



Comparison of State Voting Charts – Involving Republican and Democrat VPR Regression Analysis: A new and much better methodology of analyzing election results using the Voter Participation Rate (VPR) has recently been released that gives additional insight into the 2020 General Election and will greatly help in analyzing the upcoming 2024 election. This methodology is the result of the combined efforts of Dr. S. Stanley Young (professor of statistics at NCSU) and Billy Parker, both of Raleigh, NC. For a detailed discussion of this new methodology and info about the regression analysis charts, please see the website of **www.ForFreeAndFairElections.com**. But first, we have some really exciting news.

Update Involving the Atlanta Trump Trial – A NC Connection: Team member, Dr. Stan Young, as an expert witness, entered into the court-record involving the trial of Donald J. Trump and the other co-defendants in Atlanta, Georgia many of the election charts (the more important ones) that you see here in this document. He did this on December 6, 2023 which was the deadline for discovery. When asked about this recently, Dr. Young sent us back the following message: *"The material is in the hands of the Atlanta lawyer. I've talked to him briefly. He is very busy with various filings. My impression is that he is on top of things and knowledgeable. But there are a lot of things. Many things have come out in favor of his client; ours is only part of what is becoming known. All of our material is now on the record. At a min, the other side has much to deal with. At a max, they are dead." This is really important news, because this data and new methodology of analyzing election results may be our best chance yet to show the unusualness of the 2020 General Election – and to show that Donald Trump had good cause and a reasonable belief that*

the election was possibly "stolen."

What are these charts and why are they important? In a brief synopsis, we have taken the election results for every election cycle for the past 75 years and measured them against the total population in order to show a historical trend; and then we measured that against a regression analysis line. The results are pretty incredible, to say the least. It needs to be noted, however, this is a rather simple concept that we have done – there is nothing magical or complicated about it. We are only taking the official election results provided by the government and dividing them by the U.S. Census numbers in order to get a percentage; and then plotting those percentages out on a piece of paper to provide for a historical record of the various cycles.

In our analysis, we measure the level of voting by the public with what we call the Voter Participation Rate (VPR). For instance, the population can double over time, but the level of voting (the VPR) – expressed as a percentage of the total population, should remain similar from cycle to cycle.

On the charts provided here in this document and on our website, you will see both "Blue" dots and circles and "Red" dots and circles. The blue ones are the actual VPR data points plotted. The red ones are data points calculated and derived as part of a Linear Regression. And on our website, we show four (4) charts per state of the different types of VPRs. Those 4 are: a Total VPR, Republican VPR, Democrat VPR, and a 3rd Party/Other VPR chart. The Total VPR Chart represents the combined activity of all voters and of all parties. The 3rd Party/Other Chart is usually a non-factor in many election cycles, and was so in 2020. Most activity in an election cycle, however, is mostly shown on the two individual charts of the two major political parties. For comparison analysis purposes, and having limited space available, we are therefore exhibiting here on this document only the two (2) charts involving the Republican VPR and Democrat VPR. For information on all 4 charts per state, and to learn more about the Trend Line used along with the Tolerance Bounds, and all the other aspects of the charts, go to the homepage of **www.ForFreeAndFairElections.com**.

We believe the best way to show the unusualness of the 2020 election is by the comparison of state data and charts – comparing one party to another and one state to another. Throughout this document, you will see rows of charts, some pages with only one row and other pages with two rows. (Because of the limitation of space, but wanting to have the charts big enough for proper viewing, two rows is the maximum per page.) Each row represents a selected state. And



North Carolina (South, South Atlantic region): The Democrat vote is very questionable. Why was the Democrat vote in 2020 such a huge outlier – not only the highest level in history but way above the Tolerance Bound – unusual even compared to the Democrat voting level of other states? The Republican vote is somewhat questionable as well, being an outlier and above both possible methods of analysis. Why was there NO offsetting of the vote by either party in 2020?

each row has two charts – one for the Republicans and one for the Democrats representing the party VPR patterns for that state. We have produced the finished product involving the chart data for six (6) states; these are the ones with all the "overlays" including the column strips (light-green and white) identifying election cycles from 1948 to 2020. We have included another sixteen (16) states where the overlay data is incomplete (without the light-green and white strip columns, for instance). Because there is a tremendous need to understand what happened in 2020, we are exhibiting the charts on all twenty-two (22) states where we have complete or partial charting information. (It takes upwards of 25 hours to produce the data/charts/analysis for each state – as shown on the website. See later in this text more about production status and of this time requirement.)

The states are ranked and categorized in clusters in this chart document – based upon major regions of the country, like the West, Midwest, South, and Northeast; and then further categorized by the sub-regions. (See Map to the Right.) This will allow for easier comparison of charts for neighboring states. And since there is much concern with and the trial taking place in Georgia, we are starting with the sub-region of the South Atlantic as part of the South Region being first in the presentation of the state charts.

Things to be Noted about the Charts: It is our highest hope that this new methodology and the VPR data will be discussed and debated by people on both sides of the political aisle. And we at For Free And Fair Elections are not the arbitrators of truth in presenting this data; everything should be discussed and debated. For instance, the data points from 1948 and up to only 2000 are used to predict the trend line moving forward after 2000. We did this because we noticed a major divergence in voting patterns following the 2000 election. Since all trends have a beginning and an end, this voting pattern change may simply be a case of one trend ending and another beginning, instead of data points being cast as an "outlier" to a possible previous trend. But the other side of the coin should be considered as well. If this divergence is the result of a new trend, then why do we see it only with the Democrats in only certain states, but don't necessarily see it with the Republicans? Other things that might be up for debate are the adjustment used for the Tolerance Bounds. With the tolerance being used, they usually include within the bounds of around 75% of the VPR data points. This might be debatable and thus need to include more or less than this percentage amount. What is NOT



in dispute or up for debate, however, is the core data being used for analysis to produce the charts – which is believed to be rock solid! It is the result of verifiable election results and census data produce by the U.S. government. (But there might be some concern about the truthfulness of the data being provided by the government!)

And it is important to NOT read too much into the Linear Regression (the "Red" dots and circles) and the Tolerance



Georgia (South, South Atlantic region): For the Democrat chart, notice the level which Biden was above the Tolerance Bound – at a level similar to Jimmy Carter as Georgia's "Favorite Son" in 1976. Biden was even at a higher voting level than Obama in 2008. Why was Biden so popular in Georgia??? And with the Republican vote, is it possible that it maxes out at around 23% (possibly the reason why it is below the middle Trend Line)???

Bounds. Because in a sense, they are only visual aids to help in the analysis of the primary data – the actual VPR data points (the "Blue" dots and circles). to realize that there are a number of assumptions, which may be correct or incorrect, in the use of the Regression Line. For instance, there are mathematical assumptions of linear regression, e.g., the best-fit line minimizes the sum of t

Many people believe the 2020 election was possibly "fraudulent." It is important to note that statistics alone does not prove "fraud;" statistics only shows the need to further investigate for the possibility for fraud. Therefore, these regression analysis charts DO NOT prove election fraud; but rather, they only show the possible unusualness of an election cycle. There is separation from knowing the cause and the observation of the unusualness. Only a full forensic audit can prove election fraud! And only YOU, using this data and viewing these charts, can make the determination if you believe the elections are "fraudulent" in your state and others.

And while one is not able to prove fraud with statistics alone, what we are able to do with these charts is to show beyond a doubt that something very unusual is in fact happening to our elections. Just look at the Democrat VPR charts and compare them to the Republicans – it is clearly evident that the Democrats are doing something different. Even comparing the Democrat charts for one state to the Democrat charts to another, one will notice significantly different voting patterns in the level of voting. One might even ask, why are the Democrat VPR data points for the most recent cycles, but for only certain states, so far and above their Tolerance Bound, for instance? Isn't this possibly the result of cheating? At a minimum, the leaders of the two political parties, mainly the Democrats – but the Republicans possibly too, have a little explaining to do involving the unusualness of the voting patterns in a number of states.

Making Your Own Analysis: Comparing the charts of one state to that of other states is the best method of analysis. We encourage everyone to analyze and study the charts and make up your own minds as to what the data means. We have come to a conclusion, however, that there are multiple ways of analyzing the VPR data points on the charts. One involves the use of the Linear Regression – involving the "Red" dots and circles (what you currently see with the charts). This along with the drawn-in Tolerance Bounds, is just one of numerous possible means of analyzing the core data (the "Blue" dots and circles on the charts). One might want to simply ignore the Regression Line and compare the current VPR data point to any of the previous points; for instance, comparing the current voting level to the previous highest level achieved in election-cycle history – this too is a method of analyzing the data. And it is important for one

to realize that there are a number of assumptions, which may be correct or incorrect, in the use of the Regression Line. For instance, there are mathematical assumptions of linear regression, e.g., the best-fit line minimizes the sum of the squared deviation of the points to the line. And as noted above, there is the subjective decision of using the data points between 1948 and up to only 2000 to predict the Regression Line moving forward after 2000. And we have even come to consider that this method of analysis is lacking in recognizing when the level of party vote becomes "maxed out" as a percentage of the population. Thus, there are inherent advantages and disadvantages in the method that we have chosen to analyze the VPR data. We do, however, believe comparing the VPR data points (the "Blue" dots and circles) to the Regression Line (the "Red" dots and circles) is a very helpful visualization for understanding voting history; but in the end, you will have to make the decision for yourself as to the best method in figuring out what is actually happening to our elections. There is no absolute right or wrong way of analyzing this data. But at least with the "Blue" dots and circles, we can give a visual representation of our elections, and this is the most important point.

If however you are like most people, you will probably want to make analysis WITH the use of the Linear Regression along with the Tolerance Bounds. And if this is the case, then we thought it might be helpful though to point out and make note of a couple of specific anomalies that we have noticed in using this method of analysis:

One of the first anomalies that we have noticed is involving this most recent cycle of 2020. There seems to be <u>NO</u> "offsetting" of the vote from one side to the other for many of the states – where you see the political pendulum swinging from side-to-side and see large margins. Trump does very well in these states, but there is no "offsetting" of the vote by the other party. Historically, we see this "offsetting" (with the losing party) when one party does so well that their data point is above the Upper Tolerance Bound. The best example of this was with the landslide victory of Nixon in 1972 against his Democrat challenger, McGovern; in fact, we saw some of the largest margins ever in that election (without a sizable increase in the overall Total VPR – it held steady). Nixon was above his Upper Tolerance Bound, and there was an opposite swing in the vote with McGovern being below his Lower Tolerance Bound, almost by an equal amount of distance – we saw this state after state with the individual party VPR charts. We saw the same thing happen with many (but not all) states involving the Democrat landslide victory in 1964 between Johnson versus Goldwater. We



Florida (South, South Atlantic region): With the Democrat chart, Biden was within the Tolerance Bound and was at a similar level as Obama in 2008. With the Republican chart, Trump was also within his Bound and was at a similar voting level of Nixon in 1972 and Reagan in 1984. One will have to decide for themselves if there was a problem in Florida during 2020. One possible concern is that there was NO offsetting of the vote by either party compared to the Trend Line.

also saw a similar swing involving an "offsetting" of votes, but not necessarily to this extent, in the 1984 election between Reagan versus Mondale. Reagan was significantly above his Tolerance Bound; and while most charts do NOT show Mondale below the Lower Tolerance Bound (as with the case of McGovern), he was in fact below his party Trend Line, somewhere between there and the Lower Tolerance Bound.

This "offsetting" rule, however, seems to apply only when support for the winning side is so strong that it pushes the data point clearly above and beyond the Upper Tolerance Bound – making for an Outlier. But when one side performs only above average, where they might just come close to or at their Upper Tolerance, then we don't necessarily see this visual offsetting move by the other party – it seems to only happen when one side is significantly above the bound. The election cycle of 2020, however, breaks all rules! (We only see this rule happening in 2020 for a few of the Red states.)

The second thing we have noticed involves a theory of mine, regarding voting patterns. While the political make-up as a percentage of the voting electorate may be different in the various states – more Republicans than Democrats and vice versa, the chart patterns for the individual parties should be similar, state after state, especially for states in the same region of the country. There are, however, nuances caused by local politics for some particular states. Also, the long-term trend may be of an incline or decline nature for the various states. But for the individual party VPR data points with regards to the Linear Regression along with the Tolerance Bounds, then that should exhibit a similar pattern for states in the same region.

When it comes to the Democrats regarding vote patterns, they are all over the board in 2020. They are slightly above the Upper Tolerance Bound in some states; and in others like NC, AZ, CA, and NV, they are substantially (way) above the Tolerance Bound, to the point of being a huge outlier. Yet in some Red states, the Democrats are below the trend line, along the Lower Tolerance Bound. Even the Republicans don't escape this criticism. We find it a bit unusual how much Trump was above the Upper Tolerance Bound for certain states such as PA, NV, MI, and even WI. So there might have been possibly some illegal vote harvesting by the Republicans too in those states – right along with the Democrats.

I personally have grave concerns over the state of GA and my home state of NC. For Georgia, notice the level at which Biden is above the Upper Tolerance Bound – to a level similar to that of Jimmy Carter as Georgia's "Favorite Son" in 1976 (and even higher than Obama in 2008). Why was Biden so popular in Georgia??? Could it have possibly been election fraud taking place in that state for the 2020 election??? And for North Carolina, the chart pattern for the Democrat VPR regarding the last few election cycles looks really strange as compared to the Democrat pattern for most other states. Then too, consider that out of a total of 2.7 million Democrat ballots cast for 2020 in NC, there was One (1) Million, of which, is categorized as the "Vote Difference" number – off of their Trend Line. Isn't that peculiar???

In the end, one needs to make analysis and look at things in terms of both "With" the Regression Line and "Without." If the current data point for a particular state is both an Outlier – above the Upper Tolerance Bound ("With" the Regression Line), and is also the highest level ever achieved in history (looking at things "Without" the Regression Line), then there might be a problem of voter integrity in your state. But again, only you can make that determination with this data. Remember, these charts do not prove or disprove election fraud; but rather, only the unusualness of an election cycle.

Potentials for this type of Data/Charts: The regression charts you see is for only that office of President and for only the state charts produced so far. It would be interesting to see the charts for all 50 states. And there were many questions about races involving other elected offices such as Governor, Senator, and a variety of other state held offices. This methodology can be employed in all those situations to see if anything unusual happened. Also, there seems to be election problems mainly in certain areas, like your metropolitan cities of a state. With there being over 3,000 counties in the United States, this methodology of analyzing election results can be brought down to the county level. The potentials are great with this new methodology!

Upwards of 25 Hours to produce final Chart Data: It takes somewhere between 20 and 25 hours, per state, to do things from start to finish for what you see with the final product involving the state charts, as exhibited on the website.



South Carolina (South, South Atlantic region): With the Republican vote, note the sharp incline of the long-term Trend Line; this might possibly explain the increase level of voting for 2020 versus the previous high levels of 2004 – 2016 (even higher than Nixon in 1972 and Reagan in 1984). With the Democrat vote, note Biden was at a higher level than even what Obama achieved in 2008. One will have to decide for themselves if there is a problem in South Carolina.

Of this time requirement, about 8 to 10 hours is involved in the collection of data regarding the VPR data points on the charts. Using North Carolina as an example, this data is collected and put into a formatted table as exhibited to the right. All of the state charts on the website have a link to this type data for the subject state.

A lot of time is spent just in the collection of this data and putting it in sequential order to show a trend, to where it actually makes sense. While this data is out in the public domain, it is not organized in such a way as shown with the exhibited table; and a lot of work has to be done, often by hand, in order to get the data in this particular order. For a further description of all that is involved in this process, again please visit the homepage of the website. This resource of time (between 8 to 10 hours) will continue in order to collect data for other elected offices and for other type of political jurisdictions, like at the county level. Until we get things automated and computerized, this is basically the constraint that we must learn to live with. But the good news is that we have this data-collecting work already done basically for the office of President for all 50 states – ready to go to produce the regression charts. So now, it only takes between 12 to 15 hours to produce the final product for future state charts – as you see them now on the website. In getting this work out in the future, we are, however, dealing with both time and financial constraints. There doesn't seem to be enough of either.

Other Possible Analysis: A lot of analysis can be extracted from the data collected and associated with the Formatted Tables – in addition to these regression charts. It should be noted, however, the two VPR charts, per state, as provided in this document are based upon just the data that comes from the two columns of "<u>Rep.</u>" and "<u>Dem.</u>" under the section of "<u>% of Pop. Who Voted</u>." There are other possibilities for analysis involving this data too, and regression analysis can be done for nearly any of the other columns associated with the tables. (See our website for the reason why we settled on charting only the four VPR columns per state.)

Another thing we have found extremely interesting in considering this data is the rate of increase in the number of ballots cast versus the increase in the population for the various states. One might think it should be close to a one-to-one ratio, with both increasing at nearly the same rate - if elections were free and fair. But this ratio is not what we are



Tennessee (South, East–South Central region): With the Republican vote, Trump was slightly above the Upper Tolerance Bound – similar situation to Nixon in 1972 and Reagan in 1984. With the Democrat vote, Biden was along the Lower Tolerance Bound, as we see with a number of other "Red" states. Also note that there was an offsetting of the vote between the two parties – what one would expect to see when one side (Trump) does very well.

| | | VOTE TO | OTALS | | ELECTION | | % of WHO V | POP. VOTED | | ANAL TOO | YSIS DLS |
|---------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---|--|
| rth Carolina: | <u>Total</u> | <u>Republican</u> | <u>Democrat</u> | Other | YEAR POPULATION | Total <u>(VPR)</u> | <u>Rep.</u> | <u>Dem.</u> | <u>Other</u> | Difference of 2 Parties <u>Margin</u> | Average of 2 Parties <u>Pivot Pt</u> |
| 1940 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3.571.623 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1948 | 791,209 | 258,572 | 459,070 | 73,567 | 3,963,868 | 19.96% | 6.52% | 11.58% | 1.86% | 5.06% | 9.05% |
| 1950 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 4,061,929 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1952 | 1,210,910 | 558,107 | 652,803 | 0 | 4,160,774 | 29.10% | 13.41% | 15.69% | 0.0% | 2.28% | 14.55% |
| 1956 | 1,165,592 | 575,062 | 590,530 | 0 | 4,358,465 | 26.74% | 13.19% | 13.55% | 0.0% | 0.36% | 13.37% |
| 1960 | 1,368,556 | 655,420 | 713,136 | 0 | 4,556,155 | 30.0% | 14.4% | 15.7% | 0.0% | 1.3% | 15.1% |
| 1964 | 1,424,983 | 624,844 | 800,139 | 0 | 4,766,517 | 30.0% | 13.1% | 16.8% | 0.0% | 3.7% | 15.0% |
| 1968 | 1,587,493 | 627,192 | 464,113 | 496,188 | 4,976,878 | 31.9% | 12.6% | 9.3% | 10.0% | 3.3% | 11.0% |
| 1970 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 5,082,059 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1972 | 1,518,612 | 1,054,889 | 438,705 | 25,018 | 5,242,000 | 29.0% | 20.1% | 8.4% | 0.5% | 11.7% | 14.3% |
| 1976 | 1,677,906 | 741,960 | 927,365 | 8,581 | 5,561,883 | 30.2% | 13.3% | 16.7% | 0.2% | 3.4% | 15.0% |
| 1980 | 1,855,833 | 915,018 | 875,635 | 65,180 | 5,881,766 | 31.6% | 15.6% | 14.9% | 1.1% | 0.7% | 15.3% |
| 1984 | 2,175,361 | 1,346,481 | 824,287 | 4,593 | 6,180,514 | 35.2% | 21.8% | 13.3% | 0.1% | 8.5% | 17.6% |
| 1988 | 2,134,370 | 1,237,258 | 890,167 | 6,945 | 6,479,263 | 32.9% | 19.1% | 13.7% | 0.1% | 5.4% | 16.4% |
| 1990 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 6,628,637 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1992 | 2,611,850 | 1,134,661 | 1,114,042 | 363,147 | 6,912,772 | 37.8% | 16.4% | 16.1% | 5.3% | 0.3% | 16.3% |
| 1996 | 2,515,807 | 1,107,849 | 1,225,938 | 182,020 | 7,481,043 | 33.6% | 14.8% | 16.4% | 2.4% | 1.6% | 15.6% |
| 2000 | 2,911,262 | 1,631,163 | 1,257,692 | 22,407 | 8,049,313 | 36.2% | 20.3% | 15.6% | 0.3% | 4.7% | 18.0% |
| 2004 | 3,501,007 | 1,961,166 | 1,525,849 | 13,992 | 8,643,781 | 40.5% | 22.7% | 17.7% | 0.2% | 5.0% | 20.2% |
| 2008 | 4,310,789 | 2,128,474 | 2,142,651 | 39,664 | 9,238,249 | 46.7% | 23.0% | 23.2% | 0.4% | 0.2% | 23.1% |
| 2010 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 9,535,483 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2012 | 4,505,372 | 2,270,395 | 2,178,391 | 56,586 | 9,716,264 | 46.37% | 23.37% | 22.42% | 0.58% | 0.95% | 22.90% |
| 2016 | 4,741,564 | 2,362,631 | 2,189,316 | 189,617 | 10,077,826 | 47.05% | 23.44% | 21.72% | 1.88% | 1.72% | 22.58% |
| 2020 | 5,524,804 | 2,758,775 | 2,684,292 | 81,737 | 10,439,388 | 52.92% | 26.43% | 25.71% | 0.78% | 0.72% | 26.07% |
| 2024 | | | | | 10,800,950 est. | | | | | | |

(For a larger table – better for detailed analysis, along with an example of the calculated Linear Regression data, as shown on the website, see Page 16 of this document.)

finding at the state level since 2000, for the vast majority of states. Take for instance of my home state of North Carolina: Since 2000, the rate of increase in the number of ballots cast has increased by 89.77%; but during this same period, the population has increased by only 29.69%. When you divide the two numbers, you get a ratio of 3.02. Think about it, the rate of ballots cast has increased by three (3) times as fast as the population has increased. And during the previous 20 year period of 1980 to 2000, the ratio was only 1.54. So doesn't the most recent 20 years of it being 3 Times sound a bit peculiar or out-of-whack – possibly an indicator of election fraud? We thus decided to take a look at all 50 states for this recent 20 year period. Below are the ratios for all 50 states, plus DC, listed in alphabetical order.

| AL - 3.04 | DE - 2.05 | IN – 3.27 | MA - 3.20 | NV – 2.36 | OH – 6.58 | TN – 2.19 | WI – 2.72 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| AK – 1.53 | DC – 3.44 | IA – 3.17 | MI - 22.06 | NH – 3.63 | OK – 1.79 | TX – 1.93 | WY – 1.59 |
| AZ – 2.49 | FL-2.46 | KS – 3.02 | MN – 2.15 | NJ – 4.11 | OR – 2.30 | UT - 2.00 | |
| AR – 2.55 | GA – 3.00 | KY – 3.34 | MS – 7.84 | NM – 3.31 | PA – 6.93 | VT-4.41 | U.S. – 2.83 |
| CA – 3.56 | HI – 2.79 | LA – 5.13 | MO – 2.82 | NY - 4.03 | RI – 5.68 | VA – 2.86 | |
| CO – 2.54 | ID – 1.73 | ME – 3.75 | MT – 2.32 | NC - 3.02 | SC – 2.96 | WA – 2.09 | |
| CT - 4.24 | IL-8.59 | MD - 3.00 | NE – 2.55 | ND – 1.20 | SD – 1.93 | WV27.93 | |

As one can see from these ratios, they range from 1.20 for ND on the low end, and up to 22.06 for MI on the high end (and based on absolute values, it is 27.93 for WV). The median ratio for the various states (with DC included) is 3.00 for GA. West Virginia actually has a negative ratio, because they had slightly negative population growth over the 20 year period. And for the nation as a whole, the ratio is 2.83.

While these ratios are in fact a helpful indicator of how our elections have changed for the various states, caution should be used in its use, especially considering how the number is derived. What we have come to realize is the ratio can be much skewed with states that had very little population growth or states with slight negative growth as with WV. And caution should also be used in believing the ratio might be an indicator for election fraud. There are in fact a number of factors as to why the level of voting has increased so dramatically – which are listed on our website and can

also be found with the table on Page 19 of this document. But still, with the typical state experiencing the amount of ballots cast increasing at a rate of around 3 Times the rate of population growth for this most recent 20 year period, we believe this is an alarming statistic and should be a concern involving election integrity.

General Commentary (by Billy Parker):

There are actually **Three (3) different Approaches** of using the Voter Participation Rate (VPR) to determine if elections are free and fair. These Election Charts involving the VPR data points represent just one of the three available approaches – see our website for all three. One very interesting method is the Margin and Pivot Approach. There is a high correlation between Winning Percentages and Margins – high Winning Percentages are normally associated with high Margins. But the election cycle of 2020 seems to be the exception. Taking the Winning Percentages achieved by Donald Trump – which were at historic highs for many of the states, then his Margins should have been far greater than realized. It should have been a complete blow-out election for Donald Trump, based upon this approach. This is just another reason why the results from the 2020 election are very questionable and represent an anomaly.

Regarding "election fraud," people often get so focused on that one issue that they fail to see the bigger picture as to how our elections are being altered and manipulated – for instance with Government changing election laws or like Big Tech using algorithms to alter the type of news stories you see on the computer. They are <u>ALL</u> having an effect on the outcome of our elections! We have actually indentified at least eight (8) different forces that are altering and manipulating our elections. (Again, see the list on our website and/or Page 19 of this document.) I personally believe that "election fraud" makes up only about 20% to 30% of the overall problem that we are seeing with our elections. Basically what is happening is the Democrat Party has registered a bunch of new segments of the population, who traditionally did not participate in the electoral process in the past. These new people are mainly made up of the welfare state (so they are going to vote for the continuation of the welfare state, no matter who is running or who has the best ideas). Then the Democrats utilize vote harvesting schemes (which is a form of election fraud, I believe) to either gather up these new voters to take to the polls (by the bus load) and/or gather up their absentee ballots. We know this



Kentucky (South, East–South Central region): The Republican vote might be questionable. Why was the Republican vote in 2020 such a huge outlier – not only significantly above the Upper Tolerance Bound but higher than any previous level ever achieved? And if the Republican vote was legitimate, then why is there NO offsetting of the vote by the Democrats? Both parties may be suspect in this case.

because there has been an unusual increase in the Voter Participation Rate (VPR) in election cycles mainly since 2000 (some current trend-shifts go as far back as 1984). So taking a look at EVERYTHING is very important.

Another issue that I would like for you to be aware of is all the work that has gone into this research (which is on-going and seems to never end). People just don't realize how much time, money, and effort that Dr. Young and I have invested in analyzing the 2020 election. Before coming together to work on the regression analysis charts, we both have probably logged in about 5,000 <u>unpaid</u> man-hours each over the past 3 years in putting out the various reports that we both wrote and/or were a co-author. Go to the *Article, Reports & Video* web page or the **Bio** section at the bottom of the Homepage for a list of these reports (also see the last page of this document – Page 20).

Many people think this election integrity and research work that I've done is just a hobby and that I'm doing it in my "retirement." No, this is not the case whatsoever. While my financial situation is a little different from my associate, I actually fall into the category of the "working poor" in this county and probably never will be able to "retire." (I like to think of myself as just "broke" instead of being "poor" – because I have had money before, and being "poor" is really part of just a permanent state of mind.) This work involving our research isn't cheap either. There are all kinds of bills associated with this work. I am constantly spending my last "nickel and dime" on printing and gas for visiting my fellow citizenry in central and eastern North Carolina in order to try to educate them about how our elections are being altered and manipulated. I do this work because it is a labor-of-love – having finally found something that is commensurate with my talents and level of education, and it is something I enjoy doing. I also want to do what I can to stop the tyranny that I see taking place in our country. People walk around wringing their hands about the situation we all face and wondering what they can do about it. Well, Dr. Young and I are actually doing something and trying to make a difference. (John Droz, Jr., Major Dave, Jim Womack, and others here in North Carolina are doing wonderful work also.)

I want these regression analysis charts and data to be discussed and debated by the public. Stopping the great cove-up about what really happened and getting to the bottom of that damn election is important, in my opinion. One thing that I have discovered is that if there is such a thing as "polarization," then it actually exists between the metropolitan areas

and the small cities and towns in the country. I find people, on average, are totally different in rural versus urban areas. The people who live in the smaller cities and out in the rural areas are trending towards the Republicans. But the people in the big cities are not only trending towards the Democrats but are doing so in much larger percentages. (And I have data to prove it!) I live in Raleigh, which has become a metropolitan area, but I often travel to the smaller cities and towns throughout central and eastern North Carolina trying to educate others as to what is really happening to our elections. I will occasionally have people in these smaller areas to come up to tell me that they don't know a single person who voted for Biden, but somehow he is president. So from these people's perspective, it absolutely had to be fraud. I too believed this when I first started this journey of doing election research. So it is important that we get to the bottom of what really happen in 2020; or else, this is a powder keg waiting go off. And the Democrats need to stop their cover-up of the situation.

I would also like to address what happened on January 6, 2021:

I am proud to say that I was there on that chilly winter day. While I never entered the Capitol Building, I did stand outside holding up my homemade sign and protesting. (And even if I had gone inside and just walked around the Rotunda, then that would have NOT been anything to be arrested for. It is the "people's" house and the common citizenry are customarily welcomed-in all the time by the security police.)

The Constitution gives us the specific right to "petition the Government for a redress of grievances." And that was exactly what I, along with many of my fellow citizens, were doing that day in Washington, DC. We all knew something terrible had gone wrong with our elections, and we simply wanted our voices to be heard and to show our protest as to what was about to happen in Congress that day with a certification of Biden as president. We should have all STOPPED to figure out what happened, before proceeding forward – and this is all that we were asking. None of us was there to try to overthrow our government – that notion is absurd. And if it was an "Insurrection," then it was about the sorriest attempt to do so as imaginable – nearly nobody even brought arms to try to overthrow the most powerful nation on earth. So how could it possibly be classified as an "Insurrection"? No, we see through what is happening – the Democrats and their allies in the Media and Big Tech are spinning this into something it was NOT. Nancy Pelosi,



Alabama (South, East–South Central region): With the Republican vote, note the sharp incline of the long-term Trend Line; this possibly explains why the current maximum voting level of 2004 – 2020 is above the previous maximum level of Nixon in 1972 and Reagan in 1984 – the Republican vote seems to max out at around 28%. As with a number of "Red" states in 2020, the Democrat vote is along the Lower Tolerance Bound.

Chuck Schumer, and others were not only hoping but planning for what happened – so they could then spin it into as a possible insurrection, for political purposes. Maybe now with these charts, we have the evidence to show something mighty strange and possibly "fraudulent" did indeed happened in that damn election. And for all those fellow countrymen who are rotting away in DC jails, maybe they too can use this information in their defense. I consider going to Washington on January 6 my civic duty!

And yes, I believe there should be an official forensic audit, state by state, of the ballots cast during the 2020 General Election. But I want to also see an audit done into how elections are being administered by the various states. While I have grave concerns over such practices as drop-box usage, I also think an investigation into how Early Voting, One-Stop Voting, and the "No-Excuse Absentee Ballots" are affecting election outcomes. And this goes without saying, investigation into Vote Harvesting practices should be looked into as well. I believe that we won't ever have free and fair elections again in this country until we go back to only Precinct Voting, one-day Election Day voting, and verifiable Picture ID in order to vote – all of which should be done on paper ballots.

If you would like to add your comments, please go to the Contact page to send a message on our website of **www.ForFreeAndFairElection.com**. Or simply write to me (Billy) or to Stan at:

For Free And Fair Elections, LLC 8480 Honeycutt Road, Suite 200 Raleigh, NC 27615

And Finally, a Call-to-Action: Sadly, I don't expect things to change much in the upcoming 2024 election. I didn't see much improvement with the 2022 Midterms. While turnout for Midterms are a lot less than General Elections, I noticed still a significant level of "Out-of-Line Ballots – according to historical trends and margins" in the election of 2022. And I already see now at the beginning of 2024 about news reports of an increase in "respiratory illnesses" on the rise and many institutions are again requiring mask wearing. So it is obvious that the Left will try again to use this

method as a reason for having all the mail-in ballots issued – since it worked so well for them the last time.

But here's something you can do: Make printed copies of this document and give it to your friends and relatives – so they have proof that our elections are being altered and manipulated. Make copies of the whole document or just the page involving your state charts and send it to your elected representatives on both the state and federal level. In fact, writing a simple letter – putting into your own thoughts as to what is happening, along with a photo-copy of just your state charts is probably the best form of communication. Let those in government know that you believe the 2020 election was possibly "fraudulent" and that the Left will try it again in 2024. And ask these elected people to explain why the voting patterns have changed so dramatically – see if they have an answer. Even send a letter to justices on the U.S. Supreme Court – since they will eventually need to get involved with both what is happening with our elections and with the various trails involving Donald Trump. Believe that you can make a difference!

And I hope you will realize also this work by me and Stan is not cheap. It would likely cost you \$15 a piece just to have this document of Election Charts printed in color, at a print shop, in order to hand out to your fellow citizen. I am in by no means able to take on this expense alone. I therefore appreciate all donations to my organization. You can send checks to the address provided or go on-line to our website to make a donation. Donations are, however, NOT tax deductible, since we are not a non-profit (yet).

Thank-you,

Billy Parker, American Patriot 1-31-2024



Educating Others as to What Is Happening to Our Elections



Mississippi (South, East-South Central region): In the past few cycles, notice how the Republican vote level is below the Lower Tolerance Bound; is it possible that the Republican vote maxes out in Mississippi at around 25%? And as with a number of "Red" states, the Democrat vote was at the Lower Tolerance Bound as well - but it was at a similar level as the maximum level achieved in previous elections (Carter in 1976 & 1980, and Obama in 2008 & 2012).



Arkansas (South, West–South Central region): The Republican vote looks normal for 2020. The voting level was in line with the maximum level of previous elections (Nixon in 1972 and Reagan in 1984). And as with a number of "Red" states, the Democrat vote was below the Trend Line and/or the Lower Tolerance Bound. You decide for yourself, but Arkansas seems to be conducting Free and Fair elections.



Texas (South, West–South Central region): While the Republican vote was below the Trend Line in 2020, it was within the previous maximum range of Nixon in 1972 and Reagan in 1984. The Democrat vote, however, is questionable. Not only was Biden above the Tolerance Bound, but he achieved the highest level ever at 18% (Johnson in 1964 was only at 16%). And 2020 was a different pattern than the neighboring state of Arkansas (and even nearby Mississippi).



Pennsylvania (Northeast, Middle Atlantic region): Both the Republican and Democrat votes are very questionable for the state of Pennsylvania in the 2020 election. For the Republicans vote, why was the voting level not only an outlier to the Upper Tolerance Bound but the highest level ever achieved? Similarly, why was the Democrat vote such an outlier as well? And why was there NO offsetting of the vote by either party?



New York (Northeast, Middle Atlantic region): For the Republican vote, note the sharp decline in the long-term Trend Line; as a consequence, not much is considered unusual about 2020 with the data point being an outlier. For the Democrat vote, not only was the level of voting above the Upper Tolerance Bound, but it exceeds the level even Obama achieved in 2008. With both parties being above their Tolerance Bound, why was there NO offsetting of the vote???



New Hampshire (Northeast, New England region): While the Republican vote was above the Tolerance Bound for 2020, it was at a similar maximum level as Nixon in 1972 and Reagan in 1984. The Democrat vote was not only a huge outlier for 2020, way above the Upper Tolerance Bound, but it was at the highest level ever. Thus, why was there NO offsetting of the vote by either party??? The Democrat vote pattern is concerning!



Ohio (Midwest, East-North Central region): The Republican vote might be a bit questionable. For 2020, it was not only above the Upper Tolerance Bound, but it was at the highest level ever; although, 2020 was typically higher than the 2016 level for most states. With the Democrat vote also being above the Upper Tolerance Bound, then why was there NO offsetting of the vote by either party???



Michigan (Midwest, East-North Central region): The Republican level of voting was not only above the Upper Tolerance Bound for 2020, but it was also at the highest level ever. Similarly, this can almost be said of the Democrats as well (except 2020 is slightly less than 2008). And with the Democrats, there seems to be a gap upward in the maximum level of voting in recent cycles – questionable. And why was there NO offsetting of the vote in 2020???



Wisconsin (Midwest, East-North Central region): Both the Republican and Democrat voting level for 2020 was at or above the Upper Tolerance Bound. While Wisconsin was one of the battleground states in 2020, the charts do look better than one might have expected. But still, one must ask why was there NO offsetting of the vote – since both parties performed so well???



Iowa (Midwest, West-North Central region): The Republican vote might be a bit concerning. It was clearly an outlier to the Upper Tolerance Bound in 2020; but in a historical context, it was below Eisenhower's maximum level in 1952 (and 2020 is typically above 2016 levels in most states). The Democrat voting level for 2020 seems to be normal – typical for what we see in many "Red" states. You decide, but Iowa seems to be conducting Free and Fair elections.



North Dakota (Midwest, West-North Central region): The Republican voting level for 2020 was right in line with what one would expect and was in line with the historical maximum levels of Reagan in 1984 and Eisenhower in 1952. There was offsetting of the vote regarding the Democrat level of voting. North Dakota is clearly conducting Free and Fair elections!



Idaho (West, Mountain region): In a historical context, the Republican voting level for 2020 was right in line with other maximum levels of voting – Eisenhower in 1952, Reagan in 1980 and 1984, and Bush following 9/11 in 2004. For the Democrat vote, note the decline in the long-term Trend Line; because of this, not much weight can be put in the fact that there was No offsetting of the vote – 2020 levels were similar to Obama's 2008 level.



Nevada (West, Mountain region): In 2020, the Republican voting level was a huge outlier to the Upper Tolerance Bound. For the Democrat voting level, 2020 was not only a huge outlier to the Upper Tolerance Bound, but it was the highest level ever achieved. Because there was NO offsetting of the vote by either party, Nevada (especially with both parties being huge outliers) seems to have a serious problem with election integrity.



Arizona (West, Mountain region): In 2020 for the Republican vote, it was at similar levels as Nixon in 1972 and Reagan in 1984 – nothing seems unusual. For the Democrats, however, they are not only an outlier to the Upper Tolerance Bound, but they are above, by a long shot, of any previous maximum level of voting. The Democrats are obviously doing something different than the Republicans – and it is concerning!!!



California (West, Pacific region): Note the long-term decline in the Trend Line for <u>both</u> parties. For the Republican voting level and in terms of the Upper Tolerance Bounds, 2020 was similar to Eisenhower in 1952, Nixon in 1972, and Reagan in 1984. For the Democrats, however, they are not only an outlier to the Tolerance Bound, but they are above, by a long shot, of any previous maximum level of voting. The Democrat vote is very concerning!!!

Using **North Carolina** as an **Example**, here is the download of VPR and Predicted VPR (Regression Analysis) Data as it appears on the website of **www.ForFreeAndFairElections.com** :

North Carolina Regression Analysis Data ^(2 Pages)

Data for Total VPR

Data for Republican VPR and Predicted VPR

Data for Democrat VPR

Data for 3rd Party VPR

| z | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| NCPop | 3,963,868 | 4,061,929 | 4,160,774 | 4,358,465 | 4,556,155 | 4,766,517 | 4,976,878 | 5,082,059 | 5,242,000 | 5,561,883 | 5,881,766 | 6,180,514 | 6,479,263 | 6,628,637 | 6,912,772 | 7,481,043 | 8,049,313 | 8,643,781 | 9,238,249 | 9,535,483 | 9,716,264 | 10,077,826 | OUL ULE UF |
| NCRvotes | 258,572 | • | 558,107 | 575,062 | 655,420 | 624,844 | 627,192 | • | 1,054,889 | 741,960 | 915,018 | 1,346,481 | 1,237,258 | • | 1,134,661 | 1,107,849 | 1,631,163 | 1,961,166 | 2,128,474 | • | 2,270,395 | 2,362,631 | |
| Year | 1948 | 1950 | 1952 | 1956 | 1960 | 1964 | 1968 | 1970 | 1972 | 1976 | 1980 | 1984 | 1988 | 1990 | 1992 | 1996 | 2000 | 2004 | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 | 2016 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Predicted NC VPR | 25.19 | 25.64 | 26.09 | 26.98 | 27.87 | 28.77 | 29.66 | 30.11 | 30.56 | 31.45 | 32.34 | 33.24 | 34.13 | 34.58 | 35.03 | 35.92 | 36.82 | 37.71 | 38.60 | 39.05 | 39.50 | 40,39 | |
| NC VPR | 19.96 | • | 29.10 | 26.74 | 30.04 | 29.90 | 31.90 | • | 28.97 | 30.17 | 31.55 | 35.20 | 32.94 | • | 37.78 | 33.63 | 36.17 | 40.50 | 46.66 | • | 46.37 | 47.05 | |
| NCPop | 3,963,868 | 4,061,929 | 4,160,774 | 4,358,465 | 4,556,155 | 4,766,517 | 4,976,878 | 5,082,059 | 5,242,000 | 5,561,883 | 5,881,766 | 6,180,514 | 6,479,263 | 6,628,637 | 6,912,772 | 7,481,043 | 8,049,313 | 8,643,781 | 9,238,249 | 9,535,483 | 9,716,264 | 10,077,826 | |
| NCTvotes | 791,209 | • | 1,210,910 | 1,165,592 | 1,368,556 | 1,424,983 | 1,587,493 | • | 1,518,612 | 1,677,906 | 1,855,833 | 2,175,361 | 2,134,370 | • | 2,611,850 | 2,515,807 | 2,911,262 | 3,501,007 | 4,310,789 | • | 4,505,372 | 4,741,564 | |
| ar | 48 | 950 | 952 | 956 | 960 | 964 | 968 | 970 | 972 | 916 | 980 | 984 | 988 | 066 | 992 | 966 | 000 | 004 | 800 | 010 | 012 | 016 | |

| (ear | NCDvotes | NCPop | NC D VPR | Predicted NC D VPR | Year |
|------|-----------|------------|-------------|-----------------------|------|
| 1948 | 459,070 | 3,963,868 | 11.58 | 13.01 | 1948 |
| 1950 | • | 4,061,929 | • | 13.10 | 1950 |
| 1952 | 652,803 | 4,160,774 | 15.69 | 13.18 | 1952 |
| 1956 | 590,530 | 4,358,465 | 13.55 | 13.35 | 1956 |
| 1960 | 713,136 | 4,556,155 | 15.65 | 13.53 | 1960 |
| 1964 | 800,139 | 4,766,517 | 16.79 | 13.70 | 1961 |
| 1968 | 464,113 | 4,976,878 | 9.33 | 13.87 | 1968 |
| 1970 | • | 5,082,059 | • | 13.95 | 1970 |
| 1972 | 438,705 | 5,242,000 | 8.37 | 14.04 | 1972 |
| 1976 | 927,365 | 5,561,883 | 16.67 | 14.21 | 1976 |
| 1980 | 875,635 | 5,881,766 | 14.89 | 14.38 | 1980 |
| 1984 | 824,287 | 6,180,514 | 13.34 | 14.55 | 1981 |
| 1988 | 890,167 | 6,479,263 | 13.74 | 14.72 | 1986 |
| 1990 | | 6,628,637 | • | 14.81 | 1990 |
| 1992 | 1,114,042 | 6,912,772 | 16.12 | 14.89 | 1992 |
| 1996 | 1,225,938 | 7,481,043 | 16.39 | 15.06 | 1996 |
| 2000 | 1,257,692 | 8,049,313 | 15.62 | 15.23 | 2000 |
| 2004 | 1,525,849 | 8,643,781 | 17.65 | 15.40 | 2004 |
| 2008 | 2,142,651 | 9,238,249 | 23.19 | 15.57 | 2006 |
| 2010 | | 9,535,483 | • | 15.66 | 2010 |
| 2012 | 2,178,391 | 9,716,264 | 22.42 | 15.74 | 2012 |
| 2016 | 2,189,316 | 10,077,826 | 21.72 | 15.92 | 2016 |
| 0000 | 2 684 292 | 10 439 388 | 25.71 | 16.09 | 2020 |

Predicted NC R VPR 11.02 11.135 11.135 11.135 13.01 13.01 13.01 13.65 13.65 13.65 13.65 13.65 13.65 14.67 13.65 13.55 15.55 15

NC R VPR 655 655 13.41 13.41 13.19 13.19 13.11 12.60 20.12 13.34 20.12 21.79 21.79 21.79 21.79 21.79 21.79 21.79 23.34 23.34 23.34 23.34 23.34

| ~ | 9 | ٠ | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 10 | • | 92 | 5 | - | 5 | = | ٠ | 5 | - | 89 | 9 | - | • | .02 | 00 | 00 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| NC VPI | 1.8 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.6 | | 0.4 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | | 5.2 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | | 0.5 | 1.8 | 0.7 |
| NCPop | 3,963,868 | 4,061,929 | 4,160,774 | 4,358,465 | 4,556,155 | 4,766,517 | 4,976,878 | 5,082,059 | 5,242,000 | 5,561,883 | 5,881,766 | 6,180,514 | 6,479,263 | 6,628,637 | 6,912,772 | 7,481,043 | 8,049,313 | 8,643,781 | 9,238,249 | 9,535,483 | 9,716,264 | 10,077,826 | 10,439,388 |
| NCOther | 73,567 | • | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 496,188 | • | 25,018 | 8,581 | 65,180 | 4,593 | 6,945 | • | 363,147 | 182,020 | 22,407 | 13,992 | 39,664 | • | 56,586 | 189,617 | 81,737 |
| Year | 1948 | 1950 | 1952 | 1956 | 1960 | 1964 | 1968 | 1970 | 1972 | 1976 | 1980 | 1984 | 1988 | 1990 | 1992 | 1996 | 2000 | 2004 | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 | 2016 | 2020 |

| | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--------------|---|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| SIS | 2 | Average of 2 Parties Pivot Pt | | N/A | 9.05% | N/A | 14.55% | 13.37% | 15.1% | 15.0% | 11.0% | N/A | 14.3% | 15.0% | 15.3% | 17.6% | 16.4% | N/A | 16.3% | 15.6% | 18.0% | 20.2% | 23.1% | N/A | 22.90% | 22.58% | 26.07% | |
| ANAL | 001 | Difference of 2 Parties <u>Margin</u> | | N/A | 5.06% | N/A | 2.28% | 0.36% | 1.3% | 3.7% | 3.3% | N/A | 11.7% | 3.4% | 0.7% | 8.5% | 5.4% | N/A | 0.3% | 1.6% | 4.7% | 5.0% | 0.2% | N/A | 0.95% | 1.72% | 0.72% | |
| | | Other | | N/A | 1.86% | N/A | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.0% | N/A | 0.5% | 0.2% | 1.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% | N/A | 5.3% | 2.4% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.4% | N/A | 0.58% | 1.88% | 0.78% | |
| POP. | OIED | Dem. | | N/A | 11.58% | N/A | 15.69% | 13.55% | 15.7% | 16.8% | 9.3% | N/A | 8.4% | 16.7% | 14.9% | 13.3% | 13.7% | N/A | 16.1% | 16.4% | 15.6% | 17.7% | 23.2% | N/A | 22.42% | 21.72% | 25.71% | |
| % of | MHO V | Rep. | | N/A | 6.52% | N/A | 13.41% | 13.19% | 14.4% | 13.1% | 12.6% | N/A | 20.1% | 13.3% | 15.6% | 21.8% | 19.1% | N/A | 16.4% | 14.8% | 20.3% | 22.7% | 23.0% | N/A | 23.37% | 23.44% | 26.43% | |
| | | Total (VPR) | | N/A | 19.96% | N/A | 29.10% | 26.74% | 30.0% | 30.0% | 31.9% | N/A | 29.0% | 30.2% | 31.6% | 35.2% | 32.9% | N/A | 37.8% | 33.6% | 36.2% | 40.5% | 46.7% | N/A | 46.37% | 47.05% | 52.92% | |
| | ELECTION | YEAR POPULATION | | 3,571,623 | 3,963,868 | 4,061,929 | 4,160,774 | 4,358,465 | 4,556,155 | 4,766,517 | 4,976,878 | 5,082,059 | 5,242,000 | 5,561,883 | 5,881,766 | 6,180,514 | 6,479,263 | 6,628,637 | 6,912,772 | 7,481,043 | 8,049,313 | 8,643,781 | 9,238,249 | 9,535,483 | 9,716,264 | 10,077,826 | 10,439,388 | 10,800,950 est. |
| | | Other | | N/A | 73,567 | N/A | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 496,188 | N/A | 25,018 | 8,581 | 65,180 | 4,593 | 6,945 | N/A | 363,147 | 182,020 | 22,407 | 13,992 | 39,664 | N/A | 56,586 | 189,617 | 81,737 | |
| | STALS | Democrat | | N/A | 459,070 | N/A | 652,803 | 590,530 | 713,136 | 800,139 | 464,113 | N/A | 438,705 | 927,365 | 875,635 | 824,287 | 890,167 | N/A | 1,114,042 | 1,225,938 | 1,257,692 | 1,525,849 | 2,142,651 | N/A | 2,178,391 | 2,189,316 | 2,684,292 | |
| | VOIE 10 | Republican | | N/A | 258,572 | N/A | 558,107 | 575,062 | 655,420 | 624,844 | 627,192 | N/A | 1,054,889 | 741,960 | 915,018 | 1,346,481 | 1,237,258 | N/A | 1,134,661 | 1,107,849 | 1,631,163 | 1,961,166 | 2,128,474 | N/A | 2,270,395 | 2,362,631 | 2,758,775 | |
| | | Total | | N/A | 791,209 | N/A | 1,210,910 | 1,165,592 | 1,368,556 | 1,424,983 | 1,587,493 | N/A | 1,518,612 | 1,677,906 | 1,855,833 | 2,175,361 | 2,134,370 | N/A | 2,611,850 | 2,515,807 | 2,911,262 | 3,501,007 | 4,310,789 | N/A | 4,505,372 | 4,741,564 | 5,524,804 | |
| | | | Vorth Carolina: | 1940 | 1948 | 1950 | 1952 | 1956 | 1960 | 1964 | 1968 | 1970 | 1972 | 1976 | 1980 | 1984 | 1988 | 1990 | 1992 | 1996 | 2000 | 2004 | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 | 2016 | 2020 | 2024 |
| | | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Elections THEN

Elections NOW

(For the State of North Carolina)



North Carolina Voter Increases from 2000 to 2020

Total Vote (VPR): +46.31% Republican: +30.39% Democrat: +64.60%

www.ForFreeAndFairElections.com



From a NC Perspective, Was the **2020 General Election Stolen?**

(Commentary from Homepage of ForFreeAndFairElections.com under the section, "Was the 2020 Election Stolen based upon the Regression Analysis?")

Was it Stolen? Well, it depends upon your definition of "stolen" and which state is in question. Every state is somewhat different, but I can attest for here in NC that our elections have been greatly altered and manipulated in recent election cycles. For the 2020 General Election in NC, we can plainly see through the regression analysis charts for the Total VPR that there was a 1.2 Million "Vote Difference" - much of which can be described as an "Out-of-Line" bloc of voters – according to historical trends and margins.

problem was with the voting machines and hacking into the voting systems, at least here in North Carolina. And while there were actual cases of this happening around the country, which may have affected the election outcomes in some local elections in other states (an example is Antrim County, MI), I personally don't believe this method of cheating rose to any statistical significance on a national level.

For states that used ballot drop-boxes. there was a serious problem with them being stuffed with very questionable votes (Source: "2000 Mules"). But for North Carolina (which does not use drop-boxes), the problem seems to be with other types of vote harvesting schemes. The Democrat Party used (and abused) the One-Stop Voting, Early Voting, the No-Excuse Absentee Ballots, and the No Picture IDs* in an attempt to "steal" the election. They almost

succeeded in "stealing" the presidential race; but I believe they actually pulled it off with the governor's race, and possibly the attorney general's race as well

During Early Voting in NC, the Democrats were able to empty out the Homeless Camps, in order to round up people by the bus load to take to the One-Stop Voting sites. When you spread out the time to vote (like with several weeks), you give time for the cheaters to cheat. Since Homeless Camps are mainly found in metropolitan First of all, I do NOT believe the areas, these areas (not rural counties) show a major shift in voting patterns. The Democrats also took other segments of the population, like with senior centers, by the bus load to the One-Stop Voting well.

> areas with major university campuses, the candidates for only one (1) to five (5) college students. After these students lazy, afraid (possibly voting under duress graduate and/or move away, they are and pressure), and/or uninformed that often left still on the voter rolls. The they couldn't even fill out the rest of the Democrats are then able to use these ballot – even with those races that had an registrations to cheat. This is another order for fair elections.

The Democrats took similar tactic actions with the elderly and the mentally challenged with the use of the No-Excuse Absentee Ballots during the Early Voting period. They were able to go to the nursing homes to gather up Absentee Ballots from people who are



commentosed and/or have dementia people who have no business voting.

Here in North Carolina during the 2020 General Election, the Democrats also went after the very low-information sites during the Early Voting period as voter. There were roughly 190,000 (out of 5.5 Million) ballots cast in that election Also in many of these Metropolitan where the voter checked the names of "R" or "D" beside the names. I wonder population???

> With a high probability, it is estimated that there were around 100,000** votes cast where people went and voted in other people's names during the Early Voting period. Because we had No Picture ID required for voting at the time, the with many of them taking the next step of

Democrats were able to get away with this type of fraud. Very close to this category of questionable votes are those people independent New Jersev research who are registered in multiple counties. This may include people who own property in more than one county, and thus are on both the tax and voter rolls in those multiple counties. This type of voter fraud also includes people who Democrats have registration drives of elected offices. These people were so moved from one county to another, but are still on the rolls of their former county of residence. And of course, this type of fraud includes those who just falsely and illegally register in more than one county (sometimes not using the exact same reason why picture ID is so crucial in how many of these represented the name), no matter if they own or had mentally-challenged and/or homeless owned real property in those counties. These are examples of how coordination from the very top and individual Democrats – the lone wolves often cheat in our elections.

> And how about all the non-citizens who are able to obtain a driver license.

also illegally registering to vote? There is no doubt that non-citizens are affecting our elections. When asked about this recently, Jim Womack who heads up the North Carolina Election Integrity Teams (NCEIT.org) and who has worked tirelessly in cleaning up the voter rolls had this to say: "There are indeed noncitizens being 'accidentally' added to the voter registration list in NC. This occurs primarily by poor quality controls at State DMV offices, principally when being issued driver's licenses. S747 provides a means of cyclically identifying some of them for removal (when they are called for jury duty and refuse because of noncitizen status). However this fails to remove the majority of non-citizens."

No one knows for sure the exact number of votes cast by illegal immigrants in our elections. But with

surveys done of the question, we can get some type of estimate. Just Facts, an organization, released the results of a study back in June of 2017 of the 2008 Presidential Election. Using extensive data from a Harvard/YouGov study of tens of thousands of voters. Just Facts "estimated that as many as 7.9 million non-citizens were illegally registered to vote in 2008." And while the study provided a rather wide range, the number of actual votes affected could have been as high as 5.7 million.

Historically, only about 60% of registered voters actually show up to vote. So if 7.9 million non-citizens are illegally registered, then that would have translated as being 3.61% of the Total Vote being cast by illegal immigrants. If that percentage for 2008 on a national level held true for North Carolina in 2020, then that works out to possibly 199.445 (3.61% x 5.524.804) illegal votes

by non-citizens for the state.

So you decide for yourself if the election was "stolen." Again, the regression analysis, based upon official government data, shows there was a 1.2 Million "Vote Difference" – much of which was an "Out-of-Line" bloc of votes in NC for the 2020 election. And if it wasn't "stolen," then the Democrats definitely were trying. With the election result being so far off the trend line, it appears (perhaps obvious) that something very unusual indeed happened.

We must go back to only Precinct Voting and one-day Election Day voting, and that would solve 90% of the problem with election integrity. While the Democrats will still attempt to cheat on Election Day, the time element won't be in their favor if we make these changes.

Article written by Billy Parker 10/30/2023

* With the recent changes of election law by the NC General Assembly and changes with the state Supreme Court, the No Picture IDs as a method of voter fraud has effectively been taken off the table for the Democrats.

** It is believed that there was a cover-up by Governor Roy Cooper's (D) State Board of Election in their reporting of voter fraud cases – with only 358 reported cases being filed, with 61 of which having been referred to a district attorney for prosecution (out of a state of 10.4 Million people). When the public citizenry reported cases of election fraud to the board, it is believed a partisan blind-eye was often turned and very little follow-up work was done by the state in order to suppress the true number cases of voter fraud.

Answers to "What is Happening to Our Elections?"

Our elections are becoming Altered and Manipulated by at least the following 8 Forces:

A. The Government

- Changes to Election Law Early Voting & Absentee Ballots
- Motor Voter Laws
- State/County Board of Elections
- Dept. of Health and Human Services Free government services in exchange for a voter registration
- Public School System a Marxist Indoctrination Campground

B. Political Parties

- Republicans
- But Mostly by the Democrats

C. Nonprofit NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations)

- "Voter Registration Project (VRP)"
- "Blueprint NC"
- Left-wing Churches
- Other "Nonprofits"

D. Public-Private Partnerships

- Big-fat Govt. Contracts; Govt. Paid Infrastructure; & Tax Breaks
 - A form of "Fascism" Phony Capitalism
- Workers of these industries are likely to vote for Bigger Government

The Democrat Party is Using (and Abusing) the following to steal elections:

- No Excuse Absentee Ballot (the Mail-In Vote)
- Early Voting Period
- One-Stop Voting

And the Democrats are Doing this with Certain Segments of the Population, including the Elderly, Mentally-Challenged, Homeless Population, Illegal Immigrants, and the Very Low Information Voter (just to name a few).

E. Media and Big Tech

- A very slanted Mainstream Media
- Suppression of the "Hunter Biden Lap-top" news story
- Use of Algorithms to Censor News by Big Tech
- The Power of Social Media

F. Changes in Population and Demographics (from 2000 to 2020)

- 17.78% Increase in Population for the United States
- 29.69% Increase in Population for North Carolina
- 79.89% Increase in Population for Wake Co., NC

G. Immigration

- Legal
- But Mostly by Illegal Non-Citizens (Estimated at 3.6% of Total Vote)

H. Advancement in Technology

- Internet
- Smart Phone



Dr. S. Stanley Young is currently the CEO of CGStat and previously worked at Eli Lilly, GlaxoSmithKline and the National Institute of Statistical Sciences on questions of applied statistics. His current interest is studying methods used in the evaluation of observational studies. He also works on bioinformatics problems.

Dr. Young graduated from North Carolina State University, BS, MES and a PhD in Statistics and Genetics. He worked in the pharmaceutical industry on all phases of pre-clinical research. He has authored or co-authored over 70 papers including six "best paper" awards, and a highly

cited book, *Resampling-Based Multiple Testing*. He has three issued patents. He is interested in all aspects of applied statistics. He conducts research in data mining.

Dr. Young is a Fellow of the American Statistical Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He is an adjunct professor of statistics at North Carolina State University, the University of Waterloo, and the University of British Columbia where he has co-directed thesis work. He is also an adjunct professor of biostatistics in the Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health at Georgia Southern University. Dr. Young served on the Scientific Advisory Board of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2017-2021.

Dr. Young has been part of numerous reports regarding the 2020 election cycle. Below is just a sampling of his work that he has helped to co-author. These reports along with others come courtesy of John Droz, Jr. For a FREE download of the below reports, go to Election-Integrity.Info or simply go to our website of www.ForFreeAndFairElections.com.



Startling Vote Spikes, 1-2-21 (Rev 7-25-23), prepared by a group of unpaid volunteers. Three (3) Million "Spikes" Votes Found in 14 Realizing the States. questionable nature of these A visual display is given the "spikes" and that they may represent illegitimate votes, making an adjustment to the 2020 Popular Vote Count would in fact have altered the Electoral College outcome.



Contrast Analysis (US and 48 States). Each state, Maine and Alaska excluded. is examined county by county giving the contrast of Detroit. There are allegations Philadelphia Co., population the 2016 vs. 2020 election. points to unusual voting fraud. patterns, either pro Biden or pro Trump. Also given are tables of most dramatic vote

gains for each county for the

two candidates.

MICHIGAN 2020 VOTING ANALYSIS REPORT



2020 Presidential Election 2020 Presidential Election Michigan 2020 Voting Pennsylvania 2020 Voting Analysis Report, 11-27-20 Analysis Report, 11-27-20 (rev 4-10-21). Michigan is a (rev 4-10-21). The Young rather problematic state dominated by the city of that the AG covered up multiple instances of voter Biden did not decrease.

contrast report points to problematic counties. In decreases, the votes for Allegany County produced increased votes for Biden relative to HRC. In a WSJ letter, DJT listed Problematic happenings in Pennsylvania.



Other Election Integrity Reports involving Dr. S. Stanley Young:

- Critique of MITRE Report
- Claudia Tennex Report NY-22nd-• 2020 Report



I, Billy Parker, have a little bit of a different and interesting story to tell as to how I got involved with investigating the 2020 election. While I have a background in mathematics and enjoy statistics, I have a marketing and promotional business, mainly to do with collegiate apparel; and I have worked a number of championships when one of the local universities has won a national title in basketball or football. So I know demand when I see it. Well about 3 weeks before the

November 2020 election. I ordered a bunch of Donald Trump T-shirts. It was like working a National Championship. I was selling them left and right; and nobody was asking for a Joe Biden T-shirt (I didn't have any if they had asked). Then when Trump didn't actually win the election, I started to scratch my head and say, "something doesn't seem right about this picture." And we all saw it with our own eves on television. When Trump held rallies, tens of thousands showed up; but Biden could only get a handful of people to show up for his events. Having a background in numbers. I started to investigate for myself soon after the election. I have since written four (4) reports, published articles, and started a website. It has turned into a career for me.

For a FREE download of these publications, simply go to our website of www.ForFreeAndFairElections.com.



23%, 6.4%, 41% Percentages You Need to Know

If an Election is Fraudulent





r. Douglas Fran

Part I of A Special Report Part II of A Special Report Supplemental to Part II of A Critique of Dr. Douglas on the 2020 Presidential on the 2020 Presidential Election Results, Published Election Results, Published 7/16/2021: Possibly 9.6 9/21/2021: Comparison of Million Fraudulent Votes election result to US Census calculated from only 15 population from 1948 to states in the 2020 election. 2020. A historical record of Other studies are considered each election including the Election including the percentage and margins. Spikes Report.

A Special Report on the Frank – Cyber Symposium 2020 Presidential Election Results, Published 3/1/2022: Published 2/10/2022: This Continuation of findings by comparing election results to population. the Also cycle, included "Inflation at the FALSE INFORMATION with winning Ballot Box" and "Influence Dr. Frank's "incredible" of 3rd Party Candidates."

of August 10, 2021, Mike Lindell sponsored event about the 2020 election was possibly a source of assertations.

Summary of (much of) the Above Reports by Billy Parker

If You are lazy like me and don't like to read lengthy reports but would like a condensed summary, then I encourage you to read my 4-page article published 4/2/22 called 23%, 6.4%, 41% -Percentages You Need to Know If an Election is Fraudulent, This is exclusively about comparing election results to the total population - what percentages and historical trends are yielded by making such a comparison, going all the way back to 1948 in some instances. And it serves as the basis for all the rest of the analysis that uses the Voter Participation Rate (VPR) and helps to explain "What Is Happening to Our Election?" This is a Must Read for anyone interested in the subject of election integrity.