with all 26 categories of voter fraud. For purpose of this Special Report however and for brevity, we will consider only the one master table as shown on Page 3 of Mr. Navarro’s report – as shown on the next page:

Vote Irregularities and Illegals by Category and State

| | ARIZONA | GEORGIA | MICHIGAN | NEVADA | PENNSYLVANIA | WISCONSIN |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Absentee ballots cast without statutorily required application | | | | | | 170,140 |
| Absentee ballots cast that arrived after Election Day | | | | | 10,000 | |
| Absentee ballots cast that were requested before & after statutory deadline | | 305,701 | | | | |
| Absentee ballots cast from addresses other than where voters legally reside | 19,997 | | | 15,000 | 14,328 | |
| Absentee ballots cast that were returned on or before the postmark date | 22,903 | | | | 58,221 | |
| Absentee ballots cast without a postmark | | | | | 9,005 | |
| Absentee ballots requested under the name of a registered voter without consent | | | 27,825 | | | |
| Dead voters | | 10,315 | 482 | 1,506 | 8,021 | |
| Double voters: In-state | 157 | 395 | | 42,284 | 742 | 234 |
| Felon voters | | 2,560 | | | | |
| Ghost voters | 5,790 | 15,700 | | | | |
| Illegal ballot harvesting | | | | | | 17,271 |
| Indefinitely confined voter abuses | | | | | | 216,000 |
| Juvenile voters (<18 years old) | | 66,247 | | | | |
| Mail-in ballots cast by voters registered after the registration deadline | 150,000 | | | | | |
| No address on file for voter | 2,000 | 1,043 | 35,109 | 8,000 | | |
| Non-citizen voters | 36,473 | | | 4,000 | | |
| No corresponding voter registration numbers | | | 174,384 | | | |
| Non-registered voters(not on voter rolls) | | 2,423 | | | | |
| Out-of-state voters who voted in-state | 5,726 | 20,312 | 13,248 | 19,218 | 7,426 | 6,848 |
| Over-votes | 11,676 | | | | 202,377 | |
| Poll watcher & poll observer abuses | | | | | 680,774 | |
| Signature matching errors | | | | 130,000 | | |
| Voting machine irregularities (fake/manufactured ballots & spikes) | | 136,155 | 195,755 | | | 143,379 |
| Voters over 100 years old | | | | | 1,573 | |
| Voters who vote in the wrong county | | 40,279 | | | | |
| Possible Illegal Votes | 254,722 | 601,130 | 446,803 | 220,008 | 992,467 | 553,872 |
| Biden "Victory" Margin | 10,457 | 11,779 | 154,818 | 33,596 | 81,660 | 20,682 |

Mr. Navarro does such a thorough investigation of these six states that it amounts to almost an “audit.” It is truly a shame that this was not done for each of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia.

In the report and with the individual tables for each of the six states, Mr. Navarro further clarifies and emphasizes the differences of the “Potentially Illegal Votes” versus the Biden “Victory” Margin. In two of the “battleground” states it was **24** and **26** times greater; and for the state of Georgia, it was a **whopping 51** times greater. Let’s see what the actual numbers were for these six states:


| | <u>Potentially Illegal Votes</u> | ≥ | <u>Margin of Victory (Reported in 2020 Election)</u> |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Arizona | (254,722 Votes) | 24 Times Greater | (10,457 Votes) |
| Georgia | (601,130 Votes) | 51 Times Greater | (11,779 Votes) |
| Michigan | (446,803 Votes) | 2.8 Times Greater | (154,818 Votes) |
| Nevada | (220,008 Votes) | 6 Times Greater | (33,596 Votes) |
| Pennsylvania | (992,467 Votes) | 12 Times Greater | (81,660 Votes) |
| Wisconsin | (553,872 Votes) | 26 Times Greater | (20,682 Votes) |

By invalidating the illegal votes that Joe Biden received, then Donald Trump wins ALL six “battleground” states and thus the election. Consider the implication of these states on the Electoral College. The current count is: Biden = 306 and Trump = 232. This would change that count by **79 votes** – Arizona (11), Georgia (16), Michigan (16), Nevada (6), Pennsylvania (20), and Wisconsin (10). **The new total is: Trump = 311 and Biden = 227.**

Election Spikes Report:

A Vote “Spike” is a sudden and dramatic increase in the vote count of a political candidate, often represented with a “straight upward line” on a graph. These are caused by what is called a Vote “Dump” – “unusually large differentials between candidates, received/recorded at one time.”

On average, one can expect “jumps” in the count of political candidates to be in the same order of magnitude for each candidate, especially for close races. Wild differences in magnitudes, and especially ones that favor a particular candidate, are signs of rare concurrencies, often with high improbabilities. They are the picture definition of a statistical anomaly. Yet this occurred repeatedly on election night and morning thereafter, all in the favor of Joe Biden.



61

A 25-page study was done of these vote spikes during the time period mentioned. The group of unpaid volunteers (referenced in the *Acknowledgment* section of the beginning of this Special Report) published a report called **2020 Presidential Election Startling Vote Spikes 1-2-21 (rev 6-22-21)** commonly called the *Election Spikes Report*. The study was done of those vote spikes basically being that of 25,000+ vote differential between the two Presidential candidates. They found fourteen (14) states that experienced these “spikes” in the 2020 election. Again all spikes were found to be in favor of Biden.

The purpose of this detailed statistical analysis was NOT to tell **what** happened (ballot stuffing, machine algorithm, etc.), but rather **where** and **when** there were unusual results. **Table 1** presented below gives a matrix of information. The first column gives the 14 states. And for each of these states, then information is given for the individual vote dump, including: the Biden Votes Added, the Trump Votes Added, the Biden NET Vote Dumps (the difference in the two), and also presented is the actual timestamp of when these dumps happened. Let's view this **Table 1** now:

| STATE | BIDEN VOTES ADDED | TRUMP VOTES ADDED | BIDEN NET VOTE DUMPS* | TIME (Local) | TIME (UTC) |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------|
| Arizona | 363,014 | 254,499 | 108,515 | (Nov 3) 8:05 PM | 3:05:47 |
| | 798,568 | 655,467 | 143,101 | (Nov 3) 8:06 PM | 3:06:25 |
| Florida | 369,751 | 247,008 | 122,743 | (Nov 3) 7:28 AM | 12:28:01 |
| | 435,219 | 243,092 | 192,127 | (Nov 3) 7:32 AM | 12:32:23 |
| | 367,539 | 227,312 | 140,227 | (Nov 3) 7:38 AM | 12:38:40 |
| Georgia | 162,133 | 42,322 | 119,811 | (Nov 4) 1:32 AM | 6:32:50 |
| Illinois | 219,339 | 45,303 | 174,036 | (Nov 3) 8:57 PM | 2:57:45 |
| | 352,237 | 112,550 | 239,687 | (Nov 3) 9:12 PM | 3:12:42 |
| | 475,306 | 285,947 | 189,359 | (Nov 3) 9:36 PM | 3:36:11 |
| Kentucky | 206,959 | 136,032 | 70,927 | (Nov 3) 8:13 PM | 1:13:00 |
| Maine | 33,264 | 6,028 | 27,236 | (Nov 4) 2:05 AM | 7:05:33 |
| Michigan | 141,258 | 5,968 | 135,290 | (Nov 4) 6:31 AM | 11:31:53 |
| Minnesota | 198,564 | 84,809 | 113,755 | (Nov 3) 11:30 PM | 5:30:22 |
| Missouri | 157,389 | 61,899 | 95,490 | (Nov 3) 8:53 PM | 1:53:59 |
| | 67,467 | 15,783 | 51,684 | (Nov 3) 11:39 PM | 4:39:09 |
| New Jersey | 130,023 | 39,445 | 90,578 | (Nov 3) 8:59 PM | 1:59:17 |
| Ohio | 366,894 | 206,713 | 160,181 | (Nov 3) 7:44 AM | 12:44:11 |
| Pennsylvania | 70,565 | 4,218 | 66,347 | (Nov 3) 8:15 PM | 1:15:31 |
| | 73,945 | 8,543 | 65,402 | (Nov 3) 8:26 PM | 1:26:57 |
| | 88,865 | 23,713 | 65,152 | (Nov 3) 8:38 PM | 1:38:49 |
| | 62,445 | 1,159 | 61,286 | (Nov 4) 9:16 AM | 14:16:51 |
| Virginia | 245,108 | 125,813 | 119,295 | (Nov 3) 9:56 PM | 2:56:40 |
| | 308,052 | 77,493 | 230,559 | (Nov 4) 2:17 AM | 7:17:06 |
| | 191,347 | 67,210 | 124,137 | (Nov 4) 4:00 AM | 9:00:01 |
| Wisconsin | 38,989 | 14,004 | 24,985 | (Nov 3) 9:27 PM | 3:27:32 |
| | 143,379 | 25,163 | 118,216 | (Nov 4) 3:42 AM | 9:42:20 |
| TOTAL | | | 3,050,126 | | |

Table 1: Summary of State's Larger 2020 Presidential Differential Vote Dumps

*A "Net Vote Dump" for most of the above states is defined as a 25,000+ vote differential between 2020 Presidential candidates, at one time. All were for Biden as we were not able to find any cases for Trump that met this criteria. (If any can be documented, we'd be glad to do an update and include them.)

AZ, PA & VA are exceptions for our arbitrary 25k rule. PA and VA (unlike most other states) have too many over 25k. AZ has just two standouts. As a result, the PA threshold is 60k and AZ & VA are 100k.

Note: there are major differences with various versions of the Edison data — and it's not always clear as to which are the most reliable. Table 1 was made up from versions 11-24 and 11-25 Edison data, and we did our best to sort through confusing data... Also note that all of the timestamps in this report are 2020.

It is remarkable that these “spikes” happened – repeatedly, and all in favor of one candidate. It is my firm opinion that these did NOT happen naturally or by chance; but rather, it is obvious that they are the result of unscrupulous and nefarious operators in the Democrat Party; and maybe, it was even a coordinated effort. It is the “stuffing” of the tabulation voting machines! (These are my words, not that of the study’s authors – the unpaid volunteers mentioned.)

And while the authors of these *Election Spikes* do not use the word “fraud” to describe the vote dumps, they do address the issue of chance or likelihood of them happening naturally. In their individualized analysis of each of the listed states, they give the probability (what I call the **IMPROBABILITY**) of the frequency and magnitude of the “spikes” for 11 of the 14 states. Let’s take a look:

- Arizona (Probability Not Indicated)
- Florida A probability of 1 in 10²³
- Georgia A probability of 1 in 10²³
- Illinois A probability of 1 in 10³⁷
- Kentucky A probability of 1 in 10⁶⁵
- Maine A probability of 1 in 10⁸⁶
- Michigan A probability of 1 in 10¹¹⁷ – or 14 Powerball wins in a row
- Minnesota A probability of 1 in 10⁸¹
- Missouri A probability of 1 in 10³⁴
- New Jersey A probability of 1 in 10³⁷
- Ohio A probability of 1 in 10²⁵
- Pennsylvania (Probability Not Indicated)
- Virginia A probability of 1 in 10⁵⁸ – which is an equivalent to being dealt 10 royal flushes in a row
- Wisconsin (Probability Not Indicated)

The probability of some of these “spikes” happening is mind-boggling – unless it is explained by plain FRAUD!

The statistical analysis ends with a Table showing the cumulative “Vote Dump” numbers of the four (4) swing states of **Arizona, Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin**. It concludes with the effect on the Electoral College Vote: Realizing the questionable nature of these “dumps” and that they may represent illegitimate votes, making an adjustment to the 2020 Election Popular Vote Count would in fact **alter the Electoral College Vote by 57**. In fact, it would substantially change as to who should be president. Again, let’s take a look at their table:

| SWING STATE | BIDEN REPORTED LEAD | BIDEN NET VOTE DUMPS | ELECTORAL VOTES |
|--------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Arizona | 10,457 | 251,616 | 11 |
| Georgia | 10,779 | 119,811 | 16 |
| Pennsylvania | 80,555 | 258,187 | 20 |
| Wisconsin | 20,682 | 143,201 | 10 |
| TOTAL | | | 57 |

Comparison of data on Table 1 to the reported Biden lead for some key swing states.

Note 1: The current Electoral College votes are: Biden = 306 and Trump = 232.

Note 2: If any three of the above state’s Electoral College votes are changed to accurately reflect the public’s actual votes, **the new totals would put Trump in a tie, or over 270.**

Comparison of Studies

In the previous chapter, we analyzed the results of two independent and different studies of the 2020 Presidential Election. One was a comprehensive study of voter fraud for six (6) states; and the other was for an irregularity (what I believe to be a specific type of fraud) for fourteen (14) states – of the magnitude that clearly shows up as a statistical anomaly on a graphical chart. While it is a shame we don't have a detailed analysis like that of the Navarro Report for all 50 states plus the District of Columbia, the data available is what it is, and we must make the best of it. But in more closely examining these two studies by comparing them to one another and to other available election data, one is however able to derive and come to a more insightful broader conclusion about the possible extent of election fraud in the 2020 Presidential Election. To see exactly what I mean, let's now further investigate this matter.

Comparing to Total Votes Cast:

The *Margin of Victory* that is often reported in election results is simply the differential vote totals of the top two candidates in an election; and the “*Percentage*” reported in such instances is that differential number compared to the total number of votes cast. For instance, let's take the state of Arizona in this past election. The Federal Election Commission reported Joe Biden received 1,672,143 votes, Donald Trump received 1,661,686 votes, and there were a total of 3,387,326 votes cast for president in that state election. Joe Biden's reported *margin of victory* was 10,457 (1,672,143 – 1,661,686) and the “*percentage*” of *margin of victory* was therefore 0.31% (10,457 ÷ 3,387,326).

This “percentage” can be of tremendous value as an analysis tool when comparing to other election results. This is also true when comparing and further analyzing the two reports in the previous chapter. Comparing the vote spikes and Mr. Navarro's numbers to the total number of votes cast in those state elections yield further insight to the level of election fraud; and comparing them to one another, state-to-state, also yields insight. By comparing the calculations state-to-state, we can determine if the specific vote spikes and the broader comprehensive fraud numbers, as an irregularity and anomaly, are in fact “normal” and what is to be expected as an “anomaly.” In essence, we can determine (ironically) if the “abnormal” is actually “normal” to be an abnormal (more about this a little later).

Starting with the Navarro Report, let's examine the results in the following table:

Results from The Navarro Report:

| <u>States</u> | <u>Potentially Illegal Votes</u> | <u>Total Number Of Votes Cast</u> | <u>“Percentage”</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Arizona | 254,722 | 3,387,326 | 7.52% |
| Georgia | 601,130 | 4,999,960 | 12.02% |
| Michigan | 446,803 | 5,539,302 | 8.07% |
| Nevada | 220,008 | 1,405,376 | 15.65% |
| Pennsylvania | 992,467 | 6,915,283 | 14.35% |
| Wisconsin | 553,872 | 3,298,041 | 16.79% |

The range in the Potentially Illegal Votes for the six “Battleground” states is from 7.52% to 16.79%. And the median value is **13.19%** (average of the two **bold** “middle” figures). In considering these percentages, one has to wonder about the states at the two ends of the spectrum. Did Mr. Navarro underestimate the fraudulent vote for

Arizona and **Michigan**? And conversely, was **Wisconsin** an overestimate? By comparing these numbers, we do however get a sense of what is possibly the “normal” level of total fraudulent votes, at least for these six states.

Now, let’s consider the “percentages” derived from the *Election Spikes Report* with the following table:

Results from Election Spikes Report:

| <u>States</u> | <u>Vote Spikes</u> | <u>Total Number Of Votes Cast</u> | <u>“Percentage”</u> |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Arizona | 251,616 | 3,387,326 | 7.43% |
| Florida | 455,097 | 11,067,456 | 4.11% |
| Georgia | 119,811 | 4,999,960 | 2.40% |
| Illinois | 603,082 | 6,033,744 | 10.00% |
| Kentucky | 70,927 | 2,136,768 | 2.26% |
| Maine | 27,236 | 819,461 | 3.32% |
| Michigan | 135,290 | 5,539,302 | 2.44% |
| Minnesota | 113,755 | 3,277,171 | 3.47% |
| Missouri | 147,174 | 3,025,962 | 4.86% |
| New Jersey | 90,578 | 4,549,353 | 1.99% |
| Ohio | 160,181 | 5,922,202 | 2.70% |
| Pennsylvania | 258,187 | 6,915,283 | 3.73% |
| Virginia | 473,991 | 4,460,524 | 10.63% |
| Wisconsin | 143,201 | 3,298,041 | 4.34% |

Here with the *Election Spike Report*, the Potentially Illegal Votes for the 14 states range from **1.99%** to **10.63%**. The median value is **3.60%** (average of the two **bold** “middle” figures).

The two “High” outliers are **Illinois** at 10.00% and **Virginia** at 10.63%. But remember the authors of this report had to increase the threshold for considering a “spike” in the state of Virginia from 25k to 100k – because there were so many of them. So the real percentage of “spike” votes is actually higher than this 10.63% figure, if you lower the threshold back down to 25k.

With **Arizona** at 7.43%, it also might be considered a “High” outlier as well – it being the 3rd highest on this list. (But unlike some of the other states that had to raise their threshold because there were so many “spikes,” Arizona had only two standouts – both over 100k.)

The state of **Pennsylvania** (at only 3.74%) also falls in this category of the “real spike” number actually being higher. Because there were so many spikes found in that state, the authors of the study had to raise the threshold from 25k to 60k.

While one can technically argue with some of the percentages cited in the above table, the numbers are what they are and what we have to work with. But there is one thing that can be said about these results; anyway you look at it, there must have been a heck of a lot of stuffing the tabulation voting machines in all these states – of course, any amount is way too much.

Comparing the Two Studies to One Another:

As we see in these two very different studies, detection of Election Fraud can vary. But one thing we can conclude is the different types of voter fraud seem to fall into basically two categories: One is a dramatic, very noticeable, type like that of a vote spike as in the *Election Spike Report* – that actually shows up on a graph and can be easily identified. The other is a more subtle type that is not as easily identified. Example of this is a lone-wolf Democrat operative who works in a 100-person nursing home facility. He/she harvests the ballots, making sure all resident’s votes are for one candidate, and then puts all the fraudulent ballots in a drop-box, which are mixed in with all the other ballots, that is then delivered to election officials to be counted. Both of these different categories/types are a subset of the Total Fraudulent Vote, which ultimately makes up the numbers in the *Navarro Report*.

I contend that “where there is smoke, there is fire.” Where you find vote spikes, you are going to also find a whole lot of other voter fraud as well. I therefore make the reasonable assumption that **one report represents the subset of the other report**. Election spikes found in the *Election Spike Report* for certain states are a subset of the total fraudulent numbers found for those same states in the *Navarro Report*.

Peter Navarro does actually have a “vote spike” category in his list of 26 different types of fraud; it is labeled:

Voting machine irregularities (fake/manufactured ballots & spikes)

He found such illegal votes as this for the states of Georgia, Michigan, and Wisconsin (out of the six states in his study). But I contend that “vote spikes” are meshed in with the other numbers as well. For instance, consider the possibility of a Democrat operative causing such spikes by stuffing the tabulation machine with votes from a stack of ballots tagged as “Dead Voters,” “Out-of-state Voters,” “No address on file for voters,” – and the possible list goes on and on. While many have not made this connection before – connecting the dots, I firmly believe vote spikes make up a major subset category of the total fraudulent vote number as presented for the various states in the *Navarro Report*.

With this revelation and assumption, we are now able to move forward with our analysis and make the following statements and rules regarding the percentages of and differences in vote spikes and the total number of fraudulent votes: Based upon the Median numbers, vote spikes, on average, represent around **3.6%** of the fraudulent vote while the total of fraudulent vote number, in most instances, is around **13.2%**; and the difference in the two is around 10 percent or to be precise **9.6%** (13.2% - 3.6%).

And did you notice that five (5) states (**Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin**) appear in both of these reports/studies? Thus, we are also able to derive a RATIO (or percentage) from these two studies regarding these five states. In the below table, we pair up the numbers and calculate a percentage (ratio) of the two:

| <u>States</u> | <u>Vote Spikes</u> | <u>Navarro Report</u> | <u>% of “Spikes” To Total Fraud</u> |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Arizona | 251,616 | 254,722 | 98.78% |
| Georgia | 119,811 | 601,130 | 19.93% |
| Michigan | 135,290 | 446,803 | 30.28% |
| Pennsylvania | 258,187 | 992,467 | 26.01% |
| Wisconsin | 143,201 | 553,872 | 25.85% |

The first thing one notices is how out-of-whack **Arizona** seems to be at 98.78% - as compared to the other states. But recall from the analysis above that the vote spike number for Arizona seems to be “high” for the *Election Spike Report* and the total fraudulent number in the *Navarro Report* for this state seems to be a bit “low.” So we should therefore throw-out this number for calculating an overall percentage or ratio.

Once this one state is discarded from the sample, then the results are remarkable – with a very high level of correlation between the two studies. The total range is from only 19.93% to 30.28% for these four remaining samples. And the Median Value of the four is **25.93%** (average of the two **bold** “middle” figures). With such a high level of correlation, we can then reasonably assert that the spike numbers for most of the states listed in the *Election Spike Report* represents 25.93% of the total fraudulent vote number. We can therefore calculate the Total Fraudulent Vote number for the remaining “spike” states (that are not also part of the *Navarro Report*) simply by dividing the “spike” number by **0.2593** in order to estimate a number that is “fair” in representing the total number of Fraudulent Votes for those states.

Calculating the Total Fraudulent Votes:

In calculating the Total Fraudulent Vote for the fifteen (15) states in which we have data for (Nevada is not one of the 14 “spike” states, but it is one of the states in the *Navarro Report* – thus, it is added to the 14 to equal 15), there are a few adjustments needed in order for the totals for all these states to be reasonable, accurate, and not exaggerated.

The median value of 0.2593 is a “middle” value; and like an average, some numbers in a set will be slightly above this figure and some slightly below. What this means for us is that some of the calculations will be slightly above what is actually the fraudulent number and some will be slightly below the “real” number; but they basically even out in the end results with the calculations being based upon the “median” figure.

Exceptions must be taken however regarding **Illinois** and **Virginia** in using and dividing by this “median” value. Because their “spike” number is such a high percentage to begin with, dividing by 0.2593 will therefore exaggerate the results, giving an indication of possibly 40% of the Total Vote being fraudulent. Again, one of the reasons we compared the figures in both the *Election Spike Report* and the *Navarro Report* to the actual Vote Totals (as

reported by the government) for each of the states was to find which anomalies were actually “normal” or not. To assume Illinois and Virginia had a 40% fraudulent vote total would indeed be making the wrong assumption; and thus, such an anomaly would not be “normal.” So a more accurate figure for these two states would be to take the actual vote “spike” number and then add 9.6% of the Total Vote number. (Again, this 9.6% figure is the average percentage difference between the vote “spike” and the total fraudulent vote number found in the *Navarro Report*.) This will result in the estimated Total Fraudulent Vote for these two states being around 20%. While that is an alarming figure, it is way below the possible 40% (by simply dividing by the calculated median value). In fact, 20% is a conservative figure for these two states; and in all likelihood, the actual figure of Total Fraudulent Vote is probably around 25%. In projecting an estimate of fraudulent votes for a state, it is always better to underestimate rather than to overestimate such a crucial and important figure.

As noted above for the state of **Arizona**, the total fraudulent vote as reported in the *Navarro Report* is a rather low number as compared to the other “Battleground” states. But the spike number as reported in the *Election Spike Report* is considered a “High” outlier – thus resulting in a likely overestimate of total fraud if you divide that number by 0.2593. For these reasons, I deem it best to take the reported vote “spike” number (which is likely a little high) and then add 9.6% of the Total Vote number (as reported by the government) in order to come up with and to calculate a reasonable and fair number to represent the Total Fraudulent Votes for Arizona.

Remember also with the state of **Pennsylvania**, there were so many “spikes” that the authors of the report had to raise the threshold to 60k, instead of their normal 25k. This leads me to be a little suspicious of the 3.37% figure that we’ve calculated above; but then again in looking at what’s reported in the *Navarro Report*, the numbers for the “spikes” might not be that far off. Since we already have an “actual” figure to represent the “Total Potentially Illegal Votes” in the *Navarro Report* (and it seems reasonable), we will therefore use it in our calculations below.

Let’s now consider how these estimates affect the Popular Vote Totals for the fifteen (15) states in these two studies with the following table below – based upon estimates involving an Adjustment Value of 25.93% (0.2593) and whenever possible using the “Actual” figures used in the *Navarro Report*:

| <u>States</u> | <u>Vote Spikes</u> | <u>Divide by or Add</u> | <u>Adjustment Value</u> | <u>Total Estimated (or Actual) Potentially Illegal Votes</u> | |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------|
| Arizona | 251,616 | Add (+) | (0.096 x 3,387,326) | 576,799 | (Estimated) |
| Florida* | 455,097 | Divide by (÷) | 0.2593 | 1,755,098 | (Estimated) |
| Georgia | 119,811 | N/A | N/A | 601,130 | (Actual) |
| Illinois | 603,082 | Add (+) | (0.096 x 6,033,744) | 1,182,321 | (Estimated) |
| Kentucky | 70,927 | Divide by (÷) | 0.2593 | 273,533 | (Estimated) |
| Maine | 27,236 | Divide by (÷) | 0.2593 | 105,037 | (Estimated) |
| Michigan | 135,290 | N/A | N/A | 446,803 | (Actual) |
| Minnesota | 113,755 | Divide by (÷) | 0.2593 | 438,700 | (Estimated) |
| Missouri | 147,174 | Divide by (÷) | 0.2593 | 567,582 | (Estimated) |
| Nevada | N/A | N/A | N/A | 220,008 | (Actual) |
| New Jersey | 90,578 | Divide by (÷) | 0.2593 | 349,317 | (Estimated) |
| Ohio | 160,181 | Divide by (÷) | 0.2593 | 617,744 | (Estimated) |
| Pennsylvania | 258,187 | N/A | N/A | 992,467 | (Actual) |
| Virginia | 473,991 | Add (+) | (0.096 x 4,460,524) | 902,201 | (Estimated) |
| Wisconsin | 143,201 | N/A | N/A | 553,872 | (Actual) |

**Total Estimated Fraudulent
Votes for Above 15 States**

9,582,612

Joe Biden is reportedly having won the 2020 Presidential Election by 7,052,770 votes (81,268,924 – 74,216,154). The calculations for these 15 states alone wipe-out and put Biden’s alleged “win” very much in question and in doubt. This calculation does not even consider the possible fraudulent votes that happened in the other 35 states (plus the District of Columbia). For the entire nation as a whole, we can therefore conclude the Actual Fraudulent Vote number is somewhat larger than this estimate of **9,582,612**. And anyone in their right mind has to realize Joe Biden did NOT win the Popular Vote, really.

These numbers also make you wonder about some of the other Democratic strongholds that are not part of this study – “Blue” states that have large populations like New York and California. Imagine the number of fraudulent votes likely in just those two states alone and how that could affect the 9.6 million number already calculated! Again, Joe Biden did not win this election, by any stretch of the imagination.

*Note: Again, the estimates are based upon the median value of 0.2593, with some totals representing an over-estimate and some being an under-estimate of likely actual fraudulent votes. Florida is probably one of the states where an over-estimate of fraudulent votes is calculated. With the numbers coming up to 15.86% of the total votes cast in Florida, I believe that is probably a bit high. The actual likely number of fraudulent votes is probably more in the 12% to 14% range. (Florida did in fact experience three vote spikes in excess of 100k.)

Calculating the Effect on the Electoral College:

We are not finished yet. Now let’s calculate the possible effect on the Electoral College Vote Count. There are a total of ten (10) states that “Flip” as a result of these calculations. Consider the following:

| | <u>Potentially Illegal Votes</u> | ≥ | <u>Margin of Victory (Reported in 2020 Election)</u> | <u>Electoral Votes</u> |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Arizona | 254,722 Votes | 24 Times Greater | 10,457 Votes (Biden) | 11 |
| Georgia | 601,130 Votes | 51 Times Greater | 11,779 Votes (Biden) | 16 |
| Illinois | 1,182,321 Votes | 1.1 Times Greater | 1,025,024 Votes (Biden) | 20 |
| Maine | 105,037 Votes | 1.4 Times Greater | 74,335 Votes (Biden) | 1 |
| Michigan | 446,803 Votes | 2.8 Times Greater | 154,818 Votes (Biden) | 16 |
| Minnesota | 438,700 Votes | 1.8 Times Greater | 233,012 Votes (Biden) | 10 |
| Nevada | 220,008 Votes | 6.5 Times Greater | 33,596 Votes (Biden) | 6 |
| Pennsylvania | 992,467 Votes | 12 Times Greater | 81,660 Votes (Biden) | 20 |
| Virginia | 902,201 Votes | 2.0 Times Greater | 451,138 Votes (Biden) | 13 |
| Wisconsin | 553,872 Votes | 26 Times Greater | 20,682 Votes (Biden) | 10 |
| | | | | Total 123 |

With these new Potentially Illegal Calculated Votes, this drastically changes the Electoral College Vote Count by **123 votes**. The new total is: **Trump = 355 and Biden = 183**. Again, this does not include the fraudulent vote in 35 other states plus the District of Columbia.

Any reasonable person must come to the conclusion that Joe Biden is NOT a legitimately elected president!!!

Role of Media and Big Tech

A discussion of Voter “Fraud” is not complete without at least mentioning the role of the mainstream Media and Big Tech. And while much of their influence on the 2020 Presidential Election does not meet the legal definition of actual “fraud,” their nefarious activities fall within the range of voter manipulation. And when it comes to a “fraudulent media,” they certainly push the envelope in being complicit in the voter fraud that did happen in 2020.

There was a time when we had honest journalism in America; in fact, it was once considered the 4th Branch of Government. I used to not question the validity of a news report that I heard or saw on television or radio. But this is no longer true, in this day and age. The year 2020 changed everything for me. Now I question everything I hear or see from the media and/or on the Internet. My change in attitude towards the media really started in how I saw the pandemic handled – with all the lies, exaggerations, and distortions I witnessed. First they told complete lies about the drug Hydroxychloroquine, which we now know is a safe and effective treatment of the Covid-19 virus. Doctors were smeared online and by the media for just speaking up and giving a second opinion. How about all the lies and why we needed to continue with a lockdown of the economy and why we must wear a mask – which are not even effective in stopping the spread of the virus. It was like there was a complete conspiracy of the Big Tech firms to control and censor the information being given to the American people. Now we are learning of a great cover-up involving the origins of the pandemic in China; the Media and Big Tech lie again and try to deny that the virus was man-made and came from a laboratory in Wuhan, China. But all these lies didn’t start in 2020; we started to see a huge escalation by the media beginning when Donald Trump became President in 2016.

The news reporter (one of the few real ones still around) Maria Bartiromo addressed this issue on “Sunday Morning Futures with Maria Bartiromo” recently on June 20th 2021 when she listed the five (5) Big Lies.⁶⁴ Consider the constant bombardment the American population has endured over the past number of years:

The 5 Big Lies:

- RUSSIA HOAX/ MADE UP DOSSIER
- IMPEACHMENT WITH NO CRIME
- HUNTER BIDEN LAPTOP & BUSINESS DEALS
- ORIGINS & TREATMENT OF COVID-19
- ARMED INSURRECTION

Americans can’t believe anything we hear any longer. Now let’s consider the role of the Media and Big Tech specifically in how they swayed the 2020 elections.

News Suppression:

No doubt, Media and Big Tech altered the outcome of the 2020 election in how they handled “Hunter Biden Laptop and Business Deals.” Hunter Biden, the son of President Joe Biden, engaged in “influence peddling” by trading on his father’s name – allegedly receiving millions of dollars from both countries of Ukraine and China. This was a financial scandal enveloping Joe Biden and his son; and if fully known by the public, it would have likely made a significant difference in the election.

Then a couple of weeks before and into the lead up of November 3rd, news broke also about Hunter’s laptop computer being “found,” with incriminating evidence on it – and the FBI even had a copy of the hard-drive. People on the Right were aware of this story through news-outlets like talk radio and FOX News; but the mainstream media and Big Tech kept this explosive news story SUPPRESSED, to prevent it from getting to those on the Left

before the election. This story was in fact “infamously censored” by **Twitter** and **Facebook**. Only after the election did the “dam finally break” when many on the Left first started to learn of the facts.

According to the website **LifeNews.com**, a poll was taken after the election by the **MRC/Polling Company** of 1,750 actual Biden voters. A full **45.1%** said they were **unaware** of the financial scandal enveloping Biden and his son, Hunter. And according to the poll, “full awareness of the Hunter Biden scandal would have led **9.4% of Biden voters to abandon the Democratic candidate**” – flipping all six of the Battleground swing states that Biden won from Trump.⁶⁵

Big Tech and Mind Control:

“In elections, search rankings that favor one candidate over another can shift the voting preferences of Undecided Voters by up to 80 percent in some demographic groups. Automated search suggestions and the ‘featured snippet’ (the answer box at the top of the page of search results) also influence people’s opinions, purchases and votes without their knowledge. The Search Engine is, in effect, the most powerful ‘Mind Control Machine’ ever invented.”⁶⁶

These are the words of **Dr. Robert Epstein** – Senior Research Psychologist for the **American Institute for Behavioral Research and Technology** (AIBRT) who is sounding the alarm of the effect that Big Tech has over our lives, especially in regards to the outcome of “Free and Fair” elections. On July 16, 2019, Dr. Epstein gave witness testimony before a U.S. Senate subcommittee into ongoing research on new forms of online manipulation. “Most of these effects involve ephemeral experiences, which means, among other things, that they don’t leave paper trails for authorities to trace.”⁶⁷ Let’s look at what Dr. Epstein has to say about these matters:

“All that matters now is who has the power to decide what content people will see or will not see (censorship), and what order that content is presented in. That power is almost entirely in the hands of the arrogant executives at two U.S. companies. Their algorithms decide which content gets suppressed, the order in which content is shown, and which content goes viral. You can counter a TV ad with another TV ad, but if the tech execs are supporting one candidate or party, *you can’t counteract their manipulations.*

Forget the Russians. As I said when I testified before Congress last summer, if our own tech companies all favor the same presidential candidate this year [2020]—and that seems likely—I calculate that they can easily shift *15 million votes* to that candidate without people knowing and without leaving a paper trail.

By the way, the more you know about someone, the easier it is to manipulate him or her. **Google** and **Facebook** have *millions* of pieces of information about every American voter, and they will be targeting their manipulations at the individual level for every single voter in every swing state. No one in the world except Google and Facebook can do that.

In President Eisenhower’s famous 1961 farewell address, he warned not only about the rise of a military-industrial complex; he also warned about the rise of a “technological elite” who could someday control our country without us knowing.”⁶⁸

For the record, Dr. Epstein is neither a conservative nor a Trump supporter. But he loves democracy and America more than he loves any particular party or candidate. The rigorous research that he has conducted, since 2013, shows that Big Tech companies now have unprecedented power to sway elections. For further information into this fighter for democracy, go to the website **MyGoogleResearch.com**.

Mark Zuckerberg and Center for Tech and Civic Life:

A number of Conservative websites and news outlets have reported on **Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg’s** involvement in the 2020 election. But even **National Public Radio (NPR)** acknowledges Zuckerberg’s heavy involvement as well. These sources form the basis for the following reporting:

Focusing on the logistics of the election, Mark Zuckerberg and wife, Priscilla Chan, **gave between \$350 million and \$400 million** to the **Center for Tech and Civic Life** (CTCL), a previously small Chicago-based nonprofit. The purpose of this organization was to give grant money to Left-leaning groups in more than **2,500 jurisdictions**, mostly in critical swing states, in order to “increasing number of voters who wanted to vote by mail.” This included the funding for heavy increase numbers of drop boxes for ballots in predominantly Democratic districts versus few

or none in Republican districts. These boxes allowed voters to cast ballots on a twenty-four hours a day basis, often with lax control and security measures. The sole aim by Zuckerberg with this funding was to boost Democratic turnout.^{69 and 70}

In The Art of the Steal, Peter Navarro details Zuckerberg’s activities in two of the swing states of Wisconsin and Pennsylvania as follows:

“For example, Wisconsin used a \$6.3 million CTCL grant from Zuckerberg to support the installation of drop-boxes and illegal ballot harvesting events like “**Democracy in the Park.**” . . .and funds were used to help with various other election administration activities in several Democrat strongholds.”⁷¹

“Similarly, Pennsylvania received over \$12 million from CTCL. Fully \$10 million of those funds poured into the Democrat-dominated Philadelphia to help boost turnout and count ballots. The strings attached to those funds required the city to open no fewer than 800 new polling places, thereby dramatically changing how Philadelphia managed its General Election processes.”⁷²

“It is also worth noting here that while this report does not examine any possible interventions by the Chinese Communist Party into our elections, Mark Zuckerberg has long sought to enter the Chinese market. He speaks fluent Chinese, and his company, Facebook, has – despicably – hired Chinese Communist Party members to increase Facebook’s ability **to censor** Trump supporters and the conservative movement.”⁷³

Many consider what Mark Zuckerberg has done as being “illegal.” These nefarious activities are a form of disenfranchisement (of Republican voters who didn’t get increased numbers of drop boxes in their areas, for instance) and this therefore violates the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause and possibly the National Voter Registration Act. Anyway you look at it; this is just one more example of how Big Tech improperly and unethically affected the election outcome in 2020.

Some Final Thoughts

Ever since I began this investigation into election fraud of the 2020 Presidential election, I have been asking myself and wondering “Where (which states) and to What Extent” was the fraud? Some of the most profound data available of election fraud involves the fifteen (15) states we have just examined. We will attempt to further answer these questions of “Where” and “What” for the remaining thirty-five (35) states plus the District of Columbia in Part II and Part III of this series of Special Reports.

We will likely never know the full extent of the fraud that took place in the 2020 election. As my friend Major Dave points out: “For any investigation to mean anything, it must have teeth. The only way to know for sure what happened is to go in with a badge and warrant.” But, I contend that even if you did this, you still wouldn’t know the full extent of the fraud, because much of the evidence has been destroyed by now.

One should pause however and really contemplate what we have just concluded about the fraud: It was not **one or two percent** (which would be too much in a nation that was once the “gold standard” in holding elections); but rather, the problem was actually **TEN TIMES** this level in a number of states. And in the states of Illinois and Virginia, the level of voter fraud possibly represented a likely 25% of the vote – a complete fabrication and false ballots. We have quickly become a Third-World Banana Republic, at a much faster rate than I ever imagined.

With the installation of an illegitimate President as the result of an obviously fraudulent and rigged election, we have a Constitutional Crisis of monumental proportions that we have never experienced in American history.

I’m flabbergasted and want to throw-up nearly every day when I hear the news of the Biden Administration and what they have planned next. On day one, Biden cancelled the construction of the Keystone Pipeline. This decision not only killed good paying American jobs, but it will ultimately lead to us being dependent upon foreign oil again. We have a literal invasion along the Southern Border, with immigrants crossing into our country. Just in the month of May, illegal immigrant apprehensions spiked by 674% as compared to the same time in 2020. The U.S. Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) reported 180,034 immigrants attempted to cross the border illegally in May as compared to just 23,237 in May of 2020.⁷⁴ Consider the inhumanity associated with this invasion – the breakup of families and little children being left at our doorstep – and the human slavery and sex-trafficking that is also involved. The drug cartels are having a heyday with all the drugs being smuggled into the U.S. In an April article from Fox News, they said the CBP revealed the total weight of the illegal drug, fentanyl, seized at the southwest border in the first quarter has seen a 233% increase from the same time last year. Fentanyl is considered to be 50-100 times more potent than morphine and kills tens of thousands of Americans each year.⁷⁵ It is odorless and colorless, so it’s easy for smuggling; and the drug’s original origins are believed to be from China. This is a dangerous drug and is the most common cause of overdose deaths in the country, about half of all opioid-related deaths. What is the Biden Administration doing about this invasion and drug smuggling? Not only are they doing NOTHING, but they are the CAUSE and ENCOURAGING it! They are behind it all, in the hopes that these illegal immigrants will someday become future Democrat voters. And they are delivering these illegals by the busloads to the city near you. On to another fiasco, criminals (likely from beyond our borders) are hacking into and holding hostage (for ransom) companies involved in our critical infrastructure like major gas pipelines and food processing plants. These attacks are, in part, a result of Biden appearing weak, frail, and cognitively challenged to our foreign adversaries. And on another front, consider Biden’s Trillion-Dollar Deficits, the likes of nothing we have ever seen before. They are spending (our) money like there’s no tomorrow. This will definitely lead to hyper-inflation and the eventual collapse of the U.S. Dollar. It is very reminiscent of what happened with the Weimar Republic in Germany in the early 1930s – which culminated and led to the rise of Adolf Hitler. A very scary situation! And under all the turmoil of the first six months of 2021, China has finished their “takeover” of Hong Kong and now they have their eyes on Taiwan. It’s a joke if anyone believes Biden will lift a finger when China does decide to invade the island nation.

I frankly don't know exactly what "We the People" can do about the situation. Some say that we can simply wait until 2024 to re-elect Donald Trump. But there are two things about that being a fallacy.

First, as I previously iterated, "Even if Trump gets 90% of the legitimate vote in 2024, he still loses – that is simply what happens when the system is rigged! If nothing is done about this situation, the Left will be only emboldened the next time around."

And second, I'm afraid we don't have several years to wait for another Presidential General Election. Heck, we don't even have until the midterm elections to try to stop the "basic transformation" of the United States. At the warp speed rate the Biden Administration is going, the nation will be destroyed and collapse within two years.

The question remains: How do we make our elections Free and Fair (and transparent) again? And what can "We the People" do about the 2020 elections? These are questions we really need to ask ourselves.

What we need is for Congress to immediately call for and have Watergate style hearings, with wall-to-wall media coverage, of the election irregularities that happened and to have the Justice Department to file charges against a number of people for their involvement in the fraud – to have jury trials for these individual; and if found guilty, to be sentenced to hard time in jail. But with the Executive and Legislative Branches of the Federal Government being under the basic control of the Democrat Party, this is NOT likely to happen.

The Supreme Court should get involved in this matter immediately. They should adhere to the standard of "one man, one vote," which is not what happened in the 2020 election – with some on the Left casting many more than one vote per person. The High Court should declare the results of the 2020 election as fraudulent and therefore "Un-Constitutional." They should set a date for new elections ASAP with a number of safeguards. They should require a one-day Election Day, not Election Season of 30, 45, or more days. They should require citizenship and a photo ID in order to vote. And they should call out the National Guard to patrol problem precincts where there was suspect of mass fraud in the past election.

This could happen if Chief Justice, John Roberts, was a true Patriot and if he had the balls to do the right thing. But sadly, this solution is not likely to happen either. Consider what John Roberts was overheard as saying this past year. Lin Wood, attorney for Donald Trump, last year tweeted about a phone conversation between Roberts and Justice Stephen Breyer of 8/19; in it, Attorney Wood tweets, "Justice John Roberts stated that he would make sure 'the mother f#*ker (talking about Trump) would never be re-elected' – Roberts was discussing with Breyer on 'how to work to get Trump voted out.'" ⁷⁶ So we now know how the High Court truly leans about doing anything regarding the 2020 election.

What is Really Happening in America:

I cited above a number of calamities that have happened since Biden has become President. It is as if the Democrat Party is intentionally trying to destroy the nation; at least, their policies seem to point in that direction. Many people don't understand what is happening with talk of defunding the police, with the burning and riots of this past year, and our children being taught such falsehoods as Critical-Race Theory and the 1619 Project. These people who don't understand what is happening are in denial of the Truth. It is plain as day to me as to what is happening. Consider the following:

With news of Hunter Biden receiving millions of dollars for "influence peddling," we all know the Bidens are "on the dole" with the Chinese Communist – basically taking BRIBES from a foreign adversary government. In one of the two speeches given recently on Memorial Day, President Joe Biden acknowledged his "friendship" with the leader of the Communist nation. On May 28, 2021, Joe Biden was caught as having said:

"I've spent more time with President Xi of China than any world leader has, for 24 hours of private meetings with him, with just an interpreter. 17,000 miles traveling with him in China and here. He firmly believes that China, before the year 3035, is going to own America . . ." ⁷⁷

This slip of the tongue is very telling of Mr. Biden on a number of different levels: It is obvious that Joe Biden is cognitively struggling. He meant to say the year 2035 instead of 3035 – fourteen years from now, not a millennium. We all know Biden is becoming senile; maybe this is the reason he blundered this out, not really thinking about what he was saying – but telling the TRUTH in how he really thinks and feels. The most frightful part of this statement is the fact that Biden seems to be fully willing to accept the premise of Communist China

overtaking the United States – just lie down and allow for it to happen – something in his heart of hearts that he is willing to accept. In Joe Biden’s mind, China will soon be our conquerors and own us!

It is plain to me that we are under attack by China and that Biden is their puppet. Top leaders in American government and business have been compromised by China, a foreign power that seeks to undermine our country and our democratic system. And China is even part of the rigging of the 2020 election. We saw in the previous chapter having to do with “Switching of Votes” that China produced key components of the voting machines that we used. China is the one behind the brainwashing of our children being indoctrinated into Marxism ideology like with Black Lives Matter. It is China and the Democrat Party that is ultimately behind this BS being taught in the public school systems and in the universities. The Chinese and those in the Democrat Party are the real racist! It is they who see the world as one group of people (a race) versus another. Diversity is America’s strength, but they want to tear this down. They want to get rid of Martin Luther King Jr.’s dream of “a day when people will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.” This is the essence of America, where people are individuals and not skin-color groups, and where we all should strive to be the best that we can in life. But if China can have their way and have continued influence over leaders in our government and with our educational system, the concept that we are a nation of individuals with certain God-given and unalienable Rights will no longer be taught. They want to sow seeds of discontent in our society and do everything to see that our government collapses – so they can become the New Dominant World Power.

A Clear and Present Danger:



Back on December 7, 2020, Tucker Carlson did nearly a whole show on the threat and influence of China. He led his show, Tucker Carlson Tonight, with an open monologue talking about a recent video that came to public attention on November 28. Tucker described Di Dongsheng, a professor at Renmin University in Beijing, who had appeared on a Chinese television show about Wall Street and international trade. “Like so many in academia in China, Di is a servant of his country’s government.” The video was deleted from

Chinese social media soon after being uploaded, but FOX News was able to make a copy before it was deleted. While airing the video in the background, an English translation was provided as to what was being said:

DI DONSHENG (translation): “The Trump administration is in a trade war with us, so why can’t we fix the Trump administration? Why, between 1992 and 2016, did China and the U.S., use to be able to settle all kinds of issues? No matter what kind of crises we encountered ... things were solved in no time ... We fixed everything in two months. What is the reason? I’m going to throw out something maybe a little bit explosive here. It’s just because we have people at the top. At the top of America’s core inner circle of power and influence, we have our old friends.”⁷⁸

Tucker affirmed that two different Chinese speakers confirmed the above translation. This is as close to a smoking gun as we have ever seen. Tucker went on to say and ask the obvious question, “So who are these people and how many of them work in our media and in our government? Well, Di didn’t say precisely.” Tucker points out that Di Dongsheng says China’s influence over America has been in place for decades and that “the Obama administration was easy to manipulate . . . The Chinese had many friends among the Obama people. The problem came when Donald Trump was elected. After that, Di Dongsheng says, everything changed.” Showing a translation, the Tucker program further showed what this member of the Chinese Communist Party had to say:

DI DONGSHENG (translation): “For the past 30 years, 40 years, we have been utilizing the core power of the United States ... Since the 1970s, Wall Street had a very strong influence on the domestic and foreign affairs of the United States, so we had a channel to rely on. But the problem is that after 2008, the status of Wall Street has declined, and more importantly, after 2016, Wall Street can’t fix Trump. Why? It’s very awkward. Trump had a previous soft default issue with Wall Street, so there was a conflict between them. But I won’t go into details, I may not have enough time. So during the U.S.-China trade war they [Wall Street] tried to help. And I know that, my friends on the U.S. side told me that they tried to help, but they couldn’t do much.”⁷⁹

Tucker concluded this segment of his show with the following statement: “If you’re wondering why our political class has stood by and allowed the Chinese government to degrade this country and our way of life, stood by as the

Chinese government has flooded the United States with deadly opioids that have killed hundreds of thousands of people, stood by as the Chinese government ripped off billions of dollars worth of intellectual property from our companies, there's your answer.”⁸⁰

Need for Nuremberg Style Trials:

While the bullets have not yet started flying, I firmly believe we are at war, and the survival of the nation is at stake. I think many of our elected officials have taken bribes over the years and many are still “on the dole” with the Chinese Communist. They are therefore compromised and need to be rooted out. I therefore call for the need of Nuremberg style trials and have charges of TREASON brought against these people who have gotten in bed with the enemy. I don't know exactly all of who these people are, but I would strongly expect the following:

Anthony Fauci, Joe Biden, Barack Obama, Bill and Hillary Clinton, Chuck Schumer, Dianne Feinstein, Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, Nancy Pelosi, Adam Schiff, Eric Swalwell (the one caught sleeping with a Chinese spy), **Jerrold Nadler, and Maxine Waters**. There are a few on the Republican side who we might want to also take a closer look at as possibly being “on the dole;” they include **Mitch McConnell** and **Richard Burr**. If I was a bit more up on things in this regard, I could probably name a few more of these likely traitors, but this is a good start. If these people are found guilty of taking bribes and committing treason, then they need to be executed, preferably by public hanging. What they have done and some are still doing is NOT acceptable and should not be tolerated. Punishment by death is the only just sentence for such a crime. Preserving the Republic is way too important!

Charges of TREASON should definitely be brought against **George Soros** with his funding of all the causes of anarchy. As bizarre as this may sound, Soros is actually a Jew but is also a German Nazi – he is still fighting WWII and wants to destroy this nation. (As a kid, Soros went around with the Nazis to help confiscate the wealth of the Jewish people – he is a total traitor to the state of Israel – and one creepy dude.) I will be glad to see the day when that SOB is hung high. Good riddance!

And I believe the heads of the Big Tech firms should be tried for TREASON as well. An investigation needs to be made of **Mark Zuckerberg** of Facebook, **Jeff Bezos** of Amazon, **Sundar Pichai** of Google, the creepy looking **Jack Dorsey** of Twitter, and even **Bill Gates** (retired) from Microsoft.

Not only do I believe all these people have taken bribes from China at some point in the past, but I believe the majority of these were complicit in helping and sponsoring the election fraud that took place in 2020 – in order to get Donald Trump out-of-office. All the civil unrest and calamities of the Biden administration go back to the core issue of “problems with the ballot box.” We have to fix that problem first. The survival of the nation and for us to remain a Free People is at stake.

All the people complicit in election fraud who work in the postal service, with the board of elections across the nation, and other relatively “low level” jobs should also be rooted out and face long prison sentences. On top of this list should be **Stacey Abrams** of Georgia.

Here's a Radical Solution for You:

I totally agree that most problems with voter fraud need to be dealt with at the state level. It is state legislatures that make election law, and I'm totally against “federalizing” elections. We need to strengthen voter integrity laws by contacting our state representatives and going through the various state legislatures. But I am open to and in favor of possibly having some basic guidelines like having one voting day (and not voting season), and requiring citizenship and having to show a picture ID in order to vote as being addressed in the United States Constitution with a new Amendment added. While most proposed amendments start in the Congress and then sent to the states for ratification, having such a basic voter guideline amendment is not likely to be started in this Democrat controlled Congress. But there is a simple way around all this. Article V of the Constitution provides a means of starting the process of proposing amendments at the state level, effectively circumventing the control of Congress. This can be done by calling a **Convention of States**, where a proposed amendment is sent around to the various states to be voted on; and once approved by two-thirds of the legislatures (34 states), then delegates are sent to a convention to start the ratification process. Once a proposed amendment is ratified by three-fourths of the

legislatures (38 states), then it becomes part of the Constitution and the law of the land. I believe this is one way possible in how we can strengthen voter integrity and transparency in this nation.

Now here's a really radical idea for you: The United States Constitution is a grant of power by the states to the federal government. If the states can give the power, then they can certainly take it back. I believe the states should increase their oversight power of the federal government by **periodically calling** for a **Convention of States**. This can be done by having an amendment added that expands the powers of the states under Article V and where a convention is called every two years, for instance. The states would meet to consider proposals of amendments and to hold the federal government accountable for their actions. In recent years the federal government has completely gotten out-of-control. This power needs to be reigned in; at least the federal government needs to be more accountable to the states and to "We the People." The states need to "impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and [impose] term limits on Congress and federal officials." ⁸¹

Some have cautioned at calling for such a convention, warning that it could lead to a runaway convention where they start to take away such basic rights as the right to bear arms. But as one Conservative state legislator recently pointed out to me, you can propose all the amendments in the world but they still have to go through the ratification process of getting approval of 3/4s of the states, which is a very high bar and threshold. So I'm not too worried about a "runaway" convention. Only really good ideas will become part of the Constitution. And when we realize an amendment is not such a good idea, after it has become a part of the Constitution, then we can always repeal it, like with Prohibition.

What You Can Do:

You can help to get the word out as to what REALLY happened in the 2020 Election. There are at least 74 million of us who already know or highly suspect what happened. Now it is up to us to arm ourselves with the truth and make it available to all the other Americans as to what really happened – give them the proof. I ask that if you are reading this for the first time on a computer screen, then **PRINT IT OUT**. Make a hard copy of it; make it a sort of old-fashioned newspaper that you can carry around. Study and re-read it. Read the other reports cited in this Special Report – Do your own research. Then get with your friends and relatives and share this Special Report with them as well. And most importantly, make a copy and give it to your Liberal friends – they need to know what a scam the 2020 elections really were and how all of our Freedoms are at stake. They need to be Educated!

We all have a sphere of influence. Use it to help get the word out. Consider the theory of **Six Degrees of Separation**. "It is the idea that all people on average are six, or fewer, social connections away from each other – everyone on the face of the earth. As a result, a chain of 'a friend of a friend' statements can be made to connect any two people in a maximum of six steps." Use this Special Report to get the word out to everyone you know; just have your friends and family go to **ForFreeAndFairElections.com** and download a free PDF copy (or copy the link from the website and email it out to everyone). Soon everyone will have this information. They can't stop us and Big Tech can't stop us from emailing this Special Report to everyone we know.

God Bless and Godspeed,

Billy Parker

Appendix

Margins and Percentages for: National, 50 States & D.C. in the 2020 Presidential Election

| | <u>Republican</u> <u>(Donald Trump)</u> | | <u>Democrat</u> <u>(Joe Biden)</u> | | <u>Margin of Victory</u> | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| | <u>Votes</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Votes</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>Votes</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>In Favor Of:</u> |
| Alabama | 1,441,170 | 62.03% | 849,624 | 36.57% | 591,546 | 25.46% | (Republicans) |
| Alaska | 189,951 | 52.83% | 153,778 | 42.77% | 36,173 | 10.06% | (Republicans) |
| Arizona | 1,661,686 | 49.06% | 1,672,143 | 49.36% | 10,457 | 0.31% | (Democrats) |
| Arkansas | 760,647 | 62.40% | 423,932 | 34.78% | 336,715 | 27.62% | (Republicans) |
| California | 6,006,429 | 34.32% | 11,110,250 | 63.48% | 5,103,821 | 29.16% | (Democrats) |
| Colorado | 1,364,607 | 41.90% | 1,804,352 | 55.40% | 439,745 | 13.50% | (Democrats) |
| Connecticut | 714,717 | 39.19% | 1,080,831 | 59.26% | 366,114 | 20.07% | (Democrats) |
| Delaware | 200,603 | 39.77% | 296,268 | 58.74% | 95,665 | 18.97% | (Democrats) |
| Dist. Of Col. | 18,586 | 5.40% | 317,323 | 92.15% | 298,737 | 86.75% | (Democrats) |
| Florida | 5,668,731 | 51.22% | 5,297,045 | 47.86% | 371,686 | 3.36% | (Republicans) |
| Georgia | 2,461,854 | 49.24% | 2,473,633 | 49.47% | 11,779 | 0.24% | (Democrats) |
| Hawaii | 196,864 | 34.27% | 366,130 | 63.73% | 169,266 | 29.46% | (Democrats) |
| Idaho | 554,119 | 63.84% | 287,021 | 33.07% | 267,098 | 30.77% | (Republicans) |
| Illinois | 2,446,891 | 40.55% | 3,471,915 | 57.54% | 1,025,024 | 16.99% | (Democrats) |
| Indiana | 1,729,519 | 57.02% | 1,242,416 | 40.96% | 487,103 | 16.06% | (Republicans) |
| Iowa | 897,672 | 53.09% | 759,061 | 44.89% | 138,611 | 8.20% | (Republicans) |
| Kansas | 771,406 | 56.21% | 570,323 | 41.56% | 201,083 | 14.65% | (Republicans) |
| Kentucky | 1,326,646 | 62.09% | 772,474 | 36.15% | 554,172 | 25.94% | (Republicans) |
| Louisiana | 1,255,776 | 58.46% | 856,034 | 39.85% | 399,742 | 18.61% | (Republicans) |
| Maine | 360,737 | 44.02% | 435,072 | 53.09% | 74,335 | 9.07% | (Democrats) |
| Maryland | 976,414 | 32.15% | 1,985,023 | 65.36% | 1,008,609 | 33.21% | (Democrats) |
| Massachusetts | 1,167,202 | 32.14% | 2,382,202 | 65.60% | 1,215,000 | 33.46% | (Democrats) |
| Michigan | 2,649,852 | 47.84% | 2,804,040 | 50.62% | 154,188 | 2.78% | (Democrats) |
| Minnesota | 1,484,065 | 45.28% | 1,717,077 | 52.40% | 233,012 | 7.11% | (Democrats) |
| Mississippi | 756,764 | 57.60% | 539,398 | 41.06% | 217,366 | 16.55% | (Republicans) |
| Missouri | 1,718,736 | 56.80% | 1,253,014 | 41.41% | 465,722 | 15.39% | (Republicans) |
| Montana | 343,602 | 56.92% | 244,786 | 40.55% | 98,816 | 16.37% | (Republicans) |
| Nebraska | 556,846 | 58.22% | 374,583 | 39.17% | 182,263 | 19.06% | (Republicans) |
| Nevada | 669,890 | 47.67% | 703,486 | 50.06% | 33,596 | 2.39% | (Democrats) |
| New Hampshire | 365,660 | 45.36% | 424,937 | 52.71% | 59,277 | 7.35% | (Democrats) |
| New Jersey | 1,883,274 | 41.40% | 2,608,335 | 57.33% | 725,061 | 15.94% | (Democrats) |
| New Mexico | 401,894 | 43.50% | 501,614 | 54.29% | 99,720 | 10.79% | (Democrats) |
| New York | 3,244,798 | 37.75% | 5,230,985 | 60.86% | 1,986,187 | 23.11% | (Democrats) |
| North Carolina | 2,758,775 | 49.93% | 2,684,292 | 48.59% | 74,483 | 1.35% | (Republicans) |
| North Dakota | 235,595 | 65.11% | 114,902 | 31.76% | 120,693 | 33.36% | (Republicans) |
| Ohio | 3,154,834 | 53.27% | 2,679,165 | 45.24% | 475,669 | 8.03% | (Republicans) |
| Oklahoma | 1,020,280 | 65.37% | 503,890 | 32.29% | 516,390 | 33.09% | (Republicans) |
| Oregon | 958,448 | 40.37% | 1,340,383 | 56.45% | 381,935 | 16.08% | (Democrats) |
| Pennsylvania | 3,377,674 | 48.84% | 3,458,229 | 50.01% | 80,555 | 1.16% | (Democrats) |
| Rhode Island | 199,922 | 38.61% | 307,486 | 59.39% | 107,564 | 20.77% | (Democrats) |
| South Carolina | 1,385,103 | 55.11% | 1,091,541 | 43.43% | 293,562 | 11.68% | (Republicans) |
| South Dakota | 261,043 | 61.77% | 150,471 | 35.61% | 110,572 | 26.16% | (Republicans) |
| Tennessee | 1,852,475 | 60.66% | 1,143,711 | 37.45% | 708,764 | 23.21% | (Republicans) |
| Texas | 5,890,347 | 52.06% | 5,259,126 | 46.48% | 631,221 | 5.58% | (Republicans) |
| Utah | 865,140 | 58.13% | 560,282 | 37.65% | 304,858 | 20.48% | (Republicans) |
| Vermont | 112,704 | 30.67% | 242,820 | 66.09% | 130,116 | 35.41% | (Democrats) |
| Virginia | 1,962,430 | 44.00% | 2,413,568 | 54.11% | 451,138 | 10.11% | (Democrats) |
| Washington | 1,584,651 | 38.77% | 2,369,612 | 57.97% | 784,961 | 19.20% | (Democrats) |
| West Virginia | 545,382 | 68.62% | 235,984 | 29.69% | 309,398 | 38.93% | (Republicans) |
| Wisconsin | 1,610,184 | 48.82% | 1,630,866 | 49.45% | 20,682 | 0.63% | (Democrats) |
| Wyoming | 193,559 | 69.94% | 73,491 | 26.55% | 120,068 | 43.38% | (Republicans) |
| United States | 74,216,154 | 46.86% | 81,268,924 | 51.31% | 7,052,770 | 4.45% | (Democrats) |

ENDNOTES

- ¹ **Carlson, Tucker** of the **Tucker Carlson Tonight – Wednesday, June 16** on FOX News; https://video.foxnews.com/v/6259246597001?playlist_id=5556999982001#sp=show-clips
- ² **Hoft, Joe** of **The Gateway Pundit**, “**BREAKING EXCLUSIVE: Accurate List of 2020 Election Fraud Cases Shows 81 Cases Total, 30 Still Active – And NOT ONE SINGLE COURT Has Allowed Evidence to be Argued,**” 1-24-2021, <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/01/breaking-exclusive-accurate-list-2020-election-fraud-cases-shows-81-cases-total-31-still-active-not-one-single-court-allowed-evidence-argued/>
- ³ “**This Week**” on **ABC News**, Interview of **Senator Rand Paul** by **George Stephanopoulos**, Jan. 24, 2021, Transcript found: <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-24-21-amy-klobuchar-rand-paul/story?id=75455111>
- ^{4, 5, 6} Webpage “**Statistical Anomalies,**” **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**, <https://2020electionirregularities.com/statistical-anomalies/>
- ^{7, 8, 9} Webpage “**Mail-in Fraud,**” **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**, <https://2020electionirregularities.com/mailin/>
- ¹⁰ **Page 12** of **Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 1-6-21)**, Contributors: Jared Black, Ray Bleharw, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steve Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al; <https://www.scribd.com/document/495988109/MITRE-Election-Report-Critique>
- ¹¹ **Page 3 & 4** of **Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 1-6-21)**, Contributors: Jared Black, Ray Bleharw, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steve Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al; <https://www.scribd.com/document/495988109/MITRE-Election-Report-Critique>
- ¹² **The Heritage Foundation**, <https://www.heritage.org/voterfraud/search?state=NC>
- ^{13 – 31} Webpage “**Mail-in Fraud,**” **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**, <https://2020electionirregularities.com/mailin/>
- ³² **Scanlan, Quinn** of **ABC News**, “*Here’s how states have changed the rules around voting amid the coronavirus pandemic,*” Sept. 22, 2020, <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/states-changed-rules-voting-amid-coronavirus-pandemic/story?id=72309089>
- ^{33 & 34} Webpage “**Voting Machines,**” **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**; <https://2020electionirregularities.com/dominion/security-vulnerabilities-of-voting-machines/>
- ³⁵ Webpage “**Voting Machines,**” **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**; <https://2020electionirregularities.com/dominion/dominion-voting-systems-potential-ties-with-china/>
- ^{36 & 37} **Page 16** of **Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 1-6-21)**, Contributors: Jared Black, Ray Bleharw, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steve Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al; <https://www.scribd.com/document/495988109/MITRE-Election-Report-Critique>
- ³⁸ **Page 17** of **Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 1-6-21)**, Contributors: Jared Black, Ray Bleharw, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steve Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al; <https://www.scribd.com/document/495988109/MITRE-Election-Report-Critique>
- ³⁹ **Page 16** of **Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 1-6-21)**, Contributors: Jared Black, Ray Bleharw, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steve Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al; <https://www.scribd.com/document/495988109/MITRE-Election-Report-Critique>
- ⁴⁰ Webpage “**Voting Machines,**” **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**; <https://2020electionirregularities.com/dominion/>
- ^{41 - 46} Webpage “**Voting Machines,**” **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**; <https://2020electionirregularities.com/dominion/voting-machines-switch-votes/>
- ⁴⁷ Webpage “**Voting Machines,**” **2020ElectionIrregularities.com**; <https://2020electionirregularities.com/dominion/security-vulnerabilities-of-voting-machines/>
- ⁴⁸ **Ramsland Jr., James**, “**Antrim Michigan Forensics Report (REVISED PRELIMINARY SUMMARY, v2 – Dated 12/13/2020),**” www.depernow.com/report, https://depernow.com/uploads/2/7/0/2/27029178/antrim_michigan_forensics_report_%5b121320%5d_v2_%5bredacted%5d.pdf
- ⁴⁹ **Page 16** of **Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 1-6-21)**, Contributors: Jared Black, Ray Bleharw, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steve Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al; <https://www.scribd.com/document/495988109/MITRE-Election-Report-Critique>

- ⁵⁰ **Turner, Ben, CEO of Fraud Spotters**, www.fraudspotters.com/statistics, also available on Webpage “**Statistical Anomalies**,” 2020ElectionIrregularities.com; <https://2020electionirregularities.com/dominion/fraud-analyst-finds-average-of-2-to-3-percent-shift-for-biden-in-counties-that-used-dominion/>
- ⁵¹ & ⁵² Webpage “**Voting Machines**,” 2020ElectionIrregularities.com; <https://2020electionirregularities.com/dominion/security-vulnerabilities-of-voting-machines/>
- ⁵³ Webpage “**Voting Machines**,” 2020ElectionIrregularities.com; <https://2020electionirregularities.com/dominion/>
- ⁵⁴ **Page 17 of Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 1-6-21)**, Contributors: Jared Black, Ray Bleharw, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steve Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al; <https://www.scribd.com/document/495988109/MITRE-Election-Report-Critique>
- ⁵⁵ & ⁵⁶ **Dave, Major** – Private Citizen, **2020 NC General Election Wrap Up – YouTube**, <https://youtu.be/DTBirZj9SVc>
- ⁵⁷ **Page 6 of Critique of MITRE Report: February 25, 2021 (rev 1-6-21)**, Contributors: Jared Black, Ray Bleharw, John Droz, Alex Kossovsky, Steve Miller, Eric Quinnell, Michael Sheliga, Stan Young, Et. Al; <https://www.scribd.com/document/495988109/MITRE-Election-Report-Critique>
- ⁵⁸ **Navarro, Peter, Page 1 of Volume Three of the Navarro Report**, PeterNavarro.com; <https://www.thethinkingconservative.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/The-Navarro-Report-Volume-III-Final-1.13.21-0001.pdf>
- ⁵⁹ **Navarro, Peter, Page 12 of Volume Three of the Navarro Report**, PeterNavarro.com; <https://www.thethinkingconservative.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/The-Navarro-Report-Volume-III-Final-1.13.21-0001.pdf>
- ⁶⁰ **Navarro, Peter, Page 3 of Volume Three of the Navarro Report**, PeterNavarro.com; <https://www.thethinkingconservative.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/The-Navarro-Report-Volume-III-Final-1.13.21-0001.pdf>
- ⁶¹ Webpage “**Statistical Anomalies**,” 2020ElectionIrregularities.com, <https://2020electionirregularities.com/statistical-anomalies/>
- ⁶² **Page 2 of Presidential Election Startling Vote Spikes 1-2-21 (rev 6-22-21)**, Contributors: **Quinnell, Eric** (Engineer); **Young, Stan** (Statistician); **Cox, Tony** (Statistician), **Davis, Tom** (IT Expert); **Blehar, Ray** (Government Analysis, ret’d); **Droz, John** (Physicist); and **Anonymous Experts**, TheThinkingConservative.com/statistical; https://election-integrity.info/Vote_Spikes_Report.pdf
- ⁶³ **Page 25 of Presidential Election Startling Vote Spikes 1-2-21 (rev 6-22-21)**, Contributors: **Quinnell, Eric** (Engineer); **Young, Stan** (Statistician); **Cox, Tony** (Statistician), **Davis, Tom** (IT Expert); **Blehar, Ray** (Government Analysis, ret’d); **Droz, John** (Physicist); and **Anonymous Experts**, TheThinkingConservative.com/statistical; https://election-integrity.info/Vote_Spikes_Report.pdf
- ⁶⁴ **Bartiromo, Maria** of the **Sunday Morning Futures with Maria Bartiromo**, June 20 on **FOX News**, https://video.foxnews.com/v/6259740044001?playlist_id=3386055101001#sp=show-clips
- ⁶⁵ **Noyes, Rich**, “**17% of Biden Voters Would Not Have Voted for Him Had They Known Scandals Liberal Media Censored**,” Nov. 24, 2020, LifeNews.com; <https://www.lifenews.com/2020/11/24/17-of-biden-voters-would-not-have-voted-for-him-had-they-known-scandals-liberal-media-censored/>
- ⁶⁶, ⁶⁷, ⁶⁸ **Dr. Epstein, Robert**, Webpage “**Internet Studies**,” AmericanInstituteforBehavioralResearchandTechnology and also of MyGoogleResearch.com; <https://aibr.org/index.php/internet-studies>
- ⁶⁹ “**How Private Money From Facebook’s CEO Saved The 2020 Election**,” Dec. 8, 2020 [NationalPublicRadio \(NPR\)](http://NationalPublicRadio(NPR)) and [APM Reports](http://APMReports), <https://www.npr.org/2020/12/08/943242106/how-private-money-from-facebooks-ceo-saved-the-2020-election>
- ⁷⁰ **Widburg, Andrea**, “**Understanding how Mark Zuckerberg affected the election**,” Dec. 13, 2020, AmericanThinker.com, <https://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2020/12/understanding-how-mark-zuckerberg-affected-the-election.html>
- ⁷¹, ⁷², ⁷³ **Navarro, Peter, Page 16-17 of The Art of the Steal – Volume Two of the Navarro Report, January 5, 2021**, PeterNavarro.com, <https://www.priestsforlife.org/elections/pdf/navarro-art-of-the-steal.pdf>
- ⁷⁴ **George, Liz** of AmericanMilitaryNews.com; “**Illegal immigrant apprehensions spike 674% in May compared to last year**”; June 11, 2021; <https://americanmilitarynews.com/2021/06/illegal-immigrant-apprehensions-spike-674-in-may-compared-to-last-year/>
- ⁷⁵ **Keene, Houston** of **FOX News**, “**Border crisis: 233% increase in fentanyl seizures at southern border, Fentanyl smuggling has spiked amid the border crisis**”; April 15, 2021; <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/border-crisis-mexico-southern-border-fentanyl-mccarthy>

⁷⁶ **Rightwing Minute**, “Did Justice John Roberts say he would make sure “the mother#*ker would never be re-elected”?, <https://www.rightwingminute.com/headlines/did-justice-john-roberts-say-he-would-make-sure-the-motherfker-would-never-be-re-elected/>

⁷⁷ **Transcript Library**, “Joe Biden & Jill Biden Memorial Day Weekend Speech Transcript Hampton, Virginia,” May 28, 2021; <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/joe-biden-jill-biden-memorial-day-weekend-speech-transcript-hampton-virginia>

^{78, 79, 80} **Carlson, Tucker** on **FOX News**, “Our elites' collusion with China is real and widespread. Here's why our political class stood by as China degraded America and our way of life: Many of them are on the take,” December 7, 2020; <https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/tucker-carlson-elites-china-collusion-di-dongsheng>

⁸¹ **Convention of States Action**, <https://conventionofstates.com/>