

A Crime Against All of Us...

Evidence that the
2020 Presidential Election was Rigged



To ignore Evil
is to
become
an accomplice
to it.

Martin Luther King Jr.

David Spring M. Ed.

A Crime Against All of Us...

Evidence that the 2020 Presidential Election was Rigged

Table of Contents

1 The First Step in Solving Any Problem is Admitting the Truth.....	1
2 Our Vote Counting Machines have never been secure.....	8
3 What caused a dramatic increase in ballots in 2020?.....	13
4 Unexplained Problems in Pennsylvania.....	17
5 Unexplained Problems in Washington State.....	35
6 Unexplained Problems in Georgia.....	43
7 Georgia Court Cases.....	50
8 Unexplained Problems in Arizona.....	58
9 Voting Machine Problems: ES & S versus Dominion.....	73
10 Who Rigged the 2020 election?.....	78
11 Three Steps to End Election Rigging.....	81
12 Resolution to Restore Free and Equal Elections.....	83
Addendum 1 Eight Red Flags of the Albert Data Mining Program.....	85




**Injustice
Anywhere
is a threat
to Justice
Everywhere.**

Martin Luther King Jr.

1 The First Step in Solving Any Problem is Admitting the Truth

A national poll taken shortly after the 2020 election found that 66% of Republican registered voters lacked confidence that votes were counted properly. Even worse, 70% of Independent Trump voters lacked confidence that votes were counted properly. I have no confidence because I have spent more than 20 years warning about the lack of security of mail in ballots and insecure centralized vote counting machines.

There is no doubt that the 2020 Presidential Election was one of the most unusual elections in US history. One reason is that there was a dramatic increase in Mail In ballots in 2020 compared to 2016 all across the nation.



In 2016, Mail In ballots accounted for one in five votes. In 2020, Mail In Ballots accounted for about one in two voters. This huge increase in Mail In ballots is in itself is a giant Red Flag. What was more troubling was the massive difference between In Person ballots and Mail In ballots in 2020.

Below is a table showing how this huge sudden increase in Mail In Ballots affected the Presidential elections in Georgia, Pennsylvania and Arizona.

State	Mail In			Election Day In Person			Gap
	Biden	Trump	Margin	Biden	Trump	Margin	
Pennsylvania	76%	23%	D+54	34%	65%	R+32	85pt
Georgia	65%	34%	D+30	38%	60%	R+23	53
Arizona*	52%	47%	D+5	32%	66%	R+34	38

*Arizona does not distinguish between mail votes and in-person early votes. Had Arizona split these votes by In Person versus Mail In, **the Biden Mail in margin would be greater than 50% and the gap would have been greater than 80%. In short, Arizona would have looked a lot like Pennsylvania – and these two states would share the honor of having the largest gap of any state in the nation.**

It is not statistically possible for one random group of more than a million voters to vote for a candidate by a two to one margin while another group of random voters of more than a million voters in the same state voted for his opponent by a three to one margin (which is what was claimed to have happened in Pennsylvania in 2020). There is a well known principle in statistics called **Regression toward the Mean**. It means that the larger the sample size is, the more likely it will tend towards the average. Statical principles may not mean much to most people, but as a person with a degree in Science Education who has spent a lifetime studying scientific data, statistical principles matter to me.

There are many other troubling facts about the 2020 election. For example, in Pennsylvania, there was a huge increases in the number of registered Republicans between 2016 to 2020 – and only a tiny increase in the number of Democrats. So how was it that the vote for the Democratic candidate increased more than the vote for the Republican candidate?

I realize that many other people have written reports critical of the 2020 election. I have read several of these reports. Some are credible and I have quoted them in this report. Others are less than credible and I have ignored them. But there are three aspects of this report that are different from other reports. First, I do not rely on just one set of data. I have done my best to seek out all of the data – especially data that is objective and beyond dispute.

Second, I myself have endeavored to be objective. It is a fact that I did not vote for Trump in 2016 or 2020. My allegiance is not to Trump. My goal is seeking out and reporting the truth.

Third, I have been studying this problem for more than 20 years. The potential for rigging Mail In ballots and centralized vote counting machines has existed this entire time. And it will continue to exist until we as a nation resolve to abandon mail in ballots and insecure centralized vote counting machines and return to simple In Person voting and locally verifiable decentralized hand counting the ballots.

My concern is that our election system has been extremely insecure for a very long time. We need to learn from the disaster of the 2020 election and return to a system that is more secure – such as voting at your local elementary school and hand counting ballots locally rather than sending them to centralized vote counting machines – where as you will see – all kinds of problems come up.

Did the courts really find that there was nothing wrong with the 2020 election?

We also need to address the misconceptions of those who claim that the courts dismissed all of the 2020 election fraud cases. A detailed analysis of all 92 election fraud cases found that 61 were dismissed on legal technicalities.

https://election-integrity.info/2020_Election_Cases.htm

Many of the challenges were dismissed by judges because they failed to “allege a particular injury” or “irreparable harm,” or the risk of fraud was too speculative, but were instead a “general grievance.” Other common reasons to dismiss the lawsuits were stating they were moot or they were filed too late. Constitutional attorney Robert Barnes said about the judges’ reasoning for throwing out 2020 lawsuits, **“Can’t sue before the election, can’t sue during election, can’t sue after election.”**


Of the remaining 31 cases that were actually considered by the court, those claiming there was evidence of election fraud prevailed in 22 of the cases. In only 9 cases did the court find there was not substantial evidence. Some cases including cases in Pennsylvania and Georgia are still ongoing. We review the status of these cases in the following pages.

It is time to learn and tell the truth about the 2020 election

As we head into the 2024 Presidential Election, few believe it will be any better than the 2020 election. In fact, many of us are expecting a repeat of the 2020 election. If we are ever to restore honest elections, we need to open our eyes to the serious crimes that were committed in the 2020 Presidential Election. This report provides evidence that the 2020 Presidential election was rigged. If the truth continues to be hidden, the 2024 Presidential Election will also be rigged. This is the problem with pretending that our mail in ballots and voting counting systems are secure when they are not.

What ever happened to the First Amendment?

For those with short memories, in 2000, many Democrats, including myself, accused the Republican Party in Florida of rigging the 2000 Presidential Election. In 2004, many Democrats, including myself, accused the Republican Party in Ohio of rigging the 2004 Presidential Election. We provided proof that the Windows-based vote counting machines in Ohio had been tampered with.



2004 Ohio Presidential Election Rigging

New Court Filing Reveals How the 2004 Ohio Presidential Election Was Hacked

The Mysterious Case of Ohio's Voting Machine Allegations of vote fraud in Ohio, Florida: Was the 2004 presidential election stolen?

TWO OHIO ELECTION OFFICIALS CONVICTED FOR RIGGING 2004 PRESIDENTIAL RECOUNT!

Back then, no one accused us of trying to overthrow the country. Each person was entitled to say what they want and form their own opinion without the fear of being sent to prison. However, if one says the 2020 election was rigged, they are automatically accused of being a Russian spy and a traitor. This double standard is a violation of our First Amendment right to free speech. So here is a reminder about what Democrats used to say about the insecurity of vote counting machines:

Democrats Warn About Voting Machine Vulnerabilities

Members of the US Congress have been concerned about hacking and voting machine vulnerabilities since at least 2000. In 2019, Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA), along with Senators Amy Klobuchar (D-MN), Ron Wyden (D-OR), and Mark Pocan (D-WI), investigated election technology vendors. Their findings included criticism of the reliability and performance of voting equipment:

“Election security experts have noted for years that our nation's election systems and infrastructure are under serious threat, but voting machines reportedly continue to fail and breakdown across the country, as vendors fail to innovate, improve, and protect voting systems, putting U.S. elections at avoidable and increased risk.” (see 2019 (Dec. 10) – Warren, Klobuchar, Wyden, and Pocan Investigate Vulnerabilities and Shortcomings of Election Technology Industry with Ties to Private Equity on pg. 210)

“You could easily hack into them. It makes it seems like all these states are doing different things but, in fact, 3 companies are controlling them.” – Senator Amy Klobuchar

“The biggest seller of voting machines is doing something that violates cyber security 101. Directing that you install remote access software which would make a machine like that a magnet for fraudsters and hackers.” Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR)

I actually held a demonstration for my colleagues here at the Capitol where we brought in folks who, before our eyes, hacked elections machines. Those are being used in many states.” – Then Senator Kamala Harris

“Researchers have repeatedly demonstrated that ballot recording machines and other voting systems are susceptible to tampering.” – Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX)

“Even hackers with limited prior knowledge, tools, and resources are able to breach voting machines in a matter of minutes.” – Rep. Val Demings (D-FL)

“In 2018, electronic voting machines in Georgia and Texas deleted votes for certain candidates or switched votes from one candidate to another.” – Rep Jennifer Wexton (D-VA)

“These voting machines can be hacked quite easily.” “Workers were able to easily hack into an electronic voting machine. It was easy to switch votes.” “In a close presidential election, they just need to hack one swing state. Or maybe one or two. Or maybe just a few counties in one swing state.” – Rep. Ted Lieu (D-CA)

“An external party could access the machine's wireless feature to record voting data or inject malicious data.” – Rep. Robin Kelly (D-IL)

The first step in solving a problem is admitting we have one

Here is a brief overview of some of the worst problems.

2016 to 2020 Swing States

There were five swing states that shifted by a tiny percent from 2016 to 2020 that determined the outcome of the 2020 election:

State	2020 Margin	2016 Margin	Difference %	Electoral Votes
Georgia	0.24D	5.13R	5.37 %	16
Arizona	0.31D	3.55R	3.86 %	11
Pennsylvania	1.16D	0.72R	1.88 %	20
Michigan	2.78D	0.23R	3.01 %	16
Wisconsin	0.63D	0.77R	1.4 %	10
Average	1.02D	2.08R	3.1 %	Total 73

The state with the greatest difference was Georgia with over 5% of the ballots changing from R to D. The next highest swing was Arizona where just under 4% of the ballots changed from R to D. Of these five swing states only Arizona and Pennsylvania publish Voter Registration by Political Party. Here is a summary of changes to voter registrations between 2016 and 2024 by party in Arizona.

State	Total Registrants K	D Party #K	D Party %	R Party #K	R Party %	Indy Other %
AZ Jan 24	4101	1212	29.6	1418	34.6	35
AZ 2020	4281	1334	31.1	1479	34.5	33.6
AZ 2016	3588	1091	30.7	1240	34.9	34
AZ Change	739	243 K	0.4%	239 K	- 0.4%	-0.4%

Note that while there was a huge increase of 739,000 in party registrations from 2016 to 2020 (an increase of 21%), there was almost no change in the ratio of party registrations between 2016 to 2020. The increase in Democrats was only 4000 ballots greater than the increase in Republicans which is a difference of less than one tenth of one percent of the 4.28 million voters in Arizona in 2020. Yet somehow 5% of the ballots were switched. After the 2020 election, there was a decrease of 180,000 in the total number of registered voters -with Democrats decreasing by 122,000.

Below is a summary of changes to voter registrations between 2016 and 2024 by party in Pennsylvania.

State	Total Registrants K	D Party #K	D Party %	R Party #K	R Party %	Indy Other %
PA Jan 24	8685	3893	44.8	3478	40	15.2
PA 2020	9091	4229	46.5	3543	39	14.5
PA 2016	8723	4217	48.3	3301	37.8	13.9
PA Change	368 K	12 K	-0.02	242 K	0.01	0.01


From 2016 to 2020, there was a rise of 368,000 registered voters . Stunningly, the increase in Democratic voters was only 12,000 while the increase in Republican voters was 242,000. Given these fact, Trump should have won Pennsylvania by hundreds of thousands more votes in 2020 than he did in 2016. So what happened?

The answer was that there was a dramatic increase in Mail In ballots in 2020 compared to 2016 all across the nation.


In the following sections, we will take a closer look at Mail In ballots in these three swing states of Pennsylvania, Georgia and Arizona to better determine how these Mail In Ballots were created. We will also look at the state of Washington to show how mail in ballots were used to rig elections even in states that are not swing states.

2 Our Vote Counting Machines have never been secure

I have spent more than 20 years writing articles warning of the dangers of insecure voting machines. The claim that “our vote counting machines are secure” is ridiculous because all of our vote counting machines use the Windows operating system. The Windows operating system has been insecure **ever since 1998 when Bill Gates insisted on putting the web browser inside the core of the Windows operating system**. In 2013, I wrote a 400 page book describing the danger of “back doors” and remote control access to Windows computers. You can download it and read it for free at this link: <https://freeyourselffrommicrosoftandthensa.org/>




A back door is a hidden access point to a computer which can be accessed either by a USB stick or the Internet.



The only way to avoid Windows security flaws is to use computers with the Linux operating system.

For example, in 2022, the Windows operating system had 863 security flaws while the free open source Linux Debian operating system did not have a single security flaw.



Despite the fact that the Windows operating system has hundreds of security flaws, every vote counting machine made in the past 25 years has used the Windows operating system.

This problem has been going on for more than 20 years

In 2000, Florida voters were subjected to punch card machines that left hanging chads – destroying the votes of thousands of voters. But instead of going back to plain paper ballots like we used in the past, the Florida disaster was used as an excuse to promote electronic voting machines that were even less secure and more error prone than the punch card machines they were replacing.

In 2002, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act, aka HAVA. Suddenly states were awash with more than \$3 billion in tax payer funds to invest in new highly centralized vote counting machines. Instead of saving democracy, this federal cash cow was used to buy a ticket on the Titanic.



Since 2002, more than \$5 billion has been spend on generation after generation of insecure and unreliable vote counting machines with each version worse than the previous one.



How much longer are we going to throw good money after bad?

We have a simple inexpensive technology at our disposal that is invulnerable to hacking. It is called a paper ballot:



There's no malware that can attack a paper ballot. If it is properly designed, it is easy to confirm how you voted. Plus as long as you keep the paper ballots, you will always have a paper trail. Count the ballots locally and there will be no need to wait weeks to find out who won the election.

Many of the leading opponents of centralized vote counting machines were, and still are, computer scientists, because we understand the vulnerability of voting equipment in a way most election officials don't. The problem with cyber security is that you have to protect against everything, but a hacker or cheater only has to find one vulnerability

“Worried about computerized democracy? You should be. You may have already voted in 2004 — they just haven't yet told you whom you voted for. Bev Harris gives you the real skinny on the Gatesification of our ballot box.”

— Greg Palast, Author, “The Best Democracy Money Can Buy”

Do we have election integrity in WA?

Areas Voters MUST Be Able To Inspect To Obtain Assurance of Security & Integrity	Is Voter Inspection Permitted In WA?
Citizenship of Registered Voters <i>(To Verify Eligibility of All Registrants)</i>	NO
Ballot Chain-of-Custody Reports <i>(To Verify Eligibility of Cast Ballots)</i>	NO
Ballot Images <i>(To Verify Ballots Only Scanned Once)</i>	Court Order ONLY
Physical Ballots <i>(To Verify Authenticity of Ballots)</i>	Court Order ONLY
Elections System Software & Firmware <i>(To Verify Code is Clean)</i>	NO
Elections System Admin Activity Logs <i>(To Verify Honorable Use of System)</i>	NO
Elections System Data-Traffic Logs <i>(To Verify Integrity of “Air-Gap”)</i>	NO
Elections Wi-Fi Data-Traffic Logs <i>(To Verify Integrity of “Air-Gap”)</i>	NO
Results of Elections System Audits <i>(To Verify Honorable Execution of Audits)</i>	NO

We have a right to ASSURANCE of Election Integrity and our officials have an obligation to provide VERIFIABLE information so we can attain that assurance.

According to The Wall Street Journal, in the 2000 general election an optical-scan machine in Allamakee County, Iowa, was fed 300 ballots and reported 4 million votes. The county auditor tried the machine again but got the same result. At least when we vote on paper ballots, hand counted, we can hold someone accountable. We don't even know the names of our voting machine programmers.

Some people, when you give them the short but horrifying version of the electronic voting issue, insist on minimizing the problem. You tell them about an election that lost 25 percent of its votes, and they say, "That's just an isolated incident." When you tell them a voting machine was videotaped recording votes for the opposite candidate than the one selected, they say, "There are problems in every election."

In November 2002, officials in Broward County, Florida, said that the new, unauditable ES&S touch-screen machines had counted the vote without a major hitch. The next day, the County Elections Office discovered 103,222 votes had not been counted.

Feb. 11, 2003. Just 20 days before, in Snohomish County, Washington, at a meeting called because Sequoia optical-scan machines had failed to record 21 percent of the absentee votes,³⁴ I asked about the 25 percent error in Bernalillo County. The Sequoia representative was well aware of the problem, replying quickly that that 25 percent error was caused by something quite different from this 21 percent problem. OK. Nothing to see here — move along. Reference: The Everett Herald, 20 January 2003; "County to Discuss Ballot-Counting Foul-up"

In Volusia County, Florida, during the 2000 presidential election, the Socialist Workers Party candidate received almost 10,000 votes — about half the number he received nationwide. Four thousand erroneous votes appeared for George W. Bush while at the same time, presidential candidate Al Gore received negative 16,022 votes.

<https://www.orlandosentinel.com/2001/10/07/election-goal-low-profile/>

Centralized vote counting systems give a small number of people access to a great number of votes. If you control the counting software, ballot-tampering on a massive scale is possible... It is time to move back to secure decentralized paper ballots.

3 What caused a dramatic increase in ballots in 2020?

Those in power claim that any criticism of our election system undermines the faith of the voters. But what really undermines the faith of the voters is corrupt politicians lying to the voters with false claims about how secure our voting system is – when in fact, our election system is riddled with problems. Here are just a few of many concerning facts about the 2020 election:

Nationally, the voting eligible population increased from 231 million in 2016 to 239.2 million in 2020 for an increase of **8.2 million or 3.5%**. However, Presidential ballots cast increased from 136.7 million in 2016 to 159.7 million in 2020 for an increase of **23 million or 10%**. Until 2020, the average change for the previous three Presidential Elections had been an increase of only 3 million ballots per election. It is not statistically possible for total ballots to suddenly rise by 23 million when the three previous elections had been 3 million. There has never been a credible explanation about **where these additional 20 million ballots came from**.

As we will see, the 23 million additional ballots all came from **a dramatic increase in poorly tracked and easily rigged Mail In Ballots** - which in turn was due to changes in Election laws before and after the COVID 19 Scare – a problem I wrote about in a separate book - which you can read for free at this link: <https://commonsensebook.org/>




While there were huge problems in nearly every state, this report will focus on only four: Pennsylvania, Georgia, Arizona and Washington. In each of these four states, there was a huge unexplained increase of mail in and total ballots compared to the 2016 Presidential Election.

Mail In Ballot Increase 2016 to 2020


	Pennsylvania	Georgia	Arizona	Washington
2020 Mail In Ballots	2600000	1320000*	2943216	3954263
2016 Mail In Ballots	262877	189225	1991683	2964465
Increase #	2337123	1130775	951533	989798
Increase %	889%	600%	48%	33%

* Supposedly, a half million voters in Georgia went through the trouble of requesting a Mail In Ballot in the weeks before the election - but then for some strange reason never bothered to mail it in!


In Pennsylvania, an additional one million total ballots were counted in the 2020 Pennsylvania Presidential Election (6.8 million ballots versus 5.9 million ballots) – **an increase of 16%** - despite a population increase of only 1%. Registered voters increased by 4% but **twenty times more new voters registered as Republicans rather than as Democrats!** The difference was 241,888 new Republicans to only 11,432 new Democrats. The corrupt corporate media wants us to believe that 240,000 people registered as Republicans in Pennsylvania in 2020 – but then all of them decided at the last minute to vote for Biden – because they were told that the Hunter Biden laptop was a Russian plot to take over the US.




In Georgia, an additional one million total ballots were counted in the 2020 Presidential Election (5 million ballots versus 4 million ballots) – an increase of 25%. Registered voters increased by 33% - however a half million voters requested mail in ballots but never mailed them in (or maybe they got lost in the mail?)




In Washington, an additional one million total ballots were counted in the 2020 Presidential Election (4 million ballots versus 3 million ballots) – **an increase of 33%** - despite a population increase of only 5%. . Mail In Ballots increased by 33% as Washington is an All Mail In Ballot state – over six times the rate of population growth.



In Arizona, an additional 921,000 Presidential ballots were counted in the 2020 Election (3.3 million ballots versus 2.4 million ballots) – **an increase of 38.4%** - despite a population increase of only 5%. Mail In ballots increased by 48%, about ten times the rate of population growth. Registrations increased by 21% - with nearly equal numbers of new Republicans and new Democrats.



The total increase in ballots in these 4 States was about 4 million and the increase in Mail In Ballots was over 5 million.



Now that we have noted the massive increase in mail in ballots in all four states – increases that were much greater than the growth in population in those states, let's begin by taking a closer look at how a flood of mail in ballots affected what happened in Pennsylvania.

4 Unexplained Problems in Pennsylvania

Prior to the 2020 election, with minor exceptions, Pennsylvania required in-person voting with proof of ID. The Election Law changed in 2019 to allow Mail In ballots. Among those who voted in person with verified ID in the 2020 election, **Trump beat Biden in a million vote landslide with about 66% of the vote.** However, among the 2.6 million mail-in ballots, Biden beat Trump by 75% of the vote - by almost 1.4 million ballots (2.0 million Biden to 0.6 million Trump).

Election Fraud Deniers would like you to believe that is is perfectly normal for mail-in ballots to have a radically different outcome than in-person ballots. But it is not normal for any candidate in any election to get 33% among one random group of voters and 75% among a different group of random voters. In fact, it is not possible. There has never been an election anywhere in the world where any candidate got 33% of the in-person vote but 75% of the mail-in vote. In this section, we will review evidence of election rigging in Pennsylvania and outline the most likely way this election was rigged – and how this blatant election rigging can be easily accomplished in many other states.

Prelude to Rigging

In the weeks before the 2020 election, both Trump and Biden held several campaign events in Pennsylvania. Tens of thousands of people turned out for Trump rallies in Pennsylvania:



At the same time, almost no one attended any of the Biden rallies in Pennsylvania – a fact that the corporate media tried hard to cover up by never taking any shots of his tiny audiences. Here is an image of Biden at one of his embarrassingly empty rallies:




The audience responses to this C-SPAN video on October 24, 2020 confirmed that there was only a couple of cars honking and about ten people at this event. <https://www.c-span.org/video/?477335-1/joe-jill-biden-campaign-bucks-county-pennsylvania>

2020 Pre Election Ballot Analysis

According to the US Census, the Pennsylvania population grew by 2.4% or 300,000 people from 2010 to 2020. This was a rate of only 0.24% per year or 30,000 people per year. Thus, in 2016, the population was 12.9 million and in 2020, the population was 13 million (**an increase of 1%**). 80% of the population was voting age. Thus, the voting age population was 10.3 million in 2016 and 10.4 million in 2020 – an increase of about 100,000. Subtracting 7% to account for those not eligible to vote, **the eligible voting population increased by 93,000**. Yet, the Presidential ballots cast increased from 5.9 million in 2016 to 6.84 million in 2020 – **an increase of 940,000 ballots (16%) or more than 16 times the increase in the voting eligible population!**

In 2016, Pennsylvania counted 262,877 Mail In Ballots. In 2020, Mail In ballots skyrocketed to more than 2.9 million (an increase of 900%).

https://ballotpedia.org/Analysis_of_absentee/mail-in_voting,_2016-2018



The corrupt corporate media claims that this massive increase was due to a tidal wave of support for Biden in Pennsylvania the 2024 election. But the actual voter registrations by party affiliation shows just the opposite – a decline in support for the Democratic Party and increase in support for the Republican Party.

Pennsylvania is one of only a few states in the nation that reports voter registration by political party. Here is a table of voter registrations by party for the 2020 and 2016 General Elections:

PA Year	Dems	Reps	Ind Other	Registered Total	Pres Vote
2020 General	4228888	3543070	1319004	9090962	6915283
2016 General	4217456	3301182	1204339	8722977	6115402
Change	11432	241888	114665	367985 (4%)	799881 (See #1)

Sources:

<https://www.dos.pa.gov/VotingElections/OtherServicesEvents/VotingElectionStatistics/Documents/2016%20Election%20VR%20Stats.pdf>

<https://www.dos.pa.gov/VotingElections/OtherServicesEvents/VotingElectionStatistics/Documents/2020%20Election%20VR%20Stats%20%20FINAL%20REVIEWED.pdf>

Note #1: These two documents claim that the increase in votes was only 799,881. However, other sources such as Wikipedia indicate that the actual increase was from 5.9 million to 6.84 million. This is likely due to Wikipedia only including the ballots for the two major party candidates while the above report also includes votes for third party presidential candidates.

Despite the fact that the eligible voting age population only rose by 93,000 from 2016 to 2020, the number of registered voters rose by about four times that amount – nearly 368,000!

Most shocking is the fact that of this 368,000 increase, **nearly 242,000 or 66% of the increase in voter registrations was people registering for the Republican Party.** Is it likely or even remotely possible that all of these people would register for the Republican Party and then vote for Biden?

By contrast, the increase in registration for the Democratic Party was only 11,432 or 3%. **Is it likely or even remotely possible that Biden could have an increase of nearly one million votes over 2016 when the Democratic Party registrations had increased by only 11,432 voters?**

But the situation is even less plausible if we look at the Voter Registrations reported by the Pennsylvania Dept. of State on October 16, 2020 – three weeks before the 2020 General Election – compared to 2016:

PA Year	Dems	Reps	Ind Other	Registered Total
2020 October 16	4199412	3494255	1289521	8983188
2016 General	4217456	3301182	1204339	8722977
Change	Minus 18,044	Plus 193,073	Plus 85,182	Plus 260,211

The above table is stunning. Three weeks before the 2020 election, Democratic Party registrations were actually **18,044 below the 2016 election.** Meanwhile, Republican party registrations were up 193,073 above the 2016 election.

So where did the 800,000 to one million extra votes for Biden come from? The answer is they came from a tidal wave of Mail In ballots. Here is a table of 2020 mail in ballots in Pennsylvania broken down by party:

PA Mail In Ballots	Dems	Reps	Ind Other	Mail In Total
2020 Applications	1941000	785000	361000	3087000
2020 Turned in	1702000	623000	304000	2629000
Difference Not turned in	239000	162000	57000	458000

Source: <https://electproject.github.io/Early-Vote-2020G/PA.html>

Here is a breakdown of these mail in ballots by candidate:

PA Mail In	Dems	Reps	Ind Other	Mail In Total
2020 Turned in	1.7 million	623000	304000	2.6 million
2020 counted for	Biden: 1.7 million	Trump: 623,000	99% Biden	2.6 million 77% Biden
From Independents	300000	0	0% Trump	77% Biden

As we show below, Biden got about 2 million Mail In Ballots. This included 1.7 million Democratic Turned in Mail In Ballots. Thus, Biden must also have gotten 99% of the 304,000 Indy and Other Turned in Mail In Ballots.

By contrast, Trump got about 600,000 Mail In Ballots. Assuming Trump got all 632,000 Republican Mail In Ballots, this implies that **Trump did not get a single one of the 300,000 Independent Mail In Ballots**. This is despite the fact that Trump is popular with Independent voters because they see him as a political outsider. It should be obvious by now that Trump getting zero percent of the Independent Vote is not actually possible.

What really happened with the Independent Mail In Ballots

The only way to solve the problem of Biden getting 99% of the 300,000 Independent Vote is to reduce the Democratic turned in Mail In ballots by at least 200,000. This would give Biden 1.7 million Democratic Mail In ballots and 100,000 Independent Mail In Ballots.

Trump in turn would get 200,000 Independent Mail In ballots for a total of 66% of the Independent votes – which is what he got in 2016 and what he got from In Person voting on election day. Combine this with 623,000 Republican Mail In Ballots and the difference would be Biden 1.8 million (68%) Trump 823,000 (32%).

Biden would still win the Mail In vote by 1 million. But because Trump won the In Person votes by more than 1 million, **Trump would win the Pennsylvania election by about 120,000 votes.**

Which counties did the 200,000 magic mail in ballots come from?

There are two major reports that have conducted a helpful breakdown of the voting by county in Pennsylvania. The first as we previously cited was <https://electproject.github.io/Early-Vote-2020G/PA.html>

The second can be found at the following link: https://election-integrity.info/PA_2020_Voter_Analysis_Report.pdf

This second report is interesting because it analyzed all of the counties and found that while most of the counties (54) had very little change from 2008 to 2020, five counties were statistical outliers with a huge change compared to previous Presidential Elections. These five counties shown below accounted for 216,000 excess votes.

County	Obama 2008	Obama 2012	Clinton 2016	Biden 2020	Excess votes
PA Statewide	3276363	2990274	2926441	3458229	394000
Montgomery	253393	233356	256082	313543	65033
Allegheny	373153	352687	367617	415737	51251
Chester	137833	123311	141682	179065	44456
Bucks	179031	160521	167060	198251	29380
Delaware	178870	171792	177402	200911	24890

Below is a table of data taken from both of the above reports.

County	Registrations 2020	Mail In Requests	% of Registrations	Subtract Excess 216K	% of Registrations
PA Statewide	8983188	3087000	34%	2871000	32%
Montgomery	593485	273539	46%	208506	35%
Allegheny	918015	413585	45%	362334	39%

Chester	370032	167519	45%	123063	33%
Bucks	474273	192924	41%	163544	34%
Delaware	414474	150623	36%	125733	30%

The above two tables confirm that the entire 216,000 excess votes in these five counties can be accounted for by 216,000 excess mail in ballots in these same five counties.

Precinct Analysis in Montgomery and Allegheny Counties

Another independent research, Dr. Eric Quinnell did a Precinct by Precinct analysis in the two counties that had the most divergence from the three previous Presidential Elections. Each county is divided into a thousand or more precincts with each precinct having a hundred to a thousand or more registered voters. The Quinnell Analysis is Chapter 3 in the following link and was published on November 30, 2020.

https://election-integrity.info/PA_2020_Voter_Analysis_Report.pdf

Here are some quotes: “Montgomery and Allegheny Counties stand out as problematic in our analysis. extremely high turnouts of 77-84% (significantly higher than heavily democratic cities like Philadelphia with 63% turnout and Atlanta with 65% turnout) suggested deeper analysis into both.”

“Problematic precincts within these counties exhibit unusual Democrat to Republican ratios as compared to their history. Additionally, some precincts show an excessive number of votes in favor of candidate Joseph Biden sometimes even exceeding new voter registrations.”


The study showed that in Montgomery County, Trump gained about 50 votes per precinct over 2016 while Biden gained about 143 votes per precinct over 2016.

“What’s curious is that above the 2016 totals, a new vote ratio appears in contrast to the voting history of the area – showing new voters going 74% Democrat vs 26% Republican – a 13-point gain for Democratic new voters above their recent history. “

“As an example of the excess vote gains above the norm, consider the district of Upper Dublin – a district that was already heavily Democrat voted 68D / 32R in the 2016 election... Biden takes on average 98% of the new

vote in Upper Dublin, and most surprisingly, 231% of new registrations. Specifically, Biden gains 2,173 new votes over 2016 against Trump's 393 new votes, gaining 5.5 new voters for every 1 new Trump voters. The new population of voters show a ratio of 86 D / 14R, which for the new voters is a 38-point swing toward Biden as compared to just 4 years ago."

"The following screenshot was taken 11/14/2020 (and was still there 12/2/2020!) on the Montgomery County results website. The screenshot shows this sub district having 15 votes in excess of all registered voters. Thus, confidence in our predictive model was greatly increased by correctly pointing to what seems to be some kind of mistake. **The excess votes are those matching the absentee ballots for the precinct.** "



Voter Turnout was 178.95% - a remarkable achievement. But what was even more remarkable is that all of the excess ballots cast matches the Mail In Ballots for the Precinct sub division. Get rid of the extra Mail In Ballots (all for Biden) and the turnout fails below 100% and back into the range of the plausible.

In Allegheny County, similar problems occurred. Trump gained 17 votes per precinct over 2016 while Biden gained 47 votes per precinct.


“What’s curious is that above the 2016 totals, a new vote ratio appears in contrast to the voting history of the area – showing new voters going 73% Democrat vs 27% Republican – a 14-point gain per precinct for Democratic new voters above their recent history. “

“As an example of the excess vote gains above the norm, consider the district of McCandless – a district that voted 48D / 52R in the 2016 election. Biden takes on average 115% of the new vote in McCandless and 296% of the new registrations. The new population of voters show a ratio of 86 D / 14R, which is a 38-point swing toward Biden as compared to 4 years ago.”

Strangely Synchronized Allegheny County Absentee Ballots

Dr Quinnell then analyzed the time sequence of Mail In Ballot submissions in Allegheny County. Here is a quote: “The results of the Allegheny time-series incremental absentee votes defy reality in a perfectly synchronous fashion – with all 1,300 precincts and candidates marching perfectly in time toward their eventual total of 340,000 absentee votes – not deviating in time nor in total share of each incremental count, regardless of how many or how few timestamps are used to break apart the count. Surely this cannot be...”

Here is the graph of this unusual data:



Two Statistically Impossible Spikes in Ballot Reporting

Chapter 5 in the Election Integrity dot info Pennsylvania Report was an independent study done by Dr. Robert Hancock. Votes are reported in batches of a few thousand votes as the mail in ballots are tabulated by the vote counting machines. Generally, these batches follow a trend line.


Dr. Hancock analyzed all of these batches and found two batches that were so far out of normal as to be statistically impossible (1 in a million).

“These “impossible” Biden jumps are found at the following time stamps:
PA: 2020-11-04 **10:54:36 (+60,448 votes)**, 2020-11-04 **02:16:43 (+12,401 votes).**”

The total of nearly 72,000 ballots was counted almost entirely for Biden.

Potential Voter Fraud in Pennsylvania

Chapter 6 in the Election Integrity dot info Pennsylvania Report was an independent study done by Dr. William Briggs. He analyzed the running vote totals for both candidates over time. Here is his graph beginning on November 4, 2020 with Trump ahead by about a half million votes:



Here are quotes:

“Trump starts well ahead, but due to enormous increases at specific time points (demonstrated next), Biden catches up rapidly. Obviously, those adding the votes in time do not know what the eventual total will be. This is what makes the late addition on the 6th suspicious. Biden’s total was augmented by just over 27 thousand votes, which was just enough to put him ahead. The time was also near where the vote count was nearing its end.”

“The first thing to note is who requested mail-in ballots. The county ratio of ballots requested by registered voter total is plotted for each party. Dots are red for predominately Republican counties, or Blue for predominately Democrat counties.”

The four counties with the highest Mail In requests were Chester, Montgomery, Buck and Allegheny (as we noted earlier).

In a separate study on Vote Spikes in several states, including vote spikes on election night, the following vote spikes were observed in Pennsylvania:

Pennsylvania	70,565	4,218	66,347	(Nov 3) 8:15 PM
	73,945	8,543	65,402	(Nov 3) 8:26 PM
	88,865	23,713	65,152	(Nov 3) 8:38 PM
	62,445	1,159	61,286	(Nov 4) 9:16 AM

These four spikes accounted for an additional 260,000 votes for Biden. All are likely related to Mail In Ballots counted before or shortly after election night. https://election-integrity.info/Vote_Spikes_Report.pdf

This study found 1 vote spike in Georgia we will discuss in a later section:

Georgia	162,133	42,322	119,811	(Nov 4) 1:32 AM
----------------	---------	--------	----------------	-----------------

It also found 2 vote spikes in Arizona we will discuss in a later section:

STATE	BIDEN VOTES ADDED	TRUMP VOTES ADDED	BIDEN NET VOTE DUMPS*	TIME (Local)
Arizona	363,014	254,499	108,515	(Nov 3) 8:05 PM
	798,568	655,467	143,101	(Nov 3) 8:06 PM

Other Statistical Evidence... Variance in Rejected Mail In Ballots

One problem with Mail In Ballots, besides the ease of creating them and cheating with them, is that about one person in a hundred forgets to sign their ballot or signs it – but the signature does not match the signature on file. Signature matching is entirely subjective. Nevertheless, in two small Republican counties, Fulton county rejected 13% and Pike county rejected 5%. By contrast, in the two largest counties, Allegheny and Philadelphia, with a combined 722,588 turned in ballots, they only rejected 298 ballots which is 0.0004 – which rounds to ZERO percent. This matches reports in Georgia and Arizona of hundreds of thousands of mail in ballots being accepted in the most populist cities without checking or rejecting a single signature match.

Back to the Future?

But there is more. Here is what has happened to voter registration in Pennsylvania since the 2020 General Election:


Total voter registration 2024 versus 2020

PA Year	Dems	Reps	Ind Other	Registered Total
2024 Jan	3893213	3478086	1314022	8685321
2020 General	4228888	3543070	1319004	9090962
Change	Minus 335675	Minus 64984	Minus 4982	Minus 405641

Total voter registration has fallen by 405,641 voters – of which the **Democratic Party has lost 335,675**. What we can conclude even before looking at the actual election results is that there were more than 200,000 additional “magical” unexplained Democratic Party Mail In Ballots in the 2020 Pennsylvania election – likely coming from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Election Night Results in Pennsylvania

On Election Night in 2020, it appeared that that Trump had won Pennsylvania in a landslide:



On Election Night, **Trump was ahead by a half million votes** with 80% of the votes counted. This included nearly all In Person votes and 1.3 million Mail In Ballots (about half of the Mail In Ballots).

Election Night Total included 1.3 million Mail In Ballots

2020 PA Presidential Results	Trump (Thousands)	Biden (thousands)	Total (Thousands)	% Trump
In Person Ballots	2778	1458	4236	65
Mail In Ballots	257	1064	1321	20
Total Ballots	3035	2522	5557	54

It has been claimed that the Mail In Ballots were not counted until days after the election. In fact, **half of the Mail In Ballots were included in the Election Night Results.** Had these Mail In Ballots not been included, Trump would have been ahead by 1.3 million votes! Despite half the Mail In Ballots being counted on Election Night, Biden did not overcome the Trump's half million vote lead until four days later. It was essential to count these Mail In Ballots on election night because otherwise the entire nation would have known that **Trump had a 65% to 35% landslide victory.**

Final Election Total

According to the Pennsylvania Election Returns' website, Biden received 1,995,691 mail-in votes to Trump's 595,538.

2020 PA Presidential Results	Trump (Thousands)	Biden (thousands)	Total	% Trump
In Person Ballots	2778	1458	4236	65
Mail In Ballots	600	2000	2600	23
Total Ballots	3378	3458	6836	49.4

Put in plain English, Trump beat Biden by 1.3 million In Person votes while Biden beat Trump by 1.4 million in Mail In Ballots. As noted earlier, this ridiculous difference between In Person and Mail In Ballots has never occurred in any other election and is simply not possible.

2004 to 2020 Pennsylvania Presidential Election Ballots

But the absurd split between In Person and Mail In Ballots is not the only clue that election fraud on a massive scale occurred in the 2020 Pennsylvania Presidential Election.

Here are vote totals over the previous 16 years in Pennsylvania.

PA Presidential Ballots	Total (Thousands)	Ballots/Population x 100
2004	5732	45.9 + 0.3
2008	5932	46.8 + 1.2
2012	5670	44.3 – 1.3
2016	5897	45.7 + 0.1
04 to 16 average	5808	45.6 + 0.0
2020	6836???	52.6 + 7.0

The average of the previous 4 Presidential elections was 5.8 million votes plus or minus 130,000 votes. The 2020 election suddenly skyrocketed by more than a million ballots to an amazing 6.8 million votes.

This dramatic change can not be explained by a population increase because Pennsylvania's population has grown very slowly over this period:

2010 12.7 million Census confirmed

2012 12.8 million,

2016 12.9 million

2020 13.0 million Census confirmed

The Ballots per population ratio was 45.6% plus or minus 1.3% (see table above). Thus, it is a fact that there were one million additional ballots counted in the 2020 election compared to previous elections. All of these one million additional ballots were Mail In Ballots and **all one million additional ballots were counted for Joe Biden** – resulting in Biden winning in Pennsylvania by 80,000 votes.

How the Pennsylvania Election was rigged

Here is a link to an article by NPR showing two states having trouble counting Mail In Ballots:

Why Vote Counting In Pennsylvania And Michigan Takes So Long

NOVEMBER 4, 2020 · 6:00 AM ET



Miles Parks



<https://www.npr.org/2020/11/04/931136905/we-ll-be-working-24-hours-vote-counting-to-continue-through-the-week>

Here are quotes: "Voting administrators worked into and through the wee hours in swing states like Pennsylvania and Michigan. Officials in those states pleaded for patience as they worked through the unprecedented amount of mail votes they received."

"We're doing everything we can to get it done as soon as possible, but we'll be working 24 hours — through the night — to get it done," said Lisa Deeley, the chairwoman of the Philadelphia City Commissioners. Other counties in Pennsylvania were not set to even begin counting their absentee ballots until Wednesday.

What the NPR article fails to mention is that **over half of the Mail In Ballots had already been counted in a few hours on Election Day.** This was in addition to counting all of the In Person Ballots on Election Day. So why did it take nearly a week to count the other half?

A different article described an accounting error

<https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/carolineodonovan/the-us-postal-service-said-it-cant-track-300000-ballots>

The US Postal Service Said It Can't Track 300,000 Ballots Sent In The Mail, But That Doesn't Mean They're Lost

During an ongoing trial, Postal Service officials said the ballots weren't being tracked so that they could be delivered more quickly.

Based on a court filing, it appeared that the Postal Service had lost track of some 300,000 mail-in ballots. The ballots had been scanned into the system, but there was no record they had been scanned out. But the Postal Service said in a statement that there was a simple explanation: “Under the extraordinary measures it was taking to get election mail delivered on time, **postal workers removed the ballots from the system before they received a final scan and delivered them directly to election boards.**”

In plain English, the Post Office skipped the scanning to get the ballots turned in on Election Day or the day after. This caused hundreds of thousands of ballots to be untraceable. Yet thousands of ballots were not counted until days later:


Allegheny County, Pa., Will Resume Counting Votes Friday



Scientific Proof Video

A few months after the 2020 election, Mike Lindell released an hour long video called **Scientific Proof** in which he interviewed **Dr. Douglas G. Frank**, who had broken down the election results in Pennsylvania and several other states not only by county and Congressional District but also by 82 age groups. Dr. Frank found that age curves were nearly identical within different counties within a state – but that each state had a different age curve which was the same in every county in that state. These in-state matches are not statistically possible - meaning that elections were not just rigged in Pennsylvania, they were rigged in all the states he studied. Here is a link to this video: <https://rumble.com/vf8iq3-scientific-proof-television-special-on-election-fraud-by-mike-lindell.html?mref=2oodx&mc=8wf7a>

Here is the age profile for Pennsylvania District 4:




The blue line is eligible voters broken out by ages from 18 to 100.

The black line is registered voters.

There was a huge increase in the number of registered voters in 2020. Note that **in some ages, there are more registered voters than eligible voters**. The red line is the ballots received from each age group. Note that each age group had nearly the same voter turnout – which is also not statistically possible. In fact, in some age groups, more ballots were turned in than there were people in that age group!

Even before the 2020 election, a group called **Judicial Watch** found 353 counties in 29 states where the Voter Registration rates exceeded 100%:

New Judicial Watch Study Finds 353 U.S. Counties in 29 States with Voter Registration Rates Exceeding 100%



<https://www.judicialwatch.org/new-jw-study-voter-registration/>

Now that we have seen massive unexplained problems in the swing state of Pennsylvania, let's look at similar problems in the non-swing state of Washington which was all Mail In in 2016 and all Mail In in 2020.


5 Unexplained Problems in Washington State

Dr. Frank claimed that Washington State also had evidence of election rigging. Below are charts for four counties in Western Washington.


Here is his chart for King County:




Here is Snohomish County:



Here is Skagit County:



Here is Whatcom County:



All of the above graphs indicate a huge increase in voter registrations for the 2020 election in Washington state. Below is an analysis confirming that a huge increase of about one million ballots occurred in Washington State in the 2020 Presidential Election.

2004 to 2020 Washington Presidential Election Ballots

Washington is different from Pennsylvania in that Washington has all Mail In Ballots. Thus, there is not an In Person Ballots to use as a baseline. But we can still compare elections over time to see if there is a change in the trend line of the ballots to population ratio. Here are vote totals going back over the previous 16 years in Washington.

WA Presidential Ballots	Total (Thousands)	Ballots/Population x 100 WA	Ballots/Population x 100 PA
2004	2815	46.1 + 1.4	45.9 + 0.3
2008	2980	45.8 + 1.1	46.8 + 1.2
2012	3046	44.1 - 0.6	44.3 – 1.3
2016	2964	42.8 – 1.1	45.4 + 0.1
04 to 16 average	2950	44.7 + 0.0	45.6 + 0.0
2020	3955???	51.4 + 6.7	52.6 + 7.0

The average of the previous 4 Presidential elections was 2.95 million votes plus or minus 100,000 votes. **The 2020 election suddenly skyrocketed by a million ballots** to an amazing 3.955 million votes. This dramatic change can not be explained by a population increase because Washington's population growth rate has not changed much over this period (it has increased by about 100,000 per year):

2004 6.1 million

2008 6.5 million

2010 6.7 million Census confirmed

2012 6.9 million

2016 7.3 million

2020 7.7 million Census confirmed

The Ballots per population ratio was 45.6% plus or minus 1.3% (see table above). Thus, it is a fact that there were one million additional ballots counted in the 2020 election compared to previous elections.

But a closer look at the data reveals an even more ridiculous set of facts.

Here is a summary of voter registration increases and Mail In Ballot increases compared to population increases in Washington state since 2016:

From 2016 to 2020, the Washington State population rose from about 7.3 million to about 7.7 million – an increase of about 400,000 or **about 5%**. According to the US 2020 Census, 21% of the Washington State population is under 18. Therefore the increase in the voting age population was $.79 \times 400,000$ or **316,000**.

During this same time, the number of registered voters rose from 4.27 million to 4.89 million – an increase of about **620,000** or **13%**. In short, all 316,000 of the new voting age population who moved to Washington State between 2016 and 2020 registered to vote - PLUS an additional 303,000 people who already lived here registered to vote. In addition, 530,000 of the 620,000 or **85% of this increase occurred in a single year – 2020**.

Even more remarkable, during this same time, the number of ballots counted rose from 3,363,440 in the 2016 General Election to 4,116,894 in the 2020 General Election – an **increase of 753,454 ballots or 18.3%**.

Even more remarkable, during this same time the number of ballots in the Presidential Race rose from 2,964,465 in 2016 to 3,954,263 in 2020 – an **increase of 989,798 ballots or 33%**.


Even if every new voting age person was registered to vote, an increase of 316,000 in new registered voters times an 80% turn out rate would lead to $0.8 \times 316,000$ or **253,000 additional ballots**. Yet the actual increase in the 2020 Presidential race was 989,798 additional ballots.

Thus, there appears to be 500,000 to 700,000 additional Mail In Ballots in 2020 - even after accounting for the increase in population – which is completely out of the trend line for any election in Washington state for the past 20 years.

This leads to an obvious question: How could the actual increase in the number of Presidential ballots in 2020 be more than six times the increase in state population?

Here is a table of the increase in registered voters during the past 6 Presidential elections in Washington state:

Year	Registered Voters	Increase over previous Presidential election # (%)
2000	3335714	257506 (8.4%)
2004	3508208	172494 (5.2%)
2008	3630118	1121910 (44.8%)
2012	3904959	274841 (7.6%)
2016	4270270	365311 (9.4%)
2020	4892871	622601 (14.6%)
2024 Feb	4814566	Minus 78305 (-1.6%)




Here is a graph of these changes:

Source: <https://www.sos.wa.gov/elections/data-research/voter-participation-statistics>

As we show below, ballots for the Governor race increased by 9% in 2008 – but as we see here, registered voters increased by 45%. Then **in 2020 ballots for the Governor race increased by 25% while registered voters increased by just under 15%**. All of this occurred in a State where the population was growing at a steady rate of about 5% per year.


Here is a graph comparing population growth to registered voter growth and total ballots submitted growth from 2016 to 2020:



Washington State does not have voter registration by party. So it is impossible to determine the ratio in increase of Republicans versus Democrats from 2016 to 2020. One proxy would be to use the past four governor races votes. In Washington, Governor elections occur every four years during the same years as Presidential elections.

Year Candidate	Ballots	Percent	Increase over Previous
2020 Inslee	2294243	0.57	533723 (30%)
2020 Culp	1749066	0.43	272720 (18%)
2020 total	4056454	1	2020 minus 2016 818588 (25%)
2016 Inslee	1760520	0.54	177718 (11%)
2016 Bryant	1476346	0.46	Minus 11899
2016 total	3236866	1	2016 minus 2012 165819 (5%)
2012 Inslee	1582802	51.5	Minus 15936 (minus 1%)
2012 McKenna	1488245	48.5	84121 (6%)
2012 Total	3071047		2012 minus 2008 68185 (2%)
2008 total	3002862		2008 minus 2004 256273 (9%)
2004 total	2746589		

Washington State Governor Election Total Ballots Percent Increase over previous Governor Race



The 2020 Washington State Governor Election total ballots was a 25% increase over the 2016 Washington State Governor Election total ballots. This was five times greater than the population growth (5%) and five times greater than the average growth of ballots in the previous three Governor races. All of these elections were all Mail In Ballot elections.

818588 ballots was 25% of 2016 3236866 ballots. So the expected increase of 5% would be 176843 ballots. The unexplained increase was 20% or 647373 ballots. Given that the difference between Inslee and Culp was 545177 ballots, there is a statistical argument that Culp may have won the 2020 Governor's election as he has claimed. However, I have also analyzed all 10 Congressional Districts in Washington state. The increase in Congressional District total ballots from 2016 to 2020 was also exactly 25 percent. This means that whatever caused the dramatic increase in ballots happened in all 10 Congressional Districts.

It is strange that the Congressional District and Governor elections would increase by 25% but then the Presidential Election would increase by 33%. I do not believe that either one of these things is possible. But without further data, all we can really conclude is that there was significant unexplained Monkey Business that occurred in the 2020 election.

Here is a link to the vote counting machines used in each county:

<https://www.sos.wa.gov/elections/data-research/election-technology/voting-systems-county>

County	System	Type of AVU*	Vendor	Software	Version†	Accessible Voting Unit	Voting Location
Adams	Digital Scan	Touchscreen	Clear Ballot	ClearVote	2.2	ClearAccess	Vote by Mail
Asotin	Digital Scan	Touchscreen	Hart InterCivic	Verity	2.5	Touch Writer	Vote by Mail
Benton	Digital Scan	Touchscreen	Clear Ballot	ClearVote	2.2	ClearAccess	Vote by Mail

You can click on the Vendor link to see the Application, Test Report and Certification for each machine. Franklin county uses Dominion, Jefferson and Thurston use ESS and **King County users Clear Ballot**. The only thing you really need to know is that **they all use the Windows operating system** – which is known to be loaded with back doors that allow remote access and uploading of files without any need for the root password.

We review the problems with Dominion and ESS in a later section. We also include a truly disgusting story about the founders of Clear Ballot at the end of the Arizona section. Here we will review the Clear Ballot website. This is the link: <https://www.clearballot.com/>

Right click on the Home page to view the source code. You will see it uses JQuery version 1.11.2. JQuery is a JavaScript library that has suffered from many security problems. **Version 1.11.2 was released in 2014. Security support for this version ended in 2016.** JQuery is currently on version 4.0.0 released in February 2014. <https://endoflife.date/jquery>


Using JQuery 1.x is a security risk for Cross Site Scripting. It also demonstrates a lack of code review and code maintenance. In today's security landscape, using unsupported out of date code with known security problems shows a complete lack of concern for security. **Should we really be trusting the future of our democracy to voting machine companies that care so little about security that they can not even keep their website up to date?**

6 Unexplained Problems in Georgia

Georgia's population rose from 9.7 million in 2010 to 10.7 million in 2020. This was an increase of 100,000 per year. Thus, we can estimate that the population rose from 10.3 million in 2016 to 10.7 million in 2020 or a **growth of 400,000 or 4%**. The voting age population rose by 320,000.

Voter registration in 2016 had been 5443046. Voter registration for the 2020 general election was 7,233,584 registered voters, an increase of **1,790,538 new voters or 33%** since the 2016 election - 6 times the growth in population. Nearly all of these 1.8 million new voters requested absentee (mail-in) ballots. 1,782,580 absentee ballots were requested by mail or online by the deadline of October 23, 2020. The request rate for Mail In Ballots was almost exactly 25%. A total of just over 4 million people voted. So the In Person vote was 2.7 million while the Mail In Vote was 1.32 million. It was claimed that 2.7 million did In Person Early Voting. So perhaps almost no one voted on the actual Election Day.

Strangely, only 1.32 million out of the 1.78 million who requested absentee ballots actually voted. This means that **460,000 people went through the trouble of requesting a Mail In ballot only to decide a couple of weeks later they did not want to vote in the Presidential Election after all!**



In 2016, Trump beat Clinton by more than 200,000 votes. (2.09 million to 1.88 million). The total vote in 2016 was just under 4 million. In 2020, Biden beat Trump by just 12,000 (2.47 million to 2.46 million). The total vote was just under 5 million – **an increase of 25% from 2016 to 2020.**

Of the 960,000 additional ballots, Trump increased by 370,000 (35%). But the Biden total increased by 590,000 (65%) – a result that was highly unlikely given that among In Person ballots, he only got 38% of the vote.

This was just the beginning of the craziness in Georgia. A few “Democratic” counties recorded huge increases in the Democratic Party vote compared to 2016. For example, Clayton County Dem votes increased from 78,000 in 2016 to 95,466 in 2020 – an increase of 17,000 votes (or **22% in a county where the population only increased by 6%**).

DeKalb county Dem vote increased from 251,000 in 2016 to 308,000 in 2020 – and increase of 57,000 votes (**23% in a county where the population only increased by 4%**).

Fulton county Dem vote increased from 297,000 in 2016 to 380,000 in 2020 – an increase of 83,000 votes (**or 28% in a county where the population only increased by 6%**).

It is interesting to note that these same two counties had a higher than average request rate for Mail In Ballots:

Region	Registered Voters	Mail In Ballot requests	% of registrations
Georgia Statewide	7233584	1782580	25%
DeKalb County	531867	174683	33%
Fulton County	789687	213223	27%


Biden was the first Democrat to get over 70% of the vote in Fulton county since FDR in 1944. Georgia marked the strongest leftward shift of any state that Trump carried in 2016. But there appears to be at least 300,000 to 400,000 additional votes for Biden in Georgia above what would be statistically possible.

Let’s take a look at how this happened.

2020 Presidential Election Night Totals in Georgia

Tuesday Election Night November 3,2020 at just after Midnight Trump was ahead by more than 331,000 votes:

<https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-election/blog/election-day-2020-live-updates-n1245892/ncrd1246291?canonicalCard=true>



2020 Election Night Total

2020 GA Results	Trump (Thousands)	Biden (thousands)	2020 Total Ballots (thousands)
In Person Ballots	1700 (62%)	1016 (37%)	2749 (77%)
Mail In Ballots	228 (20%)	580 (80%)	821 (23%)
Total Ballots	1928 (54%)	1596 (45%)	3570

Election Rigging Deniers want us to believe that those who turn in Mail In Ballots just do not like Trump. However, **in 2016 in Georgia, Trump got 47% out of 77,000 Mail In Ballots** while Clinton got 49%. Meanwhile, in the In Person Ballots, Trump got 51%, while Clinton got 45%. The variance was only 5% between In Person Ballots and Mail In Ballots in 2016. As you can see in the table above, in 2020, the variance was 62% minus 20% or 42%. It is simply not possible for the variance to increase from 5% to 42% in any election.

The Impossible Update Spike

At 1:34 am EST on November 4, 2020, a few minutes after the Fulton County Election workers went home, an extremely unusual Georgia Update added **143,379 votes for Biden and 25,163 votes for Trump – a gain for Biden of 118,000 votes. In this single Update, Biden got a truly insane 85% of the vote** while Trump only got 15% of the vote. Even if all of these 168,542 ballots were Mail In Ballots, it is not possible that Biden got 85%.

An analysis of 9000 “updates” in the 2020 election listed this spike in Georgia as the third most unusual spike in the entire 2020 election (with the top two spikes occurring the same morning in Michigan and Wisconsin). The author concluded that the top three spikes out of nine thousand updates in all 50 states all occurring in the top five battleground states are less than one in a thousand. Thus, the odds are overwhelming that all three of these spikes occurred due to some sort of election fraud.

<https://votepatternanalysis.substack.com/p/voting-anomalies-2020>

Even if we did not have the Fulton County Election video, we can be certain that some very strange events happened in Georgia just after Midnight on Election Night. This single update reduced Trump's lead in Georgia from 331,000 to 213,000.

This was why on Thursday November 5, 2020 Trump was only ahead by 68,363 votes with 94% of the votes counted:



Here is a break down of the In Person versus Mail In Ballots as of Thursday November 5, 2020:

2020 GA Results	Trump (Thousands)	Biden (thousands)	2020 Total Ballots (thousands)
In Person Ballots	2200 (60%) (see Note 2)	1439 (39%)	3700 (77%) (see Note 1)
Mail In Ballots	204 (18%)???	897 (81%)	1108 (23%)
Total Ballots	2404 (50%)	2336 (49%)	4808

Note 1: Because the total In Person Ballots was 3.7 million and 2.7 million were counted on Election Night, it is likely that by Thursday, the entire 3.7

million In Person Ballots were counted. This leaves only 1.1 million for the Mail In Ballots which means that in the previous two days only 300,000 Mail In Ballots were counted. Subtracting the crazy 168,542 Spike we covered above, this means that only 120,000 Mail In Ballots were counted on Tuesday and Wednesday (60,000 per day). At this rate, it would take 3 or 4 more days to count the remaining 200,000 Mail In Ballots.

Note 2: Because Trump got 60% to 62% of the In Person Ballots and all were counted by Thursday, he must have gotten at least 2.2 million in person votes by Thursday meaning he could have only gotten 204,000 total Mail In Ballots. This is obviously not possible because Trump already got 228,000 Mail In Ballots on Election Night. Somehow, Trump lost 24,000 Mail In Ballots. None of this is actually possible. So we will move to the Final Result to see if those numbers add up.

2020 Georgia Presidential Election Final Total

2020 GA Results	Trump (Thousands)	Biden (thousands)	2020 Total Ballots (thousands)
In Person Ballots	2220 (60%) (see Note 2)	1424 (38.5%)	3701 (74%) (see Note 1)
Mail In Ballots	242 (19%)	1050 (81%)	1300 (26%)
Total Ballots	2462 (49.24%)	2474 (49.47%)	5001

Note 1: For a study of the above ratios, see the following:

https://web.mit.edu/healthyelections/www/sites/default/files/2021-06/georgia_final_report.pdf

Note 2: The only way the final results add up is if Biden gets 81% of the Mail In Ballots. This means that after Election Night, Biden got over 100% of the remaining Mail In Ballots. This of course is not possible.

The huge differences between In Person and Mail In Ballots occurred in nearly every state in 2020

Here is a quote from one study. “We have data for only 15 of the 50 states, but it tells a consistent story: Biden won the absentee vote in 14 out of the 15 states (all but Texas), and Trump won the Election Day In Person vote in 14 out of the 15 (all but Connecticut). Biden won the absentee vote even in reliably red states like Arkansas (61 percent to 37 percent) and South Carolina (60 percent to 39 percent.”

2020	Mail In Ballots			In Person Ballots			
State	Biden	Trump	Margin	Biden	Trump	Margin	Gap
Pennsylvania	76%	23%	D+54	34%	65%	R+32	85
Maryland	81	17	D+65	39	57	R+18	83
Hawaii	66	32	D+33	27	71	R+44	77
North Carolina	70	28	D+42	33	65	R+32	75
Rhode Island	79	19	D+60	44	54	R+10	70
Arkansas	61	37	D+24	26	70	R+43	67
Oklahoma	58	40	D+18	26	72	R+46	65
Delaware	79	20	D+59	49	49	EVEN	59
Iowa	57	41	D+16	27	70	R+43	59
South Carolina	60	39	D+21	31	67	R+35	57
Connecticut	77	22	D+56	49	49	EVEN	55
Alaska	58	39	D+19	30	66	R+36	54
Georgia#	65	34	D+30	38	60	R+23	53
Arizona	52	47	D+5	32	66	R+34	38
Texas	48	51	R+3	39	59	R+20	17


#The study claimed that Georgia Mail In Ballots were 65% Biden, 34% Trump. But as we have shown above, the actual split was 81% Biden, 19% Trump, for an actual gap of D+62% - making Georgia the third highest margin in their study with only Maryland and Pennsylvania having a higher margin.

<https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/what-absentee-voting-looked-like-in-all-50-states/>

Here is a quote on the 2016 results: “Although absentee votes in 2016 were consistently more Democratic than Election Day votes, **the average gap between them was much smaller than in 2020 — just 14 points in 2016 compared with 65 points in 2020.**”

2016 Mail In Ballots				2016 In Person Ballots			Gap
State	Clinton	Trump	Margin	Clinton	Trump	Margin	
Iowa	52%	42%	D+10	35%	57%	R+22	32
Maryland	69	25	D+44	54	39	D+15	30
South Carolina	48	49	EVEN	38	57	R+19	18
North Carolina	46	49	R+3	39	55	R+16	13
Rhode Island	60	33	D+27	54	39	D+14	12
Hawaii	66	27	D+38	59	33	D+26	12
Oklahoma	34	60	R+26	28	66	R+38	12
Arkansas	39	56	R+17	32	61	R+29	12
Delaware	56	40	D+16	53	42	D+11	5
Georgia	47	49	R+2	45	51	R+6	4
Alaska	37	52	R+15	35	52	R+17	2

The actual gap in Georgia in 2020 was D+62 to R+23 for a total of 85 – dramatically higher than the 2016 gap of 4. Also in 2016, Georgia had the second lowest gap of any state while in 2020 Georgia had the highest gap of any state at 85 matching the extreme Election Rigging that occurred in Pennsylvania in 2020. Sadly, the 538 group appears to know nothing about statistics. A gap of 85% is simply not possible. Instead, it is strong evidence that **Mail In Ballots were used to conduct massive election rigging in states all across the US in the 2020 election.**



7 Georgia Court Cases

There have been a series of Court cases in Georgia – a few of which are still going on. Here we will cover just three.

On May 21, 2021, a Henry County Superior Court Judge, Brian Amero, agreed to unseal 147,000 absentee ballots from Fulton County. The petitioners in the case alleged that fraud had occurred – based on sworn affidavits provided by four election workers who all claimed to have handled thousands of fraudulent ballots. Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger welcomed the decision. **"Fulton County has a long-standing history of election mismanagement that has understandably weakened voters' faith in its system."**

Sadly, on October 13, 2021, Amero changed his mind and dismissed the suit - ruling the suit lacked standing because it "failed to allege a particularized injury."

On August 14, 2023, Trump was accused of leading a "criminal racketeering enterprise" with 18 co-defendants who are accused of having "knowingly and willfully joined a conspiracy to unlawfully change the outcome" of the election in Georgia. The case will be tried in the Fulton County Superior Court by judge Scott F. McAfee.

<https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/23909553/read-trump-indictment-in-fulton-county-georgia-probe.pdf>

98 page PDF.

Here are quotes:

"Members of the enterprise, including several of the Defendants, falsely accused Fulton County election worker Ruby Freeman of committing election crimes in Fulton County, Georgia."

"On or about the 3rd day of December 2020, DONALD JOHN TRUMP caused to be tweeted from the Twitter account @RealDonaldTrump, "Georgia hearings now on @OANN.Amazing!" This was an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy."

“On or about the 3rd day of December 2020, RUDOLPH WILLIAM LOUIS GIULIANI committed the felony offense of FALSE STATEMENTS AND WRITINGS, in violation of O.C.G.A. § 16-10-20, in-Fulton County, Georgia, by knowingly, willfully, and unlawfully making at least one of the following false statements and representations to members of the Georgia Senate present at a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee meeting: 1. That at least 96,600 mail in ballots were counted in the November 3, 2020, presidential election in Georgia, despite there being no record of those ballots having been returned to a county elections office; 2. That Dominion Voting Systems equipment used in the November 3, 2020, presidential election in Antrim County, Michigan, mistakenly recorded 6,000 votes for Joseph R. Biden when the votes were actually cast for Donald John Trump.”

“On or about the 3rd day of December 2020, RAY STALLINGS SMITH III committed the felony offense of FALSE STATEMENTS AND WRITINGS, in violation of O.C.G.A. §16-10-20, in Fulton County, Georgia, by knowingly, willfully, and unlawfully making at least one of the following false statements to members of the Georgia Senate: That Fulton County election workers at State Farm Arena ordered poll watchers and members of the media to leave the tabulation area on the night of November 3, 2020, and continued to operate after ordering everyone to leave. “

“On or about the 10th day of December 2020, RUDOLPH WILLIAM LOUIS GIULIANI committed the felony offense of FALSE STATEMENTS AND WRITINGS, in Violation of O.C.G.A. § 16-10-20, in Fulton County, Georgia, by knowingly, willfully, and unlawfully making at least one of the following false statements: That Ruby Freeman, her daughter Shaye Moss, and an unidentified man were "quite obviously surreptitiously passing around USB ports as if they're vials of heroin or cocaine" at State Farm Arena to be used to "infiltrate the crooked Dominion voting machines"; That 96,600 mail-in ballots were counted in the November 3, 2020, presidential election in Georgia, despite there being no record of those ballots having been returned to a county elections office.”

“On the 2nd day of January 2021, DONALD JOHN TRUMP committed the felony offense of FALSE STATEMENTS AND WRITINGS, in violation of O.C.G.A. § 16-10-20, in Fulton County, Georgia, by knowingly, willfully, and unlawfully making at least one of the following false statements:

That anywhere from 250,000 to 300,000 ballots were dropped mysteriously into the rolls in the November 3, 2020, presidential election in Georgia; That Ruby Freeman, her daughter, and others were responsible for fraudulently awarding at least 18,000 ballots to Joe Biden at State Farm Arena in the November 3, 2020, presidential election in Georgia; That hundreds of thousands of ballots had been "dumped" into Fulton County and another county adjacent to Fulton County; That he won the November 3, 2020, presidential election in Georgia by 400,000 votes."

Here is a written report filed by NBC News 38 minutes after Midnight Eastern Standard Time: "In Fulton County, tallying early and mail-in ballots became far more complicated when a pipe burst in State Farm Arena, which is a counting center. Fulton County election officials halted counting for two hours and announced that they would stop counting for the night at 10:30 p.m. ET. Then, just after 10:30, officials announced they would instead continue counting Tuesday night."

Here is the 12 minute video of Fulton County election workers at State Farm Arena ordered poll watchers and members of the media to leave the tabulation area on the night of November 3, 2020, and continued to operate after ordering everyone to leave. Election workers mistakenly thought they were done for the evening: <https://rumble.com/vdp1dl-video-shows-poll-workers-pulling-out-boxes-of-ballots-georgia-election-hear.html>

Each of the 3 machines can process 3000 ballots per hour. The unobserved counting went on for 2 hours. So the total ballots processes was about 18,000 ballots.

Gabriel Sterling, a top elections official in the Georgia secretary of state's office, told the AP in December of that year that some workers, as well as members of the media and Republican observers, started leaving the facility. However, no one told observers they had to leave, (Note that this fact is disputed by several observers who claim they were told to leave). Other workers began packing up, Sterling said. This involved putting ballots that had been opened and flattened for scanning into boxes and under a table. Barron said he found out around 10:30 p.m. He then called the supervisor on site and instructed the team to continue scanning ballots that had already been prepared. They pulled the same boxes back out and resumed working, according to Sterling.

“According to election officials, between 40,000 to 60,000 main-in/drop-off absentee ballots were not counted on election night. The county election officials said it was not due to the water pipe issues, rather it was because of the sheer number of ballots.”

Fulton officials said their goal was to have 100,000 absentee plus drop-off ballots counted by the end of election night. Officials sent ballot counters home at 10:30 p.m. and said they'd return at 8:30 a.m. Wednesday.

According to Pick, an unusual occurrence took place later in the evening at around 10 p.m. local time: A woman—described as a blonde woman with braids—told workers to stop counting and notified everyone to go home. Describing the video footage, Pick said, “Everyone clears out, including the Republican observers and the press, but four people stay behind and continue counting and tabulating well into the night.” The four counted unobserved until about 1 a.m.. Pick said that video footage shows Fulton County election workers waiting at their scanning areas until GOP poll observers and reporters left the room before they started “scanning ballots,” ostensibly without any observation.

Pick said that at 11 p.m., once everyone was gone, workers are seen pulling out the suitcase-looking containers and asked rhetorically whether it's normal to “store suitcases of ballots under a table cloth.” After reviewing hours of the footage, she said that it doesn't appear to be a normal procedure. The suitcase-looking boxes for ballots were kept under a table and were then taken out after other workers were—as Pick claimed—told to go home on Election Night after 10 p.m

On Nov. 3, Regina Waller, the Fulton County public affairs manager for elections, told ABC News that the election department at State Farm Arena sent ballot counters home at 10:30 p.m. Shafer said Fulton County officials “falsely announced that the counting of ballots would stop at 10:30 p.m.”

“This video proves our allegation—that they continued counting ballots in secret until 1:00 am,” Shafer wrote in a tweet on Dec. 3. He noted that “no one disputes that Fulton County elected officials unlawfully resumed the counting of ballots after our observers left the center.”

Curling v. Raffensperger

On November 10, 2023, the Summary Judgment Motion for the Georgia Voting Machine Security case of Curling v. Raffensperger was denied. The suit, which was first filed in 2017, claims that hand counting paper ballots is more secure than the Dominion Voting Machines and that because the Dominion Voting Machines are not secure, the right to have votes counted fairly and accurately under the 1st and 14th Amendments are being violated.

For the Court's summary of this case and this decision, see this link:

<https://caselaw.findlaw.com/court/us-dis-crt-n-d-geo-atl-div/115452270.html>

Here are quotes from this summary:

“this case focuses on whether Georgia's statewide electronic voting system,¹ as currently designed and implemented, suffers from major cyber security deficiencies that unconstitutionally burden Plaintiffs' First and Fourteenth Amendment rights and capacity to cast effective votes that are accurately counted.”

“Even if Plaintiffs prevail on their substantive claims, the Court cannot order the Georgia legislature to pass legislation creating a paper ballot voting system or judicially impose a statewide paper ballot system as injunctive relief in this case. Quite simply, the Court has the legal authority to identify constitutional deficiencies with the existing voting system, but it does not have the power to prescribe or mandate new voting systems (i.e., a paper ballot system) to replace the current, legislatively enacted system.”

The Court can order that the state:

“implement other essential cyber security measures and policies recommended by the nation's leading cyber security experts and firms, including the Department of Homeland Security's CISA.”

(However) “The Court cannot wave a magic wand in this case to address the varied challenges to our democracy and election system in recent years, including those presented in this case. But reasonable, timely discussion and compromise in this case, coupled with prompt, informed legislative action, might certainly make a difference that benefits the parties and the public.”

“the Court first, in Section A, discusses the vulnerabilities and issues raised regarding the prior DRE voting system that existed at the onset of this case. While this system is no longer in operation, many of the very same concerns persist under the current BMD system. After addressing the litigation and prior findings about the old DRE system, the Court, in Section B, charts the State's transition from the DRE system to the current BMD system. Next, in Section C, the Court outlines Plaintiffs’ challenges to the constitutionality of the current BMD system. Then, in Section D, the Court reviews the concerns presented by the Plaintiffs at the 2020 preliminary injunction hearing, including their central concerns related to the QR bar codes used to tabulate votes and the auditability of the BMD system more broadly (among other issues). After that, in Section E, the Court traces newer post-2020 developments regarding these same vulnerability concerns. These new developments include: the issuance of a comprehensive report by Plaintiff's expert, Dr. Alex Halderman, regarding the vulnerabilities of the BMD system; the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Agency's (“CISA”) review and corroboration of Dr. Halderman's central findings; the results of a 2021 technical assessment conducted by the State's retained consulting cyber security firm, Fortalice; and, of course, the now infamous breach of the election system in Coffee County, Georgia and the State's response to this breach..”

“In August 2020, Plaintiffs filed their next round of motions for, now raising challenges to Defendants’ implementation of the BMD system. According to Plaintiffs, because the BMD system was not secure, reliable, or voter verifiable, it unconstitutionally burdened their right to cast effective votes that would be accurately counted. In particular, the Plaintiffs raised concerns regarding the QR codes vulnerability to alteration or manipulation, questions about the auditability of the new BMD system, and the State's failure to implement necessary elections software upgrades.”

“Plaintiffs argued that this system is problematic because: (1) the machines that generated the printouts were vulnerable to hacking/manipulation that could result in the alteration of either the human-readable text or the selections contained in the QR codes; (2), Plaintiffs could not verify whether the QR codes accurately reflected their selections; and (3) the printouts could not be meaningfully audited.”

“In its 2020 PI Order, the Court noted that Dr. Halderman's findings were consistent with a “broad consensus” among the nation's cyber security experts that electronic voting systems, such as the BMD system, are susceptible to malware. The same experts also agreed that these vulnerabilities “take on greater significance” in the context of a BMD system, like Georgia's, because it relies on unauditable QR codes for counting votes that cannot be read and verified by the voters before tabulation.”

Dr. Halderman's July 2021 Report Identifies 7 Core Vulnerabilities

On July 1, 2021, Dr. Halderman, submitted a detailed, lengthy report both (1) expounding on his prior testimony in this case and (2) identifying additional vulnerabilities he found in the BMD system, based on his testing of a BMD and associated election equipment provided to him by Fulton County. (See Redacted Halderman Report, Doc. 1681.)²⁵ To test the BMD and other election equipment, Dr. Halderman and his assistant spent multiple weeks studying the voting equipment, testing the equipment for vulnerabilities, and developing proof-of-concept attacks, which Dr. Halderman contended could purportedly be effectuated by malicious actors.

In the Principal Findings section of his Report, Dr. Halderman determined that the BMD and related voting equipment suffered from “critical vulnerabilities” that could “be exploited to subvert all of [the BMD's] security mechanisms.” In particular, Dr. Halderman identifies seven primary vulnerabilities, as follows:

1. Attackers can alter the QR codes on printed ballots to modify voters' selections;
2. Anyone with brief physical access to the BMD machines can install malware onto the machines;
3. Attackers can forge or manipulate the smart cards that a BMD uses to authenticate technicians, poll workers, and voters, which could then be used by anyone with physical access to the machines to install malware onto the BMDs;

4. Attackers can execute arbitrary code with supervisory privileges and then exploit it to spread malware to all BMDs across a county or state;
5. Attackers can alter the BMD's audit logs;
6. Attackers with brief access to a single BMD or a single Poll Worker Card and PIN can obtain the county-wide cryptographic keys, which are used for authentication and to protect election results on scanner memory cards; and
7. A dishonest election worker with just brief access to the ICP scanner's memory card could determine how individual voters voted.

Plaintiffs' Counts III (violation of the fundamental right to vote under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment) and IV (violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment), and the Coalition Plaintiffs' Counts I (violation of the fundamental right to vote under the First and Fourteenth Amendments) and II (violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment).

On July 1, 2021, Dr. Alex Halderman submitted a 96 page report on Georgia Dominion Security Problems in the case of *Curling v. Raffensperger*.

<https://coalitionforgoodgovernance.sharefile.com/share/view/s45bba4420732410ab2db5edb685a50c2>

Halderman argues in his report that the state's ballot-marking devices are vulnerable to election fraud, including vote switching. He concluded that Georgia's voting machines could be manipulated by bad actors in mere minutes. Halderman argued that attackers could alter the QR codes on printed ballots, and install malware on individual voting machines "with only brief physical access." A group of more than 20 researchers in cyber security and elections agreed with him.

8 Unexplained Problems in Arizona

As noted earlier, there were five swing states that shifted by a tiny amount from 2016 to 2020 that determined the outcome of the 2020 election:

State	2020 Margin	2016 Margin	Difference %	Electoral Votes
Georgia	0.24D	5.13R	5.37 %	16
Arizona	0.31D	3.55R	3.86 %	11
Pennsylvania	1.16D	0.72R	1.88 %	20
Michigan	2.78D	0.23R	3.01 %	16
Wisconsin	0.63D	0.77R	1.4 %	10
Average	1.02D	2.08R	3.1 %	Total 73

The state with the greatest difference was Georgia with over 5% of the ballots changing from R to D. The next highest swing was Arizona where just under 4% of the ballots changed from R to D. Put another way, in 2016, Trump got 1,252,401 while Clinton got 1,161,167. In 2020, Trump got 1,661,686 (an increase of 41,000 votes) while Biden got 1,672,143 (an increase of 511,000 votes) – and **only 10,457 votes more than Trump.**

So where did the extra half million votes for Biden come from?

Hopefully by now, you should be guessing that they came from Mail In Ballots. But first, let's look at voter registrations.

As noted earlier, Arizona like Pennsylvania publishes Voter Registration by Political Party. Here is a summary of changes to voter registrations between 2016 and 2024 by party in Arizona.

State	Total Registrants K	D Party #K	D Party %	R Party #K	R Party %	Indy Other %
AZ Jan 24	4101	1212	29.6	1418	34.6	35
AZ 2020	4281	1334	31.1	1479	34.5	33.6
AZ 2016	3588	1091	30.7	1240	34.9	34
AZ Change	739	243 K	0.4%	239 K	- 0.4%	-0.4%


Note that while there was a **huge increase of 739,000 in party registrations from 2016 to 2020 (an increase of 21%)**, there was almost no change in the ratio of party registrations between 2016 to 2020.

The increase in Democrats was only 4000 ballots greater than the increase in Republicans which is a difference of less than one tenth of one percent of the 4.281 million voters in Arizona in 2020. Yet somehow 4% of the ballots changed from R to D. This is our first red flag.

Note also that after the 2020 election, there was a huge decrease of 180,00 in the total number of registered voters. Of this decrease 122,000 were Democrats. This is our second red flag.

The total Presidential ballots cast in 2020 was 3334829 while in 2016, it was only 2413468 for an increase of 921,361. This was **an increase of 38% - which was one of the highest percent increases in the nation.** It is also significantly higher than the 21% increase in new voter registrations. Most important, it is radically higher than the **5% growth in population between 2016 and 2020 (which grew from 6.82 million to 7.15 million – an increase of 330,000).** The number of eligible age population grew by 330K times 80% or 264,000. In short, the number of registered voters – 739,0000 - grew by almost three times the rate of the eligible voter population. This is our third red flag.

The number of Mail In ballots counted increased by more than 14 times the increase in the state voter eligible population. This is our fourth red flag.



Mail In Ballot Analysis

While Arizona does not break down election results by mail in ballots versus in person ballots, the state does include mail in ballots with Early In Person voting. Here are the results from 2020 compared to 2016:

<https://azsos.gov/elections/results-data/voter-registration-statistics/historical-election-results-information>

	Early Ballots & Mail In Ballots	In Person (Polling Place) & Provisional Ballots	Total Ballots
2020 Biden	1540846 (46%)	131297 (4%)	1672143
2016 Clinton	836372 (34%)	324795 (13%)	1161167
Dem Difference	Plus 704474	Minus 193498	Plus 510976
2020 Trump	1402370 (42%)	259316 (8%)	1661686
2016 Trump	886917 (37%)	365484 (15%)	1252401
Rep Difference	Plus 515453	Minus 105868	Plus 409285
2020 Total	2943216	390613	3333829
2016 Total	1991683	690279	2413568
Total Difference	Plus 951533 (48%)	Minus 299666 (-43%)	Plus 920261 (38%)

Note: In 2016, because Maricopa County did not break down their vote type by Polling Place (In Person) versus Early Ballot (Mail In), we used the ratio of (In Person) versus Early Ballot (Mail In) in all other counties (40%) to estimate the break down in Maricopa County and then added Maricopa votes for Clinton and Trump to the rest of the state for a 1 to 1 comparison. (X plus 0.4 X = total X = total/1.4)

Maricopa Clinton 702907 divided by 1.4 = **502100** and 200800

Maricopa Trump 747361 divided by 1.4 = **533830** and 213531

What is most noticeable about the above table is that **Biden picked up about 200,000 more Mail In Ballots than Trump in 2020 compared to 2016**. Among In Person Voters Trump beat Biden by a two to one margin – just as he did in Pennsylvania.

Look closely at 2016 and notice that Trump beat Clinton by a narrow amount among BOTH Mail In and In Person Votes. This destroys the claim that Mail In voters do not like Trump. Instead, it leads to the conclusion that

there is something very wrong with the Biden Mail In Ballots reported for the 2020 election. The only reasonable conclusion of all of these red flags is that about **200,000 additional mail in ballots were somehow added to the Biden total.**

Let's look first at where they were added and then look at when they were added.

Where the 200,000 extra mail in ballots were added

The two most populous counties in Arizona are Maricopa County (with Phoenix) and Pima County (with Tucson). Here is a table of the results for Maricopa County in 2020 compared to 2016:

Year	Ballots	Total Ballots Cast	% Maricopa	Total Registrations
2020 Biden	1040774	2069133	50.3%	
2016 Clinton	702907	1536783	45.7%	
Difference	337867	532350	PLUS 4.6%	
2020 Trump	995665	2069133	48.1%	
2016 Trump	747361	1536783	48.6%	
Difference	248304	532350	Minus 0.5%	
2020 Total	2036439 D+R	2089563	Turnout 81%	2595272
2016 Total	1450268 D+R	1608875	Turnout 74%	2161716
Difference	586171 (40%)	480688	7% Increase	433556 (20%)

The population in Maricopa County grew by 6% from 2016 to 2020. Yet registrations increased by 20% (10% to Democrats and 10% to Republicans). **Yet the D plus R vote total increased a mind boggling 40%.** In this increase, **Biden picked up 90,000 more votes than Trump just in Maricopa County** – in an election that was decided by just over 10,000 votes statewide. The total swing was 5.1%. But Trump only lost 0.5% while Biden picked up nearly all of the new (Mail In) votes.

Here is a table of the results for Pima County in 2020 compared to 2016:

Year	Ballots	Total Ballots Cast	% Pima	Total Registrations
2020 Biden	304981	520397	58.6%	
2016 Clinton	224661	413509	54.3%	
Difference	80320	106888	Plus 4.3%	

2020 Trump	207758	520397	39.9%	
2016 Trump	167428	413509	40.5%	
Difference	40330	106888	Minus 0.6%	
2020 Total	512739 D+R	526319 Total	Turnout 82%	638355
2016 Total	392089 D+R	427102 Total	Turnout 78%	544270
Difference	120650 (30%)	99217	6% Increase	94085 (17%)

The population in Pima County grew by 2.4% from 2016 to 2020.

Registrations increased by 17% (almost evenly so 8% to Democrats and 8% to Republicans). **Yet the D plus R vote total increased a mind boggling 30%.** In this increase, **Biden picked up 40,000 more votes than Trump just in Pima County** – in an election that was decided by just over 10,000 votes statewide. The total swing was 4.9%. But Trump only lost 0.6% while Biden picked up nearly all of the new (Mail In) votes.

To better understand the dramatic difference between population growth and D+R votes, let's also look at the next two most populous counties in Arizona. These are Pinal and Yavapai.

Here is a table of the results for Pinal County in 2020 compared to 2016:

Year	Ballots	Total Ballots Cast	% Pinal	Total Registrations
2020 Biden	75106	185525	40.5	
2016 Clinton	47892	127197	37.7%	
Difference	27214	58328	2.8%	
2020 Trump	107077	185525	57.7%	
2016 Trump	72819	127197	57.2%	
Difference	34258	58328	0.5%	
2020 Total	182183	186319	Turnout 74.9%	248874
2016 Total	120711	131628	Turnout 69.5%	189462
Difference	61472 (50%)	54,691 (42%)	Increase 5.4%	59412 (31% Increase)

The population in Pinal County grew by 5% from 2016 to 2020. Among those voting In Person, Trump beat Biden by 27,000 to 10,000 (27/37=73%). Among Mail In and Early Voting, Trump beat Biden 80,000 to 65,000 (80/145=55%). Registrations increased by 31% in Pinal County

(almost evenly so 15% to Democrats and 15% to Republicans). **Yet the D plus R vote total increased a mind boggling 50%.** In this increase, Trump **picked up 7,000 more votes than Trump just in Pinal County.** The total swing was 3.3%. But Trump only gained 0.5% while **Biden once again picked up nearly all of the new (Mail In) votes.**

Here is a table of the results for Yavapai County in 2020 compared to 2016:

Year	Ballots	Total Ballots Cast	% Yavapai	Total Registrations
2020 Biden	49602	143221	34.6%	
2016 Clinton	35590	112504	31.6%	
Difference	14012	30717	3% increase	
2020 Trump	91527	143221	63.9%	
2016 Trump	71330	112504	63.4%	
Difference	20197	30717	0.5%	
2020 Total	141129	144911	Turnout 79.9%	165361
2016 Total	106920	116053	Turnout 84.5%	137390
Difference	34209 (32%)	28858 (25%)	Decreased 4.6%	27971 (20% increase)

The population in Yavapai County grew by 5% from 2016 to 2020. Registrations increased by 20% (almost evenly so 10% to Democrats and 10% to Republicans). **Yet the D plus R vote total increased by 32%.** In this increase, Trump **picked up 6,000 more votes than Biden in Yavapai County.** The total swing was 3.5%. But Trump only gained 0.5% while **Biden once again picked up nearly all of the new (Mail In) votes.**

Conclusion: There was a significant manipulation of the new Mail In Ballots in all four counties. In all four counties, the nearly all of the new Mail In Ballots went to Biden.

Sources:

<https://azsos.gov/elections/results-data/voter-registration-statistics/historical-election-results-information>

<https://apps.azsos.gov/election/2016/General/Official%20Signed%20State%20Canvass.pdf>

https://apps.azsos.gov/election/2020/canvass/returns/20201123-maricopa-general_election_canvass_summary.pdf

<https://apps.azsos.gov/election/2016/General/ElectionInformation.htm>

https://apps.azsos.gov/election/2020/canvass/returns/20201119-pinal-general_election_canvass.pdf

Population Change calculations

US Census 2020 Population of Maricopa County Arizona 4.42 million

US Census 2010 Population of Maricopa County Arizona 3.82 million

600,000 per ten years = 60,000 per year 15 percent per 10 years 1.5 /yr

US Census 2020 Population of Pima County Arizona 1.04 million

US Census 2010 Population of Pima County Arizona 0.98 million

60,000 per 10 years = 6000 per year equals 6% per ten years.

Maricopa grew by 6% and Pima grew by 2.4%

US Census 2020 Population of Pinal County Arizona 425

US Census 2010 Population of Pinal County Arizona 375000

50K per 10 years 5000 per year 20,000 4 years 5%

US Census 2020 Population of Yavapai County Arizona 236,000

US Census 2020 Population of Yavapai County Arizona 211000

25000 10 year 2500 1 year 10,000 4 years 5%

When were the additional 200,000 Mail In Ballots posted?

Previously, we noted that a national Vote Spikes study found two extremely unusual vote spikes in Arizona:


STATE	BIDEN VOTES ADDED	TRUMP VOTES ADDED	BIDEN NET VOTE DUMPS*	TIME (Local)
Arizona	363,014	254,499	108,515	(Nov 3) 8:05 PM
	798,568	655,467	143,101	(Nov 3) 8:06 PM

These spikes occurred just minutes after the polls closed.

Source: https://election-integrity.info/Vote_Spikes_Report.pdf

Both spikes must have come from Maricopa County since no other county in Arizona reported more than a half million ballots. In the first spike, which totaled 617513, Biden got 59% of the vote. In the second spike, which totaled 1454035, Biden got 55% of the vote.

The combined total of both spikes was 2.07 million votes. The total for Biden was 1161582 (56%) and the total for Trump was 909966 (44%). Thus, **Biden started the election with a 251,616 vote lead.** Below is a screen shot taken election night showing Biden up 53.9% to 44.9%.



Just before midnight on the East Coast on election night, Biden was up 9 percentage points in Arizona, (see screen above). Almost three hours later, at 3 am, Biden's lead had been cut in half. He was now up by only 5%. At that point, an estimated 80% of the vote was in, and Biden was up by a margin of 136,000 votes.

Biden's margin shrank steadily and drastically. By Nov. 12, nine days after Election Day, the margin had shrunk to just over 10,000 votes.

A November 4 3 am CNN article stated: "Arizona's largest county has processed and counted a total of 1,487,624 early votes out of a total of approximately 1.7 million early votes cast, according to the Maricopa County Elections Department. There are roughly 248,000 outstanding early votes that have been signature verified but not yet fully processed. Election officials will start counting these remaining early votes Wednesday as well as an undetermined number of mail-in ballots that people delivered to voting centers in person that have not been processed in any way. On Election Day, approximately 167,000 people voted in person at 175 voting centers within the county. As of 12:40 a.m. local time with 75 voting centers reporting, a total of 74,485 Election Day votes have been counted."

Here is an image of this result:

ELECTION DAY BALLOTS

Verified and Counted	167,878
Percentage of Registered Voters	6.47%
Percentage of Ballots Cast	8.03%

EARLY BALLOTS

Verified and Counted	1,915,487
Percentage of Registered Voters	73.81%
Percentage of Ballots Cast	91.67%

The above confirms that the vast majority of ballots in Maricopa county on Election Day were Early (Mail In) ballots - 91.67%. Here is another image confirming this:

FINAL OFFICIAL RESULTS

General Election

Maricopa County

November 3, 2020

Elector Group	Counting Group	Ballots	Voters	Registered Voters	Turnout
Total	EARLY VOTE	1,915,487	1,915,487	2,595,272	73.81%
	ELECTION DAY	167,878	167,878		6.47%
	PROVISIONAL	6,198	6,198		0.24%
	Total	2,089,563	2,089,563		80.51%

Registered Voters: 2,089,563 of 2,595,272 (80.51%)

Ballots Cast: 2,089,563

Requested versus Returned Mail In Ballots

An analysis of Arizona Requested versus Returned ballots is available at the following link:

<https://dataorbital.com/2020-general-election-early-vote-tracker/>

It confirms that Mail In Ballot requests were evenly divided between Republicans, Democrats and Independents – with Republicans requesting slightly more than Democrats at 36% to 35%. Note also that Republicans turned in slightly more Mail In Ballots than Democrats at 37.4% to 36.6%.

So given that Republicans actually submitted 20,000 more mail in ballots than Democrats in Arizona in 2020, how did Biden wind up with such a huge lead among the mail in ballots???

Ballots Requested			Daily Returns		Total Returns	
3,490,271			163,406		2,664,687	
Ballot Requests by Party			Ballot Returns by Party			
REP	1,259,122	36.1%	REP	997,193	37.4%	
DEM	1,214,487	34.8%	DEM	973,738	36.5%	
IND	1,016,656	29.1%	IND	693,755	26.0%	
Total	3,490,265	100.0%	Total	2,664,686	100.0%	

What is extremely unusual is that while 3.49 million mail in ballots were requested in the weeks before the election, only 2.66 million mail in ballots were returned! This means that **830,000 registered voters went through the effort of mailing in the form to request a mail in ballot - but then decided a couple of weeks later to either vote in person (which very few did) or not vote at all.** This is one more of many red flags indicating that there was some monkey business going on with the mail in ballots.

The total mail in ballots returned was 2.66 million – a dramatic increase of 1.2 million over 2016. Meanwhile, in-person ballots actually fell by 300,000 ballots. Combining mail in and in-person ballots, an **additional 921,000 ballots** were counted in the 2020 Arizona Presidential Election (3.3 million ballots versus 2.4 million ballots) – an increase of 38.4% in a state where the population only increased 5%.

There are two ways to confirm that there was monkey business in 200,000 mail in ballots. The most reliable way would be to call a random sample of voters who rarely vote (such as was done in Pennsylvania) and ask them if they requested requested and turned in a Mail In Ballot.

The second way is to examine a random sample and look for mismatched signatures. This second way was used by the Arizona State Senate. On February 28, 2022, the State Senate published their report concluding that:

“A study of Maricopa County, Arizona’s mail-in ballots during the 2020 presidential election estimates that over 200,000 ballots with mismatched signatures were counted - without being reviewed or “cured.”

Here is a link

<https://humanevents.com/2022/02/28/arizona-senate-study-finds-200k-ballots-counted-with-mismatched-signatures-during-2020-election/>

Notes from an Arizona Court case

On December 2, 2020, the case of **Bowver versus Ducey** was filed. Here is a link to the PDF of the 53 page complaint:

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.azd.1255923/gov.uscourts.azd.1255923.1.0.pdf>

While the case was eventually dismissed on technical grounds, the complaint includes a lot of revealing information. Here are some quotes:

“The unlawful counting, or fabrication, of hundreds of thousands of illegal, ineligible, duplicate or purely fictitious ballots in the State of Arizona... The entire process is so riddled with fraud, illegality, and statistical impossibility that this Court, and Arizona’s voters, courts, and legislators, cannot rely on, or certify, any numbers resulting from this election.

A. Unreturned mail ballots unlawfully ordered by third parties (average for Dr. Briggs Error #1): 219,135

B. Returned ballots that were deemed unreturned by the state (average for Dr. Briggs Error #2): 86,845

C. “Excess votes” to historically unprecedented, and likely fraudulent turnout levels of 80% or more in over half of Maricopa and Pima County precincts: 100,724. Taken together, the irregularities, anomalies and physical and statistical impossibilities, account for at least 412,494 illegal ballots that were counted in Arizona... the signatures were not even close to the signatures that they were ‘comparing’ the ballot signature to.

Dominion employees and supervisors informed Mr. Wodynski “that about 12% of mail in ballots were being rejected and needed human intervention in the adjudication process,” which “amounted to tens of thousands of ballots that required intervention” in the days he was an observer...

“Signature verification standards were constantly being lowered by Supervisors in order to more quickly process that higher amount of early and mail-in ballots (from approx. 15 points of similarities, to a

minimum of 3, lowered to 1, and ultimately to none – “Just pass each signature verification through”. (note this also happened in Georgia where hundreds of thousands of mail in ballots were accepted without a single ballot being challenged.)

Challenged runs or batches of envelopes for signature verification observed by me to be the exact same handwriting on the affidavit envelopes on numerous envelopes.

In the Duplication room, I observed with my Democratic partner the preparation of a new ballot since the original may have been soiled, damaged, or ripped, and wouldn't go through the tabulator. I read her a Trump/Republican ballot and as soon as she entered it into the system the ballot defaulted on the screen to a Biden/Democratic ballot. We reported this to supervisors, and others in the room commented that they had witnessed the same manipulation. We were never told what, if any, corrective action was taken.

I observed the problem of Trump votes with voters checking the bubble for a vote for Trump, but ALSO, writing in the name “Donald Trump” and checking the bubble next to his hand written name again, as a duplicated vote, counting as an “OVERVOTE,” which means – no vote was counted at all, despite the policy having been changed to allow these overvotes.

In Arizona 86,845 Mail-In Ballots Were Lost, and 219,135 More Were Fraudulently Recorded for Voters who Never Requested Mail- In Ballots.

Dr. Briggs' analysis estimated that 208,333 to 229,337 ballots out of the total 518,560 unreturned ballots were recorded for voters who had not requested them. All of these absentee ballots were sent to someone besides the registered voter named in the request, and thus could have been filled out by anyone and then submitted in the name of another voter.

Here is a link to Dr. Briggs study:

<https://blogforarizona.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/William-Briggs-affadavut.pdf>

An Analysis of Surveys Regarding Absentee Ballots Across Several States by William M. Briggs November 23, 2020

Here are some quotes: “Survey data was collected from individuals in several states, sampling those who the states listed as not returning absentee ballots. The data was provided by Matt Braynard. The survey asked respondents whether they (a) had ever requested an absentee ballot, and, if so, (b) whether they had in fact returned this ballot.

“From this sample I produce predictions of the total numbers of: Error #1, those who were recorded as receiving absentee ballots without requesting them; and Error #2, those who returned absentee ballots but whose votes went missing (i.e. marked as unreturned). The sizes of both errors were large in each state. The states were Georgia, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Arizona where ballots were across parties. Pennsylvania data was for Republicans only. **Dr. Briggs’ finding that 58% of “unreturned ballots” in Arizona suffer from one of the two errors** above is consistent with his findings in the four other States analyzed (Georgia 39%, Michigan 45%, Pennsylvania 37%, and Wisconsin 45%). “

Enter the Arizona Audit Guys

On January 27, 2022, the New Republic published an article called **"Meet the Trio Who May Have Figured Out How to Save American Democracy"**. <https://newrepublic.com/article/165152/arizona-cyber-ninjas-audit-guys-save-democracy>

The trio consisted of three interesting people that the article referred to as **“retired election auditors.”** Of course, none of the three have ever actually been election auditors – or any kind of auditor. The first Arizona Audit guy is Benny White, a 2020 Republican candidate for Pima County recorder – where he got **41% of the vote** for an office that has been held by Democrats for more than 30 years. Recall that **Trump got 40% of the vote in Pima County in both 2016 and 2020.** So there was almost no cross over voting in 2020. The same people voted for Trump and Benny.

Benny White’s real background was that he served 21 years in the military, retiring as a lieutenant colonel. He has served as a commercial airline pilot, trained pilots and ran schools in the National Guard.

The other two Arizona Audit Guys were Larry Moore and Tim Halvorsen. They were the founders of an election counting machine called Clear Ballot. Their wealth and the future of their corporation depends on the voters trusting vote counting machines. Their initial wealth came from developing and promoting the Lotus program in the 1980's. Lotus is a spreadsheet program launched in 1983 which worked on the Microsoft operating system based IBM PC. In 1989, an improved version called Lotus Notes was launched and became successful due to an order from the CIA for 10,000 copies. IBM bought Lotus for several billion dollars in 1995. Larry Moore was the Senior Vice President of Lotus/IBM and Tim Halvorsen was their Chief Technology Officer. So both became extremely rich. Larry openly admits to being a Democrat and both have said many derogatory comments about Trump supporters.

The three Arizona Auditor Guys thought it would be “fun” (this is what they said. I am not making this up) to dig into the Maricopa County 2020 election data base in order to prove their theory that “otherwise loyal Republicans rejected Trump” and voted for Biden instead.

Maricopa County Arizona is the nation's second-largest election jurisdiction after Los Angeles County. Maricopa County residents cast 2.1 million ballots in fall 2020. Its cast-vote record was organized into ballot inventory files (called the manifest) and 10,341 batches (each containing about 200 ballots).

Here are quotes from the article:

“We wanted to find out who voted for these down-ballot [Republican] candidates but didn't vote for Trump. And, by the way, which of those did vote for Biden... **The Audit Guys knew what to look for** and began sorting and sifting through the data. “We created a synthetic variable called ‘disaffected Republican supportive voters,’ which is simply defined as those voters who voted for a majority of down-ballot Republican candidates,” Moore said. “And in Maricopa, there were 15 candidates ... and they voted for eight or more of those. But they didn't vote for Trump.”

“Moore and Halvorsen quickly found tens of thousands of Republicans who had rejected Trump. White then identified where those voters lived, using precinct-mapping software.

“In Maricopa County, there were 59,800 of these folks that were evenly spread out through the mapping data,” Moore said. “And there were 39,102 of the 59,800 who voted for Biden.... And that number, to put it in context, the 39,102, is 3.7 times the winning margin [10,457 votes] that Biden had statewide. Republicans, heavily Republican-leaning voters, voted against Trump at what turned out to be an overwhelming margin.”

Put in plain English, by cherry picking through 2 million ballots, they were able to find 39,000 ballots who has voted mostly for Republicans but had voted for Biden instead of vote Trump. Let’s assume for the sake of argument that these were real people and real ballots (something I do not think is true – but let’s assume it anyway). These so-called “auditors” completely ignored at least five red flags in the Maricopa County data:

Red Flag #1: Biden got 337,867 more ballots than Clinton in 2016. Even if 39,000 Republicans got mad at Trump and decided to vote for Biden, where did the other nearly 300,000 new ballots come from???

Red Flag #2: Trump got 248,000 more votes in Maricopa County in 2020 than he did not 2016. So clearly those Republican voters were not mad at him.

Red Flag #3: There was a massive unexplained increase in total registrations of 433,556 (20%) despite only a 6% increase in population.

Red Flag #4: There was a 40% increase in D plus R votes in 2020 compared to 2016 despite only a 6% increase in population. Of these 586,000 unexplained ballots, about 90% of the increase went to Biden.

Without this massive unexplained increase, Trump would have won the 2020 election in Arizona in a landslide.

9 Voting Machine Problems: ES & S versus Dominion

Prior to June 2020, all 67 counties in Pennsylvania got brand new voting machines. Nearly all of the counties use either ES & S or Dominion voting machines. Dominion is used in 28 states including Wisconsin and Georgia..



In September 2022, Pennsylvania Fulton County Board of Elections and voters filed a lawsuit against Dominion Voting Systems.

<https://www.democracydocket.com/cases/pennsylvania-fulton-county-voting-machines-challenge/>

The complaint alleges that Fulton County “became aware of severe anomalies in the Dominion Voting Systems due to the inaccuracy and/or inability to reconcile voter data with votes actually cast and counted, i.e., tabulated, by the System in Fulton County” following the 2020 election. While this lawsuit focuses on a alleged contract breach between the county and Dominion, the complaint raises allegations about Dominion’s voting machines, including that there are “**numerous security vulnerabilities**” with the machines, “errors in the ballot scanning,” “external USB hard drives had been inserted in the machines on several occasions” in past elections and some machines were “connected remotely to a Canadian system.”

The plaintiffs allege that Dominion breached its contract with the county by failing to “provide a system that was free from defects and compliant.” The plaintiffs request damages.

Here is a link to the original 29 page complaint:

<https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/FultonPASuesDominion.pdf>

Here is an image of Dominion's crazy disclaimer:

35. The Agreement purports to contain a “disclaimer” of warranty, which provides:

DOMINION DISCLAIMS ALL OTHER WARRANTIES, AND REPRESENTATIONS, WHETHER WRITTEN, ORAL, EXPRESS, OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING ANY WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE AND ANY WARRANTY BASED ON A COURSE OF DEALING, COURSE OF PERFORMANCE OR USAGE OF TRADE. [EXHIBIT A-6, ¶ 9.5.]

Page 13 of the lawsuit states Dominion suffers from: “numerous security vulnerabilities in Dominion’s ICX software, including flaws that would allow attackers to install malicious software on the ICX, either with temporary or physical access (such as that of voters in polling places) or remotely from election management systems.”

On Page 19, the lawsuit states Dominion also suffers from: “The machines and devices only had Windows Defender dating to July 2016 and that no other updates had been made. Id., p. 3. The report concluded that “viruses or malicious software” created after that date would not be combated by the systems without proper updates. Id. Among other findings, this constituted a direct violation of and failure of the conditions required for certification in the Dominion Certification Report.”

There were lots of other problems backed by a lot of evidence.

Dominion filed a Motion to Dismiss on technical grounds. On Sept. 23, 2023 the court granted Dominion’s Motion to Dismiss but allowed the plaintiffs to refile their complaint. In Oct. 2023, the plaintiffs filed an amended complaint which re-opened the case. Here is a link to the 45 page amended complaint:

<https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/112023-10-19-amended-complaint.pdf>

On December 6, 2023, Fulton County filed this 22 page reply to a new Dominion filed a Motion to Dismiss:

<https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/162023-12-6-Plaintiffs-reply-to-defendants-motion-to-dismiss.pdf>

Apparently, Dominion thinks they do not have to supply accurate voting machines. They just want Fulton County to go away. The litigation is still on going. At the same time, others have claimed that **ES &S (Election Systems & Software, LLC) is even worse.**

Vanishing Votes

In 2006, in Sarasota, Florida, touchscreen voting machines supplied by ES&S showed that “More than 18,000 voters..., or 13 percent of those who went to the polls,” had declined to vote in a hotly contested Congressional race...” By contrast, “only 2 percent of voters in one neighboring county within the same House district and 5 percent in another skipped the Congressional race...”

More than 100 voters told the campaign of Christine Jennings, who officially lost by just 373 votes, that “their votes for her did not show up on the summary screen at the end of the touchscreen voting process, and that they had to re-enter them.” Jennings’s attorneys said they “feared that not everyone had noticed the problem or realized that they could re-enter the vote.”

The firestorm over these “vanishing votes” caused Florida to eventually ban touchscreen voting and switch to paper ballots and scanners.

The same year, Debra Bowen, who was California’s Secretary of State at the time, sued ES&S for selling at least five California counties a version of its AutoMark ballot marking system that hadn’t yet been tested or certified for use in the state or the country. Bowen said at the time that ES&S had “ignored the law over and over again and it got caught...” ES&S later paid \$3.25 million to settle the case. Also in 2007, a team of researchers at the University of Pennsylvania Department of Computer Science found “numerous exploitable vulnerabilities in nearly every component” of ES&S’s optical scanners (for counting paper ballots) and direct record electronic (DRE, usually touchscreen) voting machines.

The same year, Jennifer Brunner, Ohio's Secretary of State commissioned an analysis called the Everest report, which also found significant vulnerabilities in ES&S systems. The report concluded that those vulnerabilities "demonstrate the capability for attackers to execute arbitrary code on many of the components given access to them. Further, specific scenarios were identified where attackers who successfully gained access to the systems and exploited identified vulnerabilities could likely impact the results of elections."

Beginning in 2015, ES&S began quietly installing wireless modems in precinct ballot scanners in some counties in swing states such as Florida and Michigan. At some point, it added them in some counties in Wisconsin, and Illinois. These modems connect both the scanners and the receiving end systems to the internet, but officials claimed otherwise. ES&S systems containing modems were never certified by the Election Assistance Commission, but ES&S falsely implied to its customers that they were.

In 2018, ES&S finally admitted, despite prior denials that it had installed remote access software in election management systems (which include county tabulators that compile precinct totals) sold between 2000 and 2006. ES&S later told NPR that it had 300 remote-access customers. It refused, however, to identify those customers. It claims the software has been removed but won't say when it was removed.

Kevin Skoglund discovered that 35 of ES&S's receiving-end systems had been left online for months and, in some cases, perhaps years. This included the swing states of Michigan, Florida, and Wisconsin.

Most recently, a "bug" identified in a September 2020 Texas examiner's report involving ES&S's "hash verification script" could have allowed ES&S to install (without detection) unauthorized software in its DS200, DS850, DS450, ExpressVote & ExpressVote XL voting systems.

In September 2000, with Bob Urosevich at the helm, Global bought an election company for \$4 million from a convicted embezzler named Jeffrey Dean whose crimes involved sophisticated computer tampering, a discovery made by Black Box Voting author Bev Harris. An SEC filing obtained by Harris shows that, as a result of the acquisition, Dean became Global's largest shareholder. Dean was also a Global vice president where he oversaw computer programming.

A few months after he joined Global, a convicted cocaine trafficker who he met in prison, John Elder, joined the company to oversee the printing of paper ballots and punch cards for several states. This, too, was discovered and first reported by Harris.

In 2010, the DOJ forced ES&S to dissolve Diebold and sell Diebold's assets because the combined company had accounted for 70% of US election equipment. That year, Dominion Voting bought Diebold's intellectual property rights and warehoused equipment.

According to a 2017 analysis by the Wharton Business School, ES&S controls 44 percent of US election equipment, and Dominion 37 percent.

This Brennan Center Voting System Failure Database offers a 132 page analysis of Voting Machine problems.

https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/Democracy/Voting_Machine_Failures_Online.pdf

This 40 page **report by Fair Fight Action regarding ES&S** is very comprehensive. It was last updated in 2019.

<https://fairfight.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Election-Systems-and-Software-ESS-Corruption-07162019.pdf>

The worst problem is not the Voting Machine Program ... It is the Windows Operating System

It does not take much research to realize that both of these corporations are extremely corrupt. However, it does not really matter which is used as **both use the insecure Windows Operating System.**

In plain English, even if Dominion and ESS fixed all of their problems, hackers could still remotely access and reprogram these voting machines by using hidden back doors in the Windows operating system. There is only one way to restore Free and Equal Elections. We need to return to In Person voting using Paper ballots that are locally hand counted.

10 Who Rigged the 2020 election?

In 2016 and again in 2020, highly paid unelected “security” experts working for the NSA, CIA, FBI and DHS falsely accused Russian and Chinese hackers of interfering with US Presidential Elections. These agencies released a report called **Grizzly Steppe** which included 876 IP addresses which they claimed were linked to a Russian Hacker called **Cozy Bear**.



I did a detailed study of these IP addresses and found that more than 80 which connected directly to **servers located inside the United States and controlled by the NSA**. Others confirmed my research which in turn confirmed that **Cozy Bear is nothing more than a front for our own tax payer funded NSA**.

In other words, the group that was hacking into our election systems in 2016 and 2020 was not Russia or China – it was the NSA. Their goal is to prevent the election of any candidates who are a threat to the continued power and domination of the Deep State.

You can read my 87 page report on the NSA, called Hack Everything, online at this link:

<https://turningpointnews.org/hack-everything-special-report>

You can download a PDF copy to share with friends at this link:

<https://turningpointnews.org/phocadownload/Hack%20EverythingA%20Detailed%20Timeline%20of%20the%20DNC%20Hack.pdf>

According to documents released by Edward Snowden in 2013, the NSA, CIA, FBI, DHS and others have set up more than 70 Department of Homeland Security “Information Sharing Fusion Centers” in the US.



These Fusion Centers do the same thing the NSA does... spy on innocent people. The total number of Fusion Agents in the US is about 100,000. Divide this by 50 means that there are about 2000 Fusion Agents just in Washington state. This is **200 Fusion Agents for each of our 10 Congressional Districts** – all making \$100,000 or more per year paid for with you tax payer dollars. These Fusion agents have access to an unlimited amount of money. It is possible that many have infiltrated both major political parties and even possible that may have been elected to Congress.

An example of a Voter Profile Creation Program

I do not have excess to the NSA Voter Database for Washington State. But I was the Training Advisor for the King County Democrats. King County is the largest county in Washington State and includes Seattle. I personally trained hundreds of Democratic Party volunteers how to use the Democratic Party program called Vote Builder to analyze the voting history of any voters in any precinct in Washington state.



Voters are divided into one of nine categories:

Likely Party

☒ Strong Democrat
 ☒ Likely Democrat
 ☒ Ind-Dem
 ☒ Independent
 ☐ Ind-Rep
 ☐ Likely Republican
 ☐ Strong Republican
 ☐ Unknown
 ☐ No Data

You can further analyze and select voters in any precinct, Legislative District, Congressional District or County based on their past voting history.

Voting History

Include anyone who did

At Least

1

of the following

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2008 General	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Voted	<input type="radio"/> Didn't Vote	<input type="radio"/> Mail
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2006 General	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Voted	<input type="radio"/> Didn't Vote	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2004 General	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Voted	<input type="radio"/> Didn't Vote	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2002 General	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Voted	<input type="radio"/> Didn't Vote	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2000 General	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Voted	<input type="radio"/> Didn't Vote	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2008 Primary	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Voted	<input type="radio"/> Didn't Vote	<input type="radio"/> Mail
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2006 Primary	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Voted	<input type="radio"/> Didn't Vote	

I am sure the NSA voter profile system is much better than the Vote Builder system used by the Washington state Democrats. There are at least two ways Fusion agents can rig elections. The first way is to create fake voters. The NSA is famous for creating fake persons that they use to manipulate public opinion on social platforms such as Facebook. The second way is to use real registered voters who rarely if ever vote and just start voting for them. It is likely that the NSA uses a combination of both of these methods.


11 Three Steps to End Election Rigging

Over 90% of all elections are rigged before the first voter even casts their ballot. The most common way of rigging elections is to provide bribes, called campaign contributions to the most corrupt candidate. The second most common way of rigging elections is for the corrupt media to provide millions of dollars in free campaign ads for corrupt candidates - post **fluff articles** about the most corrupt candidate and **hit jobs** against the most honest candidates. These two dishonest scams are the reason our election system is rigged in the first place.

To avoid rigged elections, the Washington State Constitution (and many other State Constitutions) requires that all elections be free and equal.

Washington State Constitution Article 1 Section 19
Freedom of Elections. All Elections shall be free and equal.

Sadly, instead of holding elections that are free and equal, our elections have been perverted into bidding wars between billionaires and mega monopolies where bribes - called campaign contributions - are used to elect people corrupt enough to do the bidding of their corporate masters.



How can we restore Free and Equal Elections?

The first step is to build an Independent Movement of Concerned Citizens in every school district, city, county and legislative district willing to advocate for restoring our State Constitution. We intend to do this by publishing a monthly newsletter and holding monthly online meetings.



The second step is to pass Local Resolutions in favor of clarifying and restoring the Washington State Constitution. We can work to pass resolutions at our local city, county, school board, civic organizations and local political organizations. Therefore, our second goal is to provide drafts of local resolutions and help local citizens pass these local resolutions.



The third step is to build local support for filing and passing State Initiatives aimed at restoring the Washington State Constitution. Filing an **Initiative** requires gathering nearly 400,000 signatures in just 6 months. Therefore, our third goal is to grow our Independent Movement of Concerned Citizens until our Movement is large enough to file and then pass this Initiative.

12 Resolution to Restore Free and Equal Elections

Whereas Article 1 Section 19 of our State Constitution states: **“All Elections shall be free and equal.”** and

Whereas... in plain English, this means that all local, district and state elections held in Washington State shall be free and equal and

Whereas... During the past 20 years, we have seen an alarming increase in dark money campaign contributions and dirty tricks being used to fool voters and buy elections. And

Whereas... Article 2 Section 30 of our State Constitution states: **“Bribery or corrupt solicitation The offense of corrupt solicitation of members of the legislature, or of public officers of the state or any municipal division thereof, and any occupation or practice of solicitation of such members or officers to influence their official action, shall be defined by law, and shall be punished by fine and imprisonment.”**

Whereas bribing an elected official is the ONLY criminal offense specifically defined in our State Constitution and

Whereas campaign contributions for or against an elected official are a blatant form of bribery intended to influence the actions of that elected official. and

Whereas... During this same 20 year period, there has been an alarming increase in Washington State tax breaks for billionaires and multinational corporations and

Whereas...:Article 2 Section 28 states: **“The legislature is prohibited from enacting any private or special laws in the following cases: 5. For assessment or collection of taxes, or for extending the time for collection thereof. 6. For granting corporate powers or privileges. 10. Releasing or extinguishing in whole or in part, the indebtedness, liability or other obligation, of any person, or corporation to this state.”.. and**

Whereas, in plain English, this provision means that the legislature is prohibited from enacting special laws granting tax breaks to the billionaires and multinational corporations that paid for their elections.

Whereas the total amount of these special tax breaks for the rich is now more than \$30 billion per year.

Therefore be it resolved that we support passage of an **Initiative to the People** clarifying that according to the Washington State Constitution:

#1 All local, district, city, county and state elections held in Washington State shall be free and equal and

#2 Campaign contributions are a form of bribery intended to influence the actions of elected officials and are therefore prohibited by the Washington State Constitution. and

#3 The legislature is prohibited from enacting special laws granting special tax breaks to the billionaires and multinational corporations.

Resolution passed by: (Name of group) On: (date resolution was passed).

Signed by (leader of group) Contact: (Contact Information for group)

Step 3: Pass an Initiative to Restore Free and Equal Elections

We will be drafting an Initiative based on this resolution in the coming months. But the Initiative will be simple and substantially the same as the above resolution. Once we have enough citizens willing to gather enough signatures to place this Initiative on the ballot, we will file the Restore Free and Equal Elections Initiative and begin the signature gathering process.




If you would like to join our Coalition to Restore the Washington State Constitution, go to our website and sign up for our monthly newsletter. In addition, consider attending our one or more of our monthly online meetings. We look forward to meeting you!

Addendum 1 Eight Red Flags of the Albert Data Mining Program

This article is an Addendum to my recent report, “**A Crime against All of Us.**” On February 29, 2024, the Washington State legislature passed **Senate Bill 5843** – requiring all counties to use a program called Albert to monitor their computer networks. Here is a link to the bill:

<https://app.leg.wa.gov/billssummary?BillNumber=5843&Year=2023&Initiative=false>


Grant, Ferry and Lincoln counties have refused to use Albert. Senate Bill 5843, which was requested by our current Secretary of State Steve Hobbs, falsely claimed that Albert will “improve election security.” In fact, **Albert is a centralized data mining system** that will create a single point of failure making our elections easier to hack. In this article, we will review numerous Red Flags of the Albert Data Mining program.




Before we begin, we should review what REAL computer and network security looks like. First, real security is decentralized – not centralized. Imagine if every house in Washington was required to use the same key. All a robber would need is a copy of one key to rob all of us. This is why every home should use a different key and a different security system – to force potential robbers to break into homes one at a time. Albert is a national data mining system that places every county and state that uses it at risk.

Second, real security uses Linux – not Windows. Albert falsely claims that it is capable of reducing Windows Ransomware attacks. In fact, there is no way to protect any Windows computer or network from a ransomware attack.

This is because, ever since 1998, the Windows operating system has a “call home” web browser built into the core of the operating system. By contrast, the Linux Debian operating system keeps the web browser securely outside of the core. As a result, while **the Windows operating system suffers from nearly 1000 security flaws (also known as back doors) every year**, the Linux Debian operating system does not have any security flaws. If the Albert advocates really cared about protecting computers, networks and elections, they would encourage counties to **replace Windows computers and networks with Linux computers and networks**.



For example, in 2022, the Windows operating system had 863 security flaws while the free open source Linux Debian operating system did not have a single security flaw.



As proof that Albert does not and can not stop Windows Ransomware attacks, one of the three counties in Eastern Washington that decided to stop using Albert had originally installed it only to have their network attacked by Windows Ransomware weeks AFTER they installed Albert (Lincoln County).

After Lincoln county fell victim to a crippling Windows ransomware attack, Lincoln County Commissioner Rob Coffman, a Republican, stated: "This Albert sensor didn't do a damn thing about it. It didn't function as it was advertised."

Coffman shared his findings with members of the Lincoln County Republican Party. Months later, in February 2022, the county GOP chair, Mary Blechschmidt, issued a two-page memo about Albert sensors to her fellow county Republican chairs. In her memo, Blechschmidt wrote: "I continue to press on this issue because it is hard to imagine why a county would allow a non-profit organization such as this, access to the proprietary data on its network, 24/7 across the internet."

Despite the ongoing security problems of the Windows operating system, Albert advocates have falsely claimed that Albert could have stopped the October 2020 Windows ransomware attack on Hall County, Ga., which temporarily took down election-related systems, including a voter signature database.

For more on the security problems of the Windows operating system, see my free 400 page book at this link:

<https://freeyourselffrommicrosoftandthensa.org/>

Third, any real computer security system would use entirely open source programs. Open source means that the source code of the program is publicly available so that any interested person can **inspect and audit the code** to make sure it does not have any security flaws. You would not put your money in a bank that did not have an open set of independently audited books. In the same way, we should not put any important data in a "black box" data mining system (the term Black Box means it can not be audited).

While Albert claims to use an “open source” intrusion detection system called **Suricata**, there is no way to download the actual Albert program so that it can be inspected and audited. Suricata is indeed an Open Source program which can be inspected and audited (we describe our audit below). However it is specifically against Open Source Licensing to place an open source program inside of a Closed Source hidden program.

So because Albert can not be independently inspected, the claim that Albert is an open source program is false. Albert is a Black Box program.

The fourth red flag is that Albert advocates falsely claim the reason Albert is needed is because “Russia hacked the 2016 Presidential election.” In fact, as I explained in my 85 page report, Russia did not hack the 2016 election. Rather it was our own NSA IP addresses that hacked the 2016 election. Here is a link to this 85 page report:

<https://turningpointnews.org/hack-everything-special-report>

The fifth red flag is that bribes of \$80,000 are used to sucker counties into installing Albert. In addition, Senate Bill 5843 now imposes mandates and fines on any county that fails to install Albert. If Albert really helped with election security, bribes and fines would not be needed.

The sixth red flag is that Albert is not a real firewall (a firewall is a program designed to block harmful IP addresses). Instead Albert is the exact opposite of a firewall. Albert does not block even a single IP address. Instead, Albert goes around the network firewall to give unknown outside agents access to your data. There are plenty of excellent free firewalls that block bad IP addresses. Thus, Albert is not really needed.

All Albert does is create a hidden back door around your network firewalls. Albert then data mines ALL county network traffic, not just election-related systems. If a county really wanted to improve election security or network security, there are better options – which are entirely free.

The seventh red flag is that Albert advocates claim **Albert uses Artificial Intelligence to detect threats**. What these poorly informed advocates fail to realize is that AI programs are typically much worse than human written and human controlled programs – because humans are much smarter than any AI program.

The eighth red flag is that Albert is based on a free open source program called **Suricata which itself has many significant hidden problems as we describe in detail below.**

Before we present the Suricata audit, here is a summary of the Albert Red Flags.

Summary of 8 Albert Red Flags

#1 Centralized single point of failure rather than decentralized.

#2 Windows rather than Linux (note Albert like Suricata may have a Linux version but the fact that it is primarily Windows is a huge red flag).

#3 Black Box rather than Open Source Program

#4 Albert advocates falsely claim the reason Albert is needed is because “Russia hacked the 2016 Presidential election.”

#5 Bribing countries to use it and threatening countries who do not.

#6 Albert is not a real firewall (which is a program designed to block harmful IP addresses).

#7 Albert advocates claim Albert uses Artificial Intelligence to detect threats.

#8 Suricata has significant hidden problems as we describe in detail below.

Meet Suricata... The Albert Engine

The Albert website states: “Albert leverages Suricata’s high-performance, signature-based, IDS (Intrusion Detection System) engine to accurately identify and report malicious activity. Albert’s signatures include commercial, open-source, and signatures related to **Advanced Persistent Threat (APT) actors.**”


The reference to Advanced Persistent Threat (APT) actors is another red flag. As I explained in my article on the NSA above, APT is a term used by the NSA to fool the American people into believing that we are under attack by Russian hackers. I tracked the actual IP addresses and found that APT 29 (also known as Cozy Bear) is in fact a group of NSA hackers pretending to be Russian hackers by using an NSA program called the Marble Program – which was exposed by Wikileaks in 2016.

It is time to stop being afraid of Russia and start reigning in and or shutting down our own out of control NSA (and CIA).

In an attempt to download Suricata in order to evaluate it, I clicked on the link provided by the Albert website which led to this broken link:

suricata-ids.org

In searching this domain name, I found that it was for sale on GoDaddy.com:



I eventually found the new website for Suricata at this link:

<https://suricata.io/>

However, failing to retain the old domain name creates huge security problems. First, it prevents being able to forward links from the old domain name to the new domain name. Second, should hackers buy the original domain name, they could easily set up a fake Suricata site with a fake download page and lure thousands of people into downloading malware harmful enough to not only infect their networks – but take down their servers! This is a huge red flag indicating that whoever is running Suricata has no real interest in computer or network security.

In addition, if you right click on the source for the new website, you will find that it is a Wordpress website. Wordpress websites have hundreds of security flaws reported every year. This is another red flag that whoever runs Suricata has no real interest in computer or network security.

Next, you can go to the new Download page at this link:

<https://suricata.io/download/>

Suricata (Stable) version 7.0.3 was released February 8, 2024

Linux/Mac/FreeBSD/UNIX/Windows Source: [suricata-7.0.3.tar.gz](#)

PGP Signature: [suricata-7.0.3.tar.gz.sig](#)

Windows 64-bit installer: [Suricata-7.0.3-1-64bit.msi](#)

Ubuntu [PPA channel for Suricata 7](#)

RPM packages [RPM packages for Suricata 7](#)

Downloaded the first link which is the source code. The compressed file is 24 MB.

Extract the folder. The extracted folder is nearly 80MB so Suricata is a very large program. Here is the Suricata folder structure:

Name	Size
▶ contrib	4 items
▶ doc	12 items
▶ ebpf	11 items
▶ etc	6 items
▶ libhttp	30 items
▶ lua	1 item
▶ m4	5 items
▶ python	5 items
▶ qa	6 items
▶ rules	25 items
▶ rust	9 items
▶ scripts	1 item
▶ src	1,223 items
▶ suricata-update	15 items

There are way too many folders. It would have been better to place some folders inside of other folders to provide a better structure. Also source folder contains 7 win 32 files (which is a security risk). Ideally, any real Linux program should be Linux only.

On the next page is the root level file structure. Again way too many files just laying around. There is a principal of security that the smaller the program is the more secure it is – because hackers have fewer places to hide.

aclocal.m4	55.2 kB
acsite.m4	10.6 kB
ChangeLog	155.9 kB
compile	7.4 kB
config.guess	49.5 kB
config.rpath	0 bytes
config.sub	35.4 kB
configure	1.1 MB
configure.ac	110.5 kB
COPYING	18.1 kB
depcomp	23.6 kB
install-sh	15.4 kB
libsuricata-config.in	1.3 kB
LICENSE	18.1 kB
ltmain.sh	333.4 kB
Makefile.am	2.8 kB
Makefile.in	32.0 kB
missing	6.9 kB
README.md	5.6 kB
SECURITY.md	3.3 kB
suricata.yaml.in	85.2 kB
threshold.config	1.6 kB

Here is a quote from their security.md file: “We will not request a CVE, but if you do please let us know the CVE ID.”

CVE stands for Critical Vulnerability Exploits. It is the national database where anyone can go and learn about security problems in programs such as the Windows operating system or WordPress or any other program. The fact that Suricata do not report security problems to the national database is a another extremely bad red flag!

How to Compare Suricata to other Open source Linux Intrusion Detection Systems

Do an internet search using “Open source Linux Intrusion Detection Systems”.

You will find that there are several free open source Linux programs that are all alternatives to Suricata. These include Snort which can be downloaded at this link: <https://www.snort.org/downloads#snort3-downloads>

Snort compressed file is only 3.3 MB. Right click on Properties to see that the uncompressed folder is only 18MB.

Name:	snort3-3.1.78.0
Type:	Folder (inode/directory)
Contents:	2,503 items (and 2 hidden), totalling 18.1 MB

Snort has no real GUI or easy-to-use administrative console, although lots of other open source tools have been created to help out, such as [BASE](#) and [Sguil](#). These tools provide a web front end to query and analyze alerts coming from Snort IDS. The graphical interface adds a few more Megabytes.

There is another program originally called Bro, but renamed Zeek in 2018. Zeek is a bit different than Snort and Suricata as Zeek is both a signature IDS like Suricata and an anomaly-based IDS meaning it can catch some problems before they occur rather than after.

However, the best option is an on-premise Host-based intrusion detection systems ([HIDS](#)) that works by monitoring activity occurring internal on your own network server. HIDS applications (e.g. antivirus software, spyware-detection software, firewalls) are typically installed on most internet-connected computers within a network, or on a subset of important systems, such as servers. If your organization has a compliance mandate, such as for PCI DSS or HIPAA, then you may require HIDS to demonstrate file integrity monitoring (FIM) as well as active threat monitoring.

For example, all of my servers are Debian servers on which I have installed the free open source Hestia Control Panel. Hestia automatically installs an entire series of monitoring programs. Another full-featured open source HIDS tool is called OSSEC.

OSSEC runs on almost any major operating system including Debian. It features its own client/server based management and logging architecture, which is very important in a HIDS system. Since local HIDS can be compromised at the same time the OS is, it is very important that security and forensic information be removed from the host server and stored elsewhere to avoid any kind of tampering. Here is the link:

<https://github.com/ossec/ossec-hids>

The downloaded compressed OSSEC file is also 3.3 MB. The uncompressed folder is only 11MB – about one eighth the size of Suricata:

Name:	ossec-hids-master
Type:	Folder (inode/directory)
Contents:	1,770 items (and 4 hidden), totalling 10.9 MB

The file and folder structure of this is much better than either of the other two options and it appears to be made primarily for Debian Linux – meaning it is a real security tool.

Conclusion

Even though we were not able to examine Albert directly, we have shown that Suricata, and therefore Albert has violated severe serious security protocols. The makers of Albert claim that their program does not have the ability to reach into networks or election programs. It is only a monitoring tool. However, the fact that Albert code has not been publicly posted means there is no way of knowing what Albert is capable of doing. By forcing every county in Washington state to use Albert, what the legislature has really done is make our elections not more secure, but less secure.

As always, I look forward to your questions and comments.

Regards,

David Spring M. Ed.

DavidSpring at ProtonMail dot com