A Critique of Dr. Douglas Frank, Cyber Symposium (Published Aug. 10, 2021)

A Critique Questioning the Assertion of "Phantom Voters" and that the 2010 Census Was Used to Create the Algorithm That Fabricated the Electronic Vote Outcome in the 2020 Presidential Election



"We at For Free and Fair Elections do contend that the 2020 Presidential Election was fraudulent; but in no way do we support wild and baseless claims that, we believe, to be no more than conspiracy theories, false, and misleading information."

For Free and Fair Elections

ForFreeAndFairElections.com

Author: Billy Parker

Date of Report: February 10, 2022 (rev 3-9-22)

Table of Contents

Prefix *III*

Chapter 1
Introduction 1

Chapter 2
Screenshots from Video 2

Chapter 3
Comparing to Another State – NC 12

Chapter 4
VPR - Comparing All 50 States 15

Chapter 5
Best Case for "Phantom Voter" 17

Chapter 6
Conclusion 19

Prefix

While this *Critique* is a criticism of Dr. Douglas Frank, I do in fact believe the 2020 election to be fraudulent and to have been stolen away from Donald Trump. There were many anomalies that happened in that election; and each one adds to the belief that something just wasn't right about that election. As for me, my beliefs about the election are based upon four simple concepts, and they are as follows:

- **The Vote Spikes**: Vote Spikes are highly unlikely to happen naturally. They are so improbable that the only logical explanation, in my book and way of thinking, is that election fraud occurred. These spikes were documented to happen in fourteen (14) states.
  For a detailed report of these spikes, please refer to the following link for the *Election Spikes Report*: https://election-integrity.info/Vote_Spikes_Report.pdf

- **The Political Pendulum**: The political pendulum swung to the maximum heights *in both directions at the same time*. We have never seen it to do this and to such a degree before in American history, yet it happened in the 2020 election. I contend that this is not possible, without election fraud to have occurred. And at the very least, I ask the question, "Why did the pendulum swing in both directions, to the maximum heights, at the same time?" This question is one that our political leaders need to be willing to answer!
  For further details and explanation of the political pendulum, please refer to *Part II of A Special Report on the 2020 Presidential Election Results* found on the website, **ForFreeAndFairElections.com**

- **House Races Won**: 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.
  For further information about this anomaly and others, visit the website, 2020ElectionIrregularities.com: https://2020electionirregularities.com/statistical-anomalies/

- **What We Saw with Our Own Eyes**: When Donald Trump held rallies during the campaign; 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. Yet we are supposed to believe Biden really won the election?

While I believe the election was stolen, I just don't believe it was stolen in the fashion that is portrayed by Dr. Frank with his presentation at the Cyber Symposium (published August 10, 2021). Thus, this is the purpose for this *Critique*.

Billy Parker
American Patriot

To Defend Freedom . . .

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

Billy Parker

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The whole thesis of the Dr. Douglas Frank presentation is that the Voter Registrations all across the nation were "Inflated" with "Phantom Voters." I would like to see concrete evidence (proof) of this. And if this is true, then how many "Phantom Voters" were there nationally and per state?

This *Critique* questions the validity of much of the information by Dr. Frank in his presentation at the Cyber Symposium – an on-line video published August 10, 2021. As a counter to the video, this *Critique* provides alternative data to what Dr. Frank presents. After viewing this new data, I'll let you decide who is right and who is in error.

One of the first obvious problems with the video presentation is that it is presented as FACT. When in reality, it is only a THEORY into how the election was stolen. And when one goes through the video with a fine tooth comb, one discovers there are a number of mathematical errors in it as well.

Another problem with the video presentation is that Dr. Frank paints a picture where a well-coordinated master plan was implemented by a few, possibly at the hands of the heads of a nation state like that of China, to rig the election through hacking and injecting millions of false ballots into our electoral system.

This picture painted is as if someone at the top said, "OK, in order for Joe Biden to win the election, and to do it decisively, we are going to need 3 million 'switched' votes and 22 million additional 'phantom' ballots. These phantom ballots are going to need to be physically injected into the voting system all across America and they will all be needed to match up with voter ID numbers, preferable by tagging them to an inflated voter roll (by creating a whole new group of voters and/or registrations in the days and weeks prior to the election and even on Election Day)." ***Now it is important to point out that Dr. Frank NEVER says 3 million switched votes and 22 million phantom ballots; this is only given as an example by the author of this Critique. But the implications in Dr. Frank's presentation seem to point to such a similar large number of phantom voters that must have occurred in the 2020 Presidential Election.***

I wonder if anyone has stopped to consider just how utterly ridiculous and absurd, and frankly impossible, all this really sounds? But many, including myself, bought into this conspiracy theory as being reality. Only after I did my own analysis and started to compare numbers did I realize how wrong Dr. Frank really was in his presentation. And of course, Dr. Frank is in with the Mike Lindell people as well, so the conspiracy theory extends to them as well.

We do in fact have individualized cases of switched votes – consider for instance the Audit of Antrim County, Michigan where they found examples of switched votes to have occurred. And I have one person (a very credible source) who believes and has evidence that fictional ballots here in North Carolina were created out of thin air and moved from one county to another by possible people within the North Carolina State Board of Elections. As far as hacking goes, there also seems to be examples of this in our electoral system in nearly every state of the nation.

But I just question if all these individualized cases add up to the magnitude to represent tens of millions of fraudulent votes? I question if this was all done by a very few at the top? And was it all a well coordinated plan?

I do, however, believe there were many fraudulent votes cast in the 2020 Presidential Election, possibly in the magnitude to even represent millions of ballots – total all across the nation. I believe hacking did occur; but since computers are not part of my specialized knowledge, I can't speak much to that aspect. We have instances of stuffing the voting machines with fraudulent ballots. We have what we believe to be evidence of this on video tape down in Georgia; and we believe this happened in Pennsylvania when they taped up windows so partisan observers couldn't see what was going on. But widespread cases of this happening throughout a state seem to have occurred in only a small number of states – the Battleground states mostly, and not all across the nation.

I also believe there was ballot harvesting that occurred with the drop boxes and with gathering ballots in nursing homes and the like. And I believe that people in senior centers and those in group-homes and halfway houses were rounded up by the busload and taken to the polls for One-Stop Voting and on Election Day – to vote for the Democrat candidate. (I have a person as a precinct volunteer here in NC who personally witnessed this latter vote-getting practice to have taken place.)

I believe all of these nefarious activities to have occurred by a whole lot of different people on the Democrat side of the aisle. Some of it was coordinated, but most was likely performed by individual people acting on their own behalf – in the pursuit of a common goal of their political party. And of course there were the activities of Mark Zuckerberg, the multi-billionaire who funded a lot of questionable practices that happened during the election.

In essence, there were a lot of nefarious people doing a lot of different things in order to cheat, but only a portion was coordinated by those at the very top and/or the result of hacking into voting machines. Again, I Billy Parker do not believe it was done by the methods portrayed by Dr. Frank in his presentation at the Cyber Symposium.

CHAPTER 2

Screenshots from Video

Below are screenshots from the video of Dr. Douglas Frank's presentation at the Cyber Symposium. And below each of the screenshots is additional information pertaining to that point in the video. This usually includes transcribed statements of Dr. Frank, information regarding the screenshot, and/or a counter-balance to what is presented.

Stunning Video Explanation – Dr Douglas Frank Shows How The 2010 Census Was Used to Create the Algorithm That Fabricated the Electronic Vote Outcome

Published August 10, 2021

Screenshot 0:06:

The above screenshot is part of the Introductory to Video.

Screenshot 0:58:

Screenshot 0:58 is where Dr. Frank first introduces the concept of "Phantom Voters."

In the first two minutes of the video, Dr. Douglas Franks makes the following series of statements (as transcribed by Billy Parker):

> "Someone before the election decides what they want the outcome to be . . . then they make projections . . . so they inflate the registration databases. They are manipulating the databases before, during, and after the election. But beforehand, they make an estimate of what they think is going to happen, and they inflate the registration databases. The reason they do this is that it gives them a credit line of phantom voters. . . . What they do is print a lot of ballots and put them in; so when the machines count the ballots, they don't have to cheat the machines. The machine's job then is not to 'flip' votes, although we do have cases of that; the machine's job is simply to report progress. How are things going? Is it going as predicted? And if not, then adjust it. . . . And when you write a computer algorithm that does that kind of adjustment, it is comparing to some target value; and the computer is constantly checking things . . . that's the reason the machines are so important. . . and yet, absolutely the machines are connected to the Internet."

I find these statements questionable, especially the underlined ones.

Screenshot 4:50:



In screenshot 4:50, Dr. Frank outlines the plan as to how the election was stolen.

"Classified Keys" and "Secret Recordings"

Screenshot 4:16:



Screenshot 5:30:

In screenshot 4:16, Dr. Frank makes the following statement:

"We got several situations where during the actual elections, we were downloading the registration databases from the county level and keeping track. And it is amazing; you can see them adding voters, removing voters – adding voters who request ballots and receive ballots, even though nothing happened. We have records of all that happening in real time during the election."

And in screenshot 5:30, Dr. Frank makes the following statement:

"But we got 3,009 of our counties already hacked. We got evidence that they were hacked during the election."

Dr. Frank does NOT use the term “Classified Keys” in the video, but he has used that term in many of his presentations going around the country promoting the Cyber Symposium data. I saw Dr. Frank and his presentation when he came to Cary, NC on Sept. 7, 2021. At that time, Dr. Frank spoke about his data having “Classified Keys” associated with it. And because the data is “classified,” this prevents him and his group from filing a legal lawsuit with the US Supreme Court to have the 2020 election results nullified and set aside. He went on to say that as long as the information is “classified,” he and his group could be arrested for treason and imprisoned if they entered into a legal lawsuit with the courts.

Screenshot 8:07:

In screenshot 8:07, Dr. Frank makes the following statement:

“We have a whole new set of 83 numbers, but it’s the same in every county; OK what you would know at that point is that the numbers are being decided for each state and then controlled in each county.”

From about 6:25 of his presentation to this 8:07 mark, Dr. Frank says the same 83 numbers come up in every county in a state (which is NOT natural). This is indicative of an “Algorithm” at play to influence our elections.

Screenshot 10:00:



In screenshot 10:00, Dr. Frank points out how the 2010 US Census was used to project the 2020 Election outcome. (The 2010 Census was used because it was the last detailed census prior to the 2020 election.)

Screenshot 10:52:



For the chart of **District 4 Pennsylvania**, the curved line is the voting-age population of 18 and older. The figures presented are the calculations for the number of **Total Eligible Voters**.

The percentage of people under 18 yrs of age varies slightly state-by-state. For District 4, it works out to be 21.13% (based upon the figures presented). The Ineligible number of voters is estimated at 4%. This latter number is pretty much consistent all across the nation.

The percentage of **Total Eligible Voters to the Total Population for District 4 Pennsylvania** works out to be **74.86%** (547,090 ÷ 730,739)

A good estimate of the number of Eligible Voters for other districts and states is easily calculable. We know the percentage of the voting-age population with the US Census data; and the number of Registered Voters for a state is usually available with that state's Board of Elections.

For my home state of **North Carolina**, the calculation for **Total Eligible Voters** is as following:

10,600,823	Total Est. Population in NC for 2020 (100.0%)
-2,321,580	Less those Under 18 Yrs of Age (21.9%)
-424,033	Ineligible to Vote (est. 4%)
7,855,210	Total Eligible Voters (est. 74.1%)

And the number of **Registered Voters in NC** for the 2020 General Election was **7,359,798** (Supplied by NCSBE).

Screenshot 11:27:



The Smooth Curve Line is the voting-age population of 18 to 100 yrs of age for District 4 PA. The Rigid Line is the number of Registered Voters for each age group.

The figures presented are the **Registrations to Eligible Voters** for District 4 PA. Here for this district, it is **97.9%** (535,556 ÷ 547,090).

While saying District 4 is one of the most corrupt in the country, Dr. Frank also seemed to be have implied that the **percentage of Registrations to Eligible Voters of 97.9%** is similar to other districts (and possibly even for whole states) all across the nation. This is not, however, what I found exactly true for my home state of North Carolina.

For **North Carolina**, the percentage is **93.69%**. This is 7,359,798 Registrations divided by 7,855,210 Total Eligible Voters. (Just 2 decades before, in the year 2000 for NC, it was 88.63%.)

Screenshot 12:00:



For screenshot 12:00:

- The Top Blue Smooth Curve Line is the voting-age population of 18 to 100 yrs of age.
- The Middle Black Rigid Line is the number of Registered Voters for each age group.
- The Bottom Red Rigid Line is the number of Ballots Received for each age group.

Screenshot 12:15:



With screenshot 12:15, Dr. Frank states:

"In fact if I multiply the black curve (number of Registrations) by 86%, you notice it superimposes right on the red curve (Ballots Received) pretty well, uh?"

By stating this, Dr. Frank is saying that if you **take the Ballot Received and divide by the number of Registration**, you get **86%**. Later, he calls this percentage his **"Registration Key."**

But there is one little problem. His math in this example simply does not add up. For District 4 PA, the percentage actually calculates to **81.25%**. This is 435,146 (Ballots Received) divided by 535,556 (Registrations). This

becomes a real problem in screenshot 22:23 when Dr. Frank seems to imply the 86% occurs all across the nation as the "Registration Key."

Screenshot 14:35:



In screenshot 14:35, Dr. Frank states:

"This was my first clue that <u>they were using the census to ***inflate*** the registration rolls.</u>"

The Top Line is the "Adjusted" Population ("2010 US Census x 0.22%, Shifted Ten Years x Mortality").
The Bottom Line is the Registrations (536,000) – rounded up.

Screenshot 16:32:



In screenshot 16:32, Dr. Frank presents a "pretend" (make believe) county having a total of 1,275 people, in all age groups.

The Blue Curve Line represents the population of 1,275 people in the "pretend" (make believe) county.

Screenshot 16:44:



Screenshot 16:44 is an adjustment of the previous slide. It is the same "pretend" (make believe) county less those of under 18 yrs of age (275 people).

The Blue Curve Line represents the 1,000 (1,275 – 275) Eligible Voters in the "pretend" (make believe) county. "This 1,000 number is done to make the math easy."

Screenshot 17:13:



Screenshot 17:13 is a continuation of the "pretend" (make believe) county with the number of Registered Voters added in.

The Top Blue Curve Line is the voting age population of 1,000.
Below, the Black Curve Line is the number of Registered Voters; in this instance, it is 870 people or **87%** of the population.

For the REAL state of **North Carolina**, this percentage was **88.89%** in the 2020 election. It is 7,359,798* Registered Voters divided by 8,279,243 (10,600,823 – 2,321,580) the Voting-Age Population of 18 years and up.

*Registration number supplied by NCSBE

Screenshot 17:50:



With screenshot 17:50, Dr. Frank is still using the "pretend" (make believe) county; but this slide has the number of Ballots cast out of the population.

The Bottom Red Curve Line is the number of Ballots cast of 600.

Did you notice the mathematical mistake with this slide up on the screen? Dr. Frank has "(600 = 70%)." Well, 600 out of 1,000 is NOT 70%. The last time I checked, it is 60% – unless this is some of that new math that is taught in the public schools these days.

Screenshot 21:37:

This is believable! I know of others who have run into this as well.

While exceeding 100% of Registrations in 353 counties – which is surely a big problem, remember there are a total of 3,242 counties across the nation. Just to put things in perspective, this equates to about 10% of the counties nationwide that exceed the 100% threshold. This screenshot does in fact express the need to clean up the voter rolls all across the nation.

Screenshot 22:23:



Screenshot 22:23 is for Hamilton County, Ohio; and it is similar to that of screenshot 12:15 for District 4 of Pennsylvania. Both indicate a "Registration Key" of **86%**.

The only problem with the "Registration Key" of 86% is that it is NOT this high as a percentage for nearly all the other counties and/or states in the nation.

For my home state of **North Carolina**, the percentage is only **75.07%**. This is 5,524,804 (Ballots cast for President) divided by 7,359,798 (Registrations).

While I can't say for sure about Hamilton County, Ohio, this information put out by Dr. Frank regarding a "Registration Key" of 86% is simply WRONG!

Screenshot 23:12:



Screenshot 23:12 is to represent the different age groups for Hamilton County, Ohio.

The Top Black Rigid Line is the number of Registrations.
The Bottom Red Rigid Line is the number of Ballots Received.
The Vertical (up and down) Brown Arrow Lines are suppose to represent the different age groups of 18 to 100 yrs of age.

The 86% "Registration Key" is also supposed to represent the AVERAGE for all 83 Age Groups, from 18 to 100 yrs of age.

Screenshot 24:17:



Screenshot 24:17 is of the “Sixth Degree Polynomial” – an equation/function of Microsoft Excel Spreadsheets.

Dr. Frank implies that this function of Excel was used as part of the computer algorithm to decide the number of “phantom voters” needed for each of the 83 age groups from 18 to 100 yrs of age, for nearly every county in the nation.

CHAPTER 3

Comparing to Another State - NC

In the screenshot section, we often compared the statistics (percentages) in Dr. Douglas Frank's presentation to that of my home state of North Carolina. In this chapter, we will go deeper into the numbers of **North Carolina**, in our attempt to investigate the "phantom voter."

Dr. Douglas Frank implies in his video presentation that a whole new group of fake voters were created, possibly in the days and weeks prior to the election and even on Election Day. Specifically, Dr. Frank makes the allegation that the fraud happened with the number of increase in REGISTRATIONS. In fact, he says, ". . . so they inflate the registration databases." And while Dr. Frank does NOT ever give us a specific number for the increases in registrations and/or for the alleged "phantom voters," he does, however, seem to imply that these numbers are quite large – in the millions, and possibly in the tens of millions.

So in this chapter, we will investigate phantom voters coming from the registrations. But not only will we further investigate the number of registrations here in North Carolina, but we will also consider the possibility that fraudulent votes might have come from other areas in the electoral system.

During the screenshots, there were three (3) basic categories of voter statistics (percentages) presented. And they are as follows:

- **Total Eligible Voters:** And when calculating the percentage for the numbers for District 4 in Pennsylvania, it came to **74.86%**.
- **Registrations to Eligible Voters:** With the percentage presented for District 4 in Pennsylvania, the number was **97.9%.**
- **Ballots Received to Registrations:** With the percentage presented for the **"Registration Key"** (for nearly all counties), the number was **86.00%**.

Let's now delve a little further into each of these categories, in hopes of determining exactly where the fraud might have occurred, at least for the state of North Carolina.

Total Eligible Voters:

For a brief review of what was presented earlier for North Carolina, the Total Eligible Voter calculations were as follows:

10,600,823	Total Est. Population in NC for 2020 (100.0%)
-2,321,580	Less those Under 18 Yrs of Age (21.9%)
-424,033	Ineligible to Vote (est. 4%)
7,855,210	Total Eligible Voters (est. 74.1%)

These figures reveal a percentage of **74.1% for NC**, as compared to the **74.86% for what Dr. Frank presented**.

Nothing is unusual here. The percentage of Total Eligible Voter is pretty much the same all around the country, with a slight variation because of the percentage of the youth population state-by-state.

In addition to nothing unusual with this percentage, this number is not really a good indicator for "phantom voters" anyhow, but we needed to just check to see if it might be telling of anything unusual.

Registrations to Eligible Voters:

As stated earlier, the number of **Registered Voters in NC** for the 2020 General Election was **7,359,798** (Supplied by NCSBE). Comparing this to the number of **Total Eligible Voters**, this percentage works out to **93.69%** for NC (7,359,798 ÷ 7,855,210). This number is a bit less than Dr. Frank's number of **97.9%** for District 4 PA. (So 98% is NOT possibly representative for all the rest of the country!)

Now let's see NC's historical trend and see if it might reveal anything unusual – to reveal the whereabouts of possible "phantom voters." Here are the numbers for the Presidential General Elections going all the way back to the year 2000:

NC Registrations to Eligible Voters, Presidential Election Yrs: 2000–Present

Election	Total Registered Voters*	Total Eligible Voters	% of Registered to Eligible Voters
2020 General	7,359,798	7,855,210	93.69%
2016 General	6,914,248	7,458,046	92.71%
2012 General	6,639,131	7,067,700	93.94%
2008 General	6,262,566	6,655,235	94.00%
2004 General	5,526,981	6,216,608	88.91%
2000 General	5,122,123	5,779,406	88.63%

*Figures supplied by NCSBE

As one can see, the state of NC is very efficient at registering eligible voters. This is in great part due to the motor voter laws, where they hit you up to register when you get your driver's license or pay for tags. They have also used this same approach with nearly every other state agency. You can almost register to vote while standing in the check-out line for buying groceries! But even as high as these numbers are, they still fall short of the example that Dr. Frank gives for District 4 in Pennsylvania.

If the "phantom voters" came in at the last minute for the 2020 election in the form of increase registrations, then these figures definitely don't show it. In fact, the figures for the 2020 General Election are right in line with 2008, 2012, and 2016.

Increases/Decreases in Registrations:

Along with the above category, we should also examine the increases and decreases in voter registrations. In this section, we'll take a look at both in what happened for a full year and for the 20 weeks to the lead-up to a November election – for Off Years, Mid-Terms, and the General for Presidential Elections. Below are charts for each time periods:

Registration Increases/Decreases in NC for Entire Election Years: 2012–Present:

Election	Total Registered Voters Beginning of Year	Total Registered Voters at End Of Year	Difference	% Rate of Increase/ Decrease
2020 **General**	6,839,565	7,379,363	539,798	**+7.89%**
2019 Off-Year General	7,140,798	6,836,437	-304,361	-4.26%
2018 **Mid-Term General**	6,838,697	7,139,604	300,907	+4.40%
2017 Off-Year General	6,944,978	6,838,698	-106,280	-1.53%
2016 **General**	6,435,547	6,644,997	509,450	**+7.92%**
2015 Off-Year General	6,484,752	6,433,727	-51,025	-0.79%
2014 **Mid-Term General**	6,484,856	6,631,398	146,542	+2.26%
2013 Off-Year General	6,577,163	6,483,736	-93,427	-1.42%
2012 **General**	6,209,806	6,624,136	414,330	**+6.67%**

Registration Numbers supplied by Major Dave and NCSBE

Registration Increases/Decreases in NC 20 Weeks Prior to Election Day for Election Years: 2012–Present:

Election	Total Registered Voters 20 Weeks Prior to Election	Total Registered Voters on Election Day	Difference	% Rate of Increase/ Decrease
2020 **General**	6,995,505	7,361,219	365,714	**+5.23%**
2019 Off-Year General	6,666,136	6,775,522	109,386	+1.64%
2018 **Mid-Term General**	6,955,135	7,092,686	137,551	+1.98%
2017 Off-Year General	6,766,094	6,809,844	43,750	+0.65%
2016 **General**	6,611,473	6,918,150	306,677	**+4.64%**
2015 Off-Year General	6,342,436	6,404,512	62,076	+0.98%
2014 **Mid-Term General**	6,524,456	6,627,391	102,935	+1.58%
2013 Off-Year General	6,444,292	6,474,667	-30,375	-0.47%
2012 **General**	6,289,415	6,649,188	359,773	**+5.72%**

Registration Numbers supplied by Major Dave and NCSBE

In the Off-Years, there is often a decline in the number of registered voters. But the big increases occur in years of a General for Presidential Elections (which are bold and highlighted in last column). As for what happened in 2020, the percentages are on the high end; but compared to 2012 and 2016, it's not really out-of-line. Again, these figures don't indicate large blocks of "phantom voters" in the magnitude to equate tens of millions of fraudulent votes nationally.

Ballots Received to Registrations:

This category seems to be the one bright spot where possible fraudulent votes may be detected. So let's dive straight into the numbers with the chart below.

Turnout in Presidential Election Years: 1972-Present

(Figures supplied by the NC State Board of Election)

Election	Total Registered Voters	Total Ballots Cast	Turnout Percentage
2020 General	7,359,798	5,545,848	75.35%
2016 General	6,914,248	4,769,640	68.98%
2012 General	6,639,131	4,540,488	68.40%
2008 General	6,262,566	4,354,052	69.53%
2004 General	5,526,981	3,551,675	64.26%

2000 General	5,122,123	3,015,964	58.88%
1996 General	4,277,000	2,513,357	58.76%
1992 General	3,817,380	2,611,850	68.40%
1988 General	3,432,040	2,134,370	62.19%
1984 General	3,270,933	2,239,051	68.45%
1980 General	2,774,844	1,855,833	66.88%
1976 General	2,553,717	1,677,906	65.70%
1972 General	2,357,645	1,518,612	64.41%

Here, we have the stats going all the way back to 1972 – all courtesy of the NC State Board of Election, and available on their public website.

Well isn't that strange! For three election cycles prior to 2020, the Turnout Percentage was rather consistent at around 69%. Then in 2020 it jumped all the way up to 75.35% (from already very high levels). That is basically a 6.35% increase in the number of registered voters who don't normally vote but did vote in the 2020 election. Multiplying this increase by the registered number of voters, **this equates to 467,347 new ballots** that are not normally counted. The next question is what percentage of these votes was legitimate and what percentage was illegitimate? No one really knows, unless we have a full forensic audit here in North Carolina.

Here's an interesting thing to consider: North Carolina has 3.2174% of the nation's population. If what happened in North Carolina holds true for the rest of the nation, then this would mean that there were an increase of **14,525,610** (467,347 ÷ 0.032174) new ballots cast on a national level – above and beyond what might be expected and above already very high levels for 2004 through 2016 general elections. Again, which percentage of this 14.5 Million was legitimate and what percentage was illegitimate (possibly "phantom voters")???

Getting back to what happened here in North Carolina, these figures still present some problems for the theory presented by Dr. Frank. If all of these 467,347 ballots were in fact fraudulent and came from "phantom voters," they still were NOT the result of increased registration, as Dr. Frank alleges!

And with **North Carolina** having **Ballots Received to Registrations** for 2020 being **75.35%**, this is considerably less than the **81.25%** - that is the result of Dr. Frank's figures, and especially below the **"Registration Key"** of **86.00%**.

To Summarize:

Again to briefly go over what we have learned in this section, here is a summary and comparison of the figures (percentages):

	Dr. Frank's Examples	**North Carolina**
Total Eligible Voters	**74.86%**	**74.10%**
Registrations to Eligible Voters	**97.90%**	**93.69%**
Ballots Received to Registrations (Registration Key = 86.00%)	**81.25%**	**75.35%**

CHAPTER 4

VPR - Comparing All 50 States

The prior chapter was a comparison for only one (1) state, that of North Carolina. How does Dr. Frank's numbers stack up to the rest of the country? While I was able to calculate the numbers for North Carolina, it is a much more difficult task to determine for all 50 States (plus DC). Not only would the task be quite cumbersome, but some of the information needed is not even readily available. But there is, however, a solution; and it comes in the form of a **Voter Participation Rate (VPR)**.

The **VPR** is simply the percentage of those who vote compared to the entire population. This number can be calculated in two different methods. One is by using the Total Number of Votes cast for President as reported by the Federal Election Commission, and dividing that by the population count as reported or estimated by the US Census. This is the more simple and direct route of calculating the VPR. The second method is by multiplying the three percentages used in Dr. Frank's presentation:

(**Total Eligible Voters %** **x** **Registrations to Eligible Voters %** **x** **Ballots Received to Registrations %**)

With either method of calculating the number, you come up with very similar totals (percentages). Take for instance the state of **North Carolina**. We had a total of 5,524,804 ballots cast for president in the 2020 election; and the population was 10,600,823. When you divide these two numbers, you get the percentage of **52.12%** - which represents the first method. And when you take the second method, you get **52.46%** (74.1% x 93.96% x 75.35%). Basically the same number!

And with 52.46% being the total VPR percentage for North Carolina using the second method, let's now use **Dr. Frank's three variable percentages** (which we know are high, in fact maybe too unrealistically high) and see what the VPR comes up as:

74.86% x 97.9% x 86.00% = **63.03%**

With just the VPR, we don't know the exact amounts of each of the three percentages that make up the total percentage, but we have a pretty good idea, especially when the first percentage is pretty consistent all across the nation; thus leaving us with just two percentages to figure out. From the example here, we know that a VPR of 60% and above is probably unrealistically "high." But if the VPR is in the low 50% range, as with North Carolina, or even down in the 40% range, then we can be assured that the numbers are more realistic, and might not indicate that there is even a real problem with fraudulent votes.

With this reasoning, we can even predict the possibility of voter fraud using the VPR: If it is above 60%, then there is likely to be at least some fraud indicated in the election. If the VPR is below 40%, then it is likely that the election was free and fair. The range between 40% and 60% is the big grey zone – an area of uncertainty to indicate and predict fraud – but the higher the VPR is, the more likely!

Well guess what, I have all the VPRs for the nation and for all 50 States (plus DC). I have them not only for the 2020 election but for many election cycles prior, with some going all the way back to the General Election of 1948! These VPRs are part of a table of information, with a table for the nation and for individualize states also; and these tables are found in **Appendix II** of my **Part II of A Special Report on the 2020 Presidential Election Results**. Here's the link to this report: https://forfreeandfairelections.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/2020SpecialReport-PartII.pdf

For illustration purposes, here is the table for the entire nation:

	VOTES			ELECTION YEAR	% of POP. WHO VOTED		
	Total	**Republican**	**Democrat**	**POPULATION**	**Total**	**Rep.**	**Dem.**
United States:							
1960	68,832,482	34,108,157	34,220,984	179,323,175	**38.4%**	19.0%	19.1%
1980	86,509,678	43,903,230	35,480,115	226,545,805	**38.2%**	19.4%	15.7%
1996	96,275,401	39,198,755	47,400,125	268,337,093	**35.9%**	14.6%	17.7%
2000	105,405,100	50,456,002	50,999,897	281,421,906	**37.5%**	17.9%	18.1%
2004	122,294,846	62,040,610	59,028,444	292,351,359	**41.8%**	21.2%	20.2%
2008	131,313,820	59,948,323	69,498,516	303,280,812	**43.3%**	19.8%	22.9%
2010	N/A	N/A	N/A	308,745,538	**N/A**	N/A	N/A
2012	129,085,410	60,933,504	65,915,795	312,893,255	**41.3%**	19.5%	21.1%
2016	136,669,237	62,984,825	65,853,516	321,188,689	**42.6%**	19.6%	20.5%
2020	158,383,403	74,216,154	81,268,924	329,484,123	**48.1%**	22.5%	24.7%

Going from left to right, the VPR is the sixth (6th) column, under "Total" for "% of POP. WHO VOTED" – which have been made bold and highlighted. Note that the VPR for the United States for the 2020 Election was 48.1%, which is smack in the middle of grey zone for indication of fraud. This rate for the United States has been creeping up starting in 2004, and then took another big jump in the 2020 election. This is one of the reasons why I believe the 2020 election was fraudulent. (But where is the evidence that these are "phantom voters" and not other sources of possible election fraud?)

For a further discussion of what all these figures and percentages in the above table mean, check out and read my Part II series of a Special Report, found on the website, **ForFreeAndFairElections.com**.

Getting back to the issue at hand of the VPR for individualized states – as to provide for a comparison to Dr. Frank's figures, go to the link provided to see the tables for all 50 States (plus DC).

Most states in the 2020 election had a VPR between 40% and 50% – indicating only a small possibility of election fraud. And a few states were in the range of 50% to 60% – indicating a higher level possible. Only a couple were in the upper 50s percent and/or hitting 60%; they were Colorado (56.1%), Maine (60.7%), Michigan (55.6%), Minnesota (57.9%), Montana (55.9%), New Hampshire (59.0%), Oregon (56.0%), Vermont (58.9%), and Wisconsin (56.5%).

While Pennsylvania was not in the upper half of 50%, it was close, with a VPR of 54.1%; and Virginia (that had some real screwy numbers involving vote spikes) was at 51.9%. For the remaining Battleground states (not included in the above figures), Arizona was 45.6% (up from 37.2% in 2016); Georgia was 46.7% (similar to 45.8% in 2016); and Nevada was 44.8% (up from 38.0% in 2016).

With **48.1%** being the percentage for the entire nation, this figure can also be viewed as an AVERAGE for the nation, with about half of the states being above 48.1% and about half of the states being below 48.1%. From this national average figure, we can project and estimate what the three (3) variable percentages that make up the VPR using the second method of calculation might be for the vast number of states close to the average VPR. The three variable percentages are likely to be very close to the following:

73.90% x est. **90.00%** x est. **72.32%** = **48.10%**

The first figure of Total Eligible Voters can be calculated without estimating – with the US Census reporting 22.1% of the population is under 18 years of age. This leaves the percentage of Registrations to Eligible Voters being estimated at 90.00%, and the percentage of Ballots Received to Registrations being estimated at 72.32%.

Now let's review how these numbers stack up against the examples that Dr. Douglas Frank presented in his video at the Cyber Symposium. Here is a summary and comparison of the figures (percentages):

	Dr. Frank's Examples	**VPR @ 48.10 %**
Total Eligible Voters	**74.86%**	**73.90%**
Registrations to Eligible Voters	**97.90%**	**Est. 90.00%**
Ballots Received to Registrations (Registration Key = 86.00%)	**81.25%**	**Est. 72.32%**

While these numbers for the variable percentages making up the national VPR are only an estimate – an educated guess, it is plain to see that the percentages from Dr. Frank's examples are extraordinarily high as to what actually probably happened for the rest of the nation. Dr. Frank's figures are NOT in fact representative of the rest of the nation! And I further question the existence of "phantom voters" created from "phantom registrations" of the magnitude to allow for tens of millions of fake ballots.

CHAPTER 5

Best Case for "Phantom Voter"

Dr. Frank's definition for "phantom voter" is where the voter registrations are greatly increased, then a bunch of physical ballots are injected into our electoral system (presumably tagged to the registrations), which are then made as a credit line for the algorithms to use for a pre-determined outcome; and this is all done as part of a well coordinated top-down approach. And after the election, the registrations and ballots are all cleaned up so that no one knows the "phantom voter" existed.

No one in their right mind can actually believe the existence, in large numbers, of "phantom voters" as defined above and presented in the video by Dr. Douglas Frank. But a case, however, can be made for a form of phantom voter, just not as exactly described by Dr. Frank. In the "real world," a phantom voter is usually the result of some type of ballot harvesting operation. A perfect example of this is the harvesting of votes in a nursing facility where the majority of the residents have dementia and have no business voting, yet they somehow seem to be able to cast a vote (all for the Democrat candidate). In one's mind, this could meet the definition of a "phantom voter." In the 2020 Presidential Election, there were at least two examples that occurred that probably might meet this realistic version of a "phantom voter."

The Nefarious Activities of Mark Zuckerberg:

Billionaire and Facebook CEO, Mark Zuckerberg, along with his wife, Priscilla Chan, gave between $350 million and $400 million to the Center for Tech and Civic Life (CTCL), a Chicago-based nonprofit organization. The purpose was to give grant money to Left leaning groups to rig and to swing the election. They encouraged registration drives to sign up Democratic voters. They funded heavy increase numbers of drop boxes 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. In the state of Wisconsin, they funded illegal ballot-harvesting events like "Democracy in the Park" where ballots were collected without proper governmental restrictions and safeguards (i.e., pressure was exerted to vote Democrat, with early-voting ballots, by the administrators of the event). For Pennsylvania, the majority of the grant money for that state was poured into the Democrat-dominated Philadelphia to help boost turnout and to count ballots. 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.

Everything that Mark Zuckerberg did in the 2020 election should be questioned. Mark Zuckerberg through his non-profit organization did in fact increase the voter registrations for a number of states. And one must wonder just how many were legitimate and how many were illegitimate registrations? How many were of illegal immigrants, felons, under-age people, and even fictional (made-up names of) people – that actually got through the system? We will probably never know the answer for sure. But setting these doubts aside, I do have to concede that probably the majority of the registrations would be ruled "legal" if it ever came down to it.

No telling how many "phantom voters" were created by the efforts of Mark Zuckerberg. And if you want an example of a top-down well-coordinated plan to rig the election and to have "phantom voters," this was IT! Mark Zuckerberg was behind much of it. You had increase registrations; and if you wanted to go stuff one of the drop boxes with ballots that were illegally harvested (i.e., from a "phantom voter"), there was the opportunity. There is no doubt that Mark Zuckerberg swayed the election with his millions of dollars spent.

There are, however, differences in these nefarious activities of Zuckerberg and the picture portrayed by Dr. Frank. One is that Zuckerberg only affected certain targeted areas and/or toss-up states – not every county in the nation. While many of the increase registrations were likely "questionable," there were probably many that were legitimate. And while I don't have an estimate as to the total number of increase ballots received as the result of Zuckerberg's efforts, I do highly question that it was in the range of "tens of millions" – but who really knows!

Vote Spikes:

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, documented to have happened in fourteen (14) states.

A 25-page study was done of these vote spikes during the time period mentioned. A group of unpaid volunteers 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. Again all spikes were found to be in favor of Biden. For details of this study, please see the following link to the *Election Spikes Report*: https://election-integrity.info/Vote_Spikes_Report.pdf

The unpaid volunteers in their report **DO NOT** tell **WHAT** happened (ballot stuffing, machine algorithm, etc.), but rather only **WHERE** and **WHEN** these unusual occurrences happened. The fourteen (14) states in which these vote spikes were documented to have happened are as follows:

Arizona	**Kentucky**	**Missouri**	**Virginia**
Florida	**Maine**	**New Jersey**	**Wisconsin**
Georgia	**Michigan**	**Ohio**	
Illinois	**Minnesota**	**Pennsylvania**	

And the volunteers of the report do not use the word "fraud" to describe these spikes; but rather, they address the issue of chance or likelihood of the spikes happening naturally. The range in frequency and magnitude of the spikes for 11 of the 14 states were found to have a "probability of 1 in 10^{23}" to a "probability of 1 in 10^{117}." In layman terms, this is like being dealt10 royal flushes in a row all the way up to 14 Powerball wins in a row. In essence, these vote spikes are highly unlikely to happen naturally!!!

Again, the unpaid volunteers do not say how these spikes happened; **but for argument sakes**, let's **assume** that they were all fraudulent votes and actually represented "phantom voters." This is certainly believable because one likely possibility for the spikes is stuffing the voting machine – which could explain why Dr. Frank said, "What they do is print a lot of ballots and put them in." So let's investigate this further and see if we can come up with the numbers that a possible viewer of Dr. Frank's video might be expected to find – possibly in the tens of millions.

First off, these vote spikes, to any significant measure (like 25,000 ballots or more) were only found and documented in 14 states, not all 50 states (plus DC). For most of the states, they did not experience "suitcases of ballots dragged from beneath the table in the dead of night."

The differential or "Biden Net Vote Dumps" for all 14 states totaled **3,050,126 ballots**. This is a sizable number – in fact, it is in the millions! But still, it falls way short of what one might expect from viewing the Dr. Frank's video (a number possibly in the tens of millions).

Another problem comes in what this 3 Million Number represents in terms of the total fraudulent vote. The spikes represented, on average, 3.60% of the total vote cast for the 14 states. And the vote spikes were considered only a portion of the total fraudulent vote for any one of the 14 states. The total fraudulent vote, however, can be estimated and calculable using the study done by Peter Navarro for the six Battleground states. When comparing Mr. Navarro's numbers to the actually total number of ballots cast for the Battleground states, we find the fraudulent vote numbers to represent, on average, 13.19% (the median figure) of the total ballots cast. So one can conclude (and assume) that **the vote spikes represent a little over one-fourth (27.29%) of the total fraudulent vote cast**, if in fact they were all fraudulent votes.

The point being, if the vote spikes represent the "phantom voter," then there are a lot of "other" suspicious votes that are unaccounted for. And again, if the stolen election was a top-down coordinated effort with tens of millions of "phantom voters," then these 3 Million ballots from the spikes fall short of what is expected from the video presentation.

Just to be clear, I am not challenging that there wasn't tens of millions of fraudulent votes involved in the 2020 Presidential Election, I just question Dr. Frank's hypothesis that they were all "phantom voters." And if Dr. Frank has evidence that there were "phantom voters" in the quantity of numbers to represent tens of millions of fake ballots and fake registrations, then I sure would like to see the evidence.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

The one thing that we learned in Chapter 3 & 4 was that the stolen election was NOT the result of phantom registrations; but rather, ***the fraud likely occurred in an abnormally high percentage of ballots cast to the actual number of voter registrations***. For North Carolina, this number jumped from 68.98% in 2016 all the way up to an amazing 75.35% in 2020.

As far as the video is concerned, we all make mistakes (including math errors), but I believe something much more sinister happened in the Dr. Douglas Frank presentation. I believe we were intentionally misled into believing something that simply is NOT SO.

Dr. Frank bills himself as some kind of professor, possibly that of mathematics or one of the sciences (something to do with numbers and problem solving for kids). Well when he implied the "Registration Key" was 86% and it applied to counties all across the nation as being controlled by a computer algorithm; that is when Dr. Frank stepped across the line from making a simple mistake to possibly out-right lying. He should have clearly known better!

In no way am I any type of computer expert; so I'm not qualified to assess the claims by Dr. Douglas Frank that computer algorithms were used to control the vote outcome for the 83 age groups, from 18 to 100 years of age. But I do know a thing or two about "numbers" and mathematics. And with it being clearly demonstrated that Dr. Frank used "fuzzy" math with his presentation, then one must question everything else in his presentation, including the part about algorithms and how they affected the 83 different categories of voters, in all the counties across America. And this also clearly cast doubt over there being "Classified Keys" as being the reason why Dr. Frank can't release all of his evidence.

For those making wild claims about the election, including switched votes and phantom voters, they actually hurt the cause of trying to get to the bottom of what happened in 2020. There are two people, however, who I know to be "honest brokers" that are fighting conspiracy theories and false information. These are John Droz, Jr. of www.Election-integrity.info and Major Dave of www.electoraleducationfoundation.com. They both recently sent me an email about this matter of those making wild claims and/or the issue of voter integrity.

John Droz writes:

"We do need to be careful in our declarations.
Wild claims are no more credible than wild denials.
The bottom line is that no one has any real idea of the number of fraudulent votes, without doing a full forensic audit.
So far that has not been done anywhere in the US for the 2020 Presidential election."

Major Dave writes:

"I don't know that we will ever prove phantom voters for 2020 but we are putting in place a tracking system that will analyze the weekly voter rolls as they are updated to see if we find batches showing up in any county where their weekly gains exceed their norm. We will be tracking changes in party affiliation prior to the Primary and then screening those who changed to see which ballot they chose in the Primary election."

About the Lawsuit in U.S. Supreme Court: There was much fanfare in the fall of 2021 about a number of state Attorney Generals (with the backing of the Mike Lindell people) filing a lawsuit with the U.S. Supreme Court on November 23rd of 2021 – where evidence was to be brought forth of election fraud and to ask the High Court to have the election results set aside and have Donald Trump reinstated as President. And because this suit was to be brought forth by the various state AGs, it was supposedly to "Have Standing" where the High Court would have had to listen to the merits of the case. Well, November 23rd came and went, and I heard nothing of the suit actually being filed. The public heard very little about the status of the suit as well, except rumors that maybe possibly some of the AGs decided to back out at the last minute.

I understand that the suit had evidence of what Dr. Douglas Frank says happened with the election. Is it possible that this is the REAL reason why we never heard anything else about the suit?

A Rebuttal: Prior to making this *Critique* public on my website, I emailed a rough-draft copy to Dr. Douglas Frank for his review. And on February 11, 2022, I sent Dr. Frank an email, at two different email addresses, offering him an opportunity to state a rebuttal and to have it added to the end of this report. I have yet to receive a reply.

CHAPTER 7

Supplemental – Yes, There were "Phantom Voters"

Yes, there were phantom voters in the 2020 election. This "supplemental" chapter written on 3.9.22 is an expansion of Chapter 5, where we considered "other cases" of possible phantom voters. This additional chapter also offers me an opportunity to respond to the comments received (not yet by Dr. Frank) that seems to imply that I don't believe there were "phantom voters." I may have been misunderstood regarding this matter. I actually do believe in the existence of the phantom voter, just not in the method of creation claimed by Dr. Frank and in the quantity of numbers that may be implied by his video presentation. So let's tackle these two questions of method and magnitude of numbers.

Dr. Douglas Frank says that the phantom voter is the result and creation of inflating the registration databases. The whole purpose and reason why I went down this road of writing this *Critique* was in trying to figure out the actual mechanics involved with the logistics of stealing the election through phantom voters, specifically by adding a bunch of phantom registrations to the voter rolls. I questioned, "Just how was this all done?" I took meticulous notes from Dr. Frank's video, but it did not reveal the actual mechanics of the process of how all these phantom registrations got put into our election system in the days and weeks to the lead-up of the election and then were mysteriously taken out of the system immediately after the election. In fact, Dr. Frank seems to have "plausible deniability" with his apparently made-up story. The reason you can't find these phantom registrations is because they were all cleaned up after the election. Sure they were!

And yes there seems to have been some increases in the voter registrations as to allow for Dr. Frank's version of phantom voters. We saw in Chapter 5 where some of the nefarious activities of Mark Zuckerberg could have definitely been put into the category of "phantom registrations." But the overall number needed to actually "steal an election" with a huge influx of new unexplained registrations just is not there. And we saw in Chapter 3 where the voter registrations do typically swell up in the years of a general election; but what happened in 2020 was not way out of line from other general elections in the past.

And while there may have been some small numbers of phantom voters as the result of fake registration, this doesn't mean there weren't any large numbers of phantom voters. The reason why I say this is because phantom voters come in different shapes and sizes – just not necessarily the shapes and sizes of how Dr. Frank describes them. I do however believe that there were significantly large numbers of phantom voters to come from other areas of our voting system. Unlike Dr. Frank, I believe they came from the EXISTING VOTER REGISTRATIONS. You see, about a third (1/3) of the registered voters DO NOT vote in an election; and from this pool of registrations is often where the so-called phantom voter comes from. We saw this in Chapter 3 where the percentage of "Ballots Received to Registrations" for the state of NC increased by a whopping 6.35% from the norm of about 69% to 75.35% in 2020. And while this increase for the state of NC was not all due to voter fraud, we must certainly consider the possibility that a good portion of it was (because 6.35% is a huge jump). Out of the pool of one-third of the registrations, all you need is about one-tenth ($1/10^{th}$) of that number to throw an election, since elections are often won by margins of one and two percent.

Before actually getting into some hard numbers to represent the phantom voter from other areas of our voting system, let's consider some likely numbers involving the total number of fraudulent votes in the 2020 election on the national level, state level and county level.

We don't know the exact number of "fraudulent" votes that happened in the 2020 election, but we have a pretty good idea of the number of "Out-of-Place" ballots as compared to the historical trends. These "Out-of-Place" ballots are comprised of either "fraudulent" ballots and/or possibly "legitimate" votes – that are a result of the recent phenomenon known as "The Polarization of the American Voter." But even with polarization as a possible factor, the vast majority of the "Out-of-Place" ballots (deviating from the historical election trends) are still believed to be in the "fraudulent" category.

Using history as a basis, models can be made as to what should be expected with election results. Election trends are clearly evident when you take election results and compare them to the population count, and then comparing one election cycle to another. Over the past 75 years of "The Modern Era of American Politics" (since the election of 1948), we see time after time the percentage of 23% as being basically the maximum level, on a national level, where a winning candidate can garner the support of the total population. And based upon this data of election trends, the "Margin" (the difference in percentage between the winner and loser) is somewhere between 3% and 9% with the median being 6.43% – whenever there is a decisive win and/or landslide victory (where one side can muster support of close to 23% of the population).

Using models based on these percentages for the 2020 election, the number of **"Out-of-Place" ballots**, on a national level, was **between 15.8 Million and 25.0 Million** – depending upon the "Margin" used and assumptions made. It is important to note that the level of "fraudulent" vote may vary slightly depending upon the "Margin"

used in the models. It is believed that the "likely real" margin in the 2020 election was between 3.15% and 6.43%, in favor of Trump. Therefore, the "fraud" level with the "Out-of-Place" ballots can be expected to be higher with a lower margin of 3.15% than with a higher margin of 6.43%. In essence, the portion of "Out-of-Place" ballots that are actually "fraudulent" will be at a slightly higher percentage with the 15.8 Million number than with the 25.0 Million number. (For instance, maybe 95% of the 15.8 Million number, but only 75% of the model indicating 25.0 Million were "fraudulent" – the difference being because of the possible polarization factor.)

For a breakdown of this national range of 15.8 – 25.0 Million for the state and local level, it needs to be done based upon population. For example, my home state of North Carolina has 3.2174% of the nation's population. So NC's portion of the national number is therefore between 508,349 – 804,350 involving these questionable ballots. To break these numbers down to a county level, it is going to be somewhere on the low end for rural counties of being 5,100 to 10,200; and for the bit more populated counties, the numbers are likely 8,000 to 16,000. And for metropolitan counties such as Wake County – the Capital County with a population of 1.112 Million, then the numbers are going to be between 53,300 to 84,400.

To help make these "Out-of-Place" ballots for North Carolina a bit more recognizable and to help one to consider what the numbers might be for people living in other states (with a state of average size/population), the different levels are ranked and categorized with the below table:

	Out-of-Place Ballots
United States	15.8 – 25.0 Million
North Carolina	508,349 – 804,350
Typical Smaller Counties in NC	5,100 – 10,200
Typical Larger Counties in NC	8,000 – 16,000
The Capital County of Wake	53,300 – 84,400

So these are the types of numbers we are dealing with on a national, state, and local level. Another way to view this is in what percentage these numbers represent as compared to the total vote count. There were 158.4 Million ballots cast for President in the 2020 election. Out of that number, roughly **a whopping 13%** were "Out-of-Place" compared to the historical trends. And if you recall from the Part I of A Special Report series, a few select states were considerably higher in the number (percentage) of possible "fraudulent" votes, with some having a fraud level possibly as high as 25% of the ballot count.

This means when people like Dr. Frank make the assertion that the election was stolen by one particular means, then they should be willing and able to back up their claims with numbers that represent, at least, a majority of the above numbers. It is my contention, however, that the election was not stolen by just one or two means but rather by a lot of different people engaging in a lot of different nefarious activities.

Now let's get back to the actual numbers of possible phantom voters in other areas (other than phantom registrations) of our electoral system.

In chapter 5, we considered the "**Vote Spikes**" that were documented for fourteen (14) states. And that total number was **3,050,126**. Out of this number, no one knows for sure how many were in fact fraudulent; but this would be a good place to start with coming up with a sizable number. It would also be interesting to figure out the effect and number of ballots that Mark Zuckerberg was responsible for – it would certainly be in the millions.

A person who goes by the name of **Major Dave** (who is highly respected in North Carolina) has done incredible amounts of investigative work into voter fraud. He has come up with some hard numbers that certainly can be classified as "phantom voters." He made the following statement to me involving some of his evidence of voter fraud for the state of North Carolina:

> "It is in the thousands. I know there were **7,946** voters, for example, whose By-Mail ballot has a witness deficiency, and most of them wound up voting in-person at One-Stop or on Election Day yet most of those ballots still report the witness deficiency as the status for that By-Mail ballot, not 'spoiled' even though they were given another ballot to cast."

When questioned about the 7,946 ballots being phantom votes, Major Dave revealed the following evidence that he has of additional phantom voters:

> "The 7,946 you mention are not necessarily phantom voters. That is the number of voters who at one point had their By-Mail ballot reported as having a witness deficiency. Frankly, I remain more concerned about the **79k** who voted in Nov 2020 and were still showing as "Inactive" well after the election. Roughly half of them show as the reason "Confirmation Not Returned" and the other half, "Confirmation Returned Undeliverable".

Now we are getting somewhere with concrete numbers that can significantly alter the outcome of an election! And these numbers being supplied by Major Dave are the type we want to consider as being possibly "phantom voters."

We have all heard numerous stories also of election systems being "hacked" into. Well, this too can be a source of phantom voters as well. And even the category of "switched votes" can certainly fall into this broader definition of "phantom voters." One of the most incredible stories I have heard of hacking comes from the same group of unpaid volunteers who did the *Election Spikes Report*. In a report called, **Critique of MITRE Report 2-25-21 (rev 2-27-21)**, they reported the following:

> "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."

I understand that voter canvassing teams to help find fraudulent registrations are popping up all across the nation. I would be really interested in seeing some of their data so far and compare it to the number of total registered voters for their county/state. Is it coming anywhere close to the numbers cited above as what is needed "to steal the election"? And even if not, I would still be interested in their numbers. If we could get a cumulative number for this type of fraud, then we can possibly start to put this puzzle together.

Ending on a final note: As of the writing of this "Supplemental" chapter on 3.9.22, I have yet to receive a response or rebuttal from Dr. Douglas Frank in regards to this *Critique*.