



AMERICAN CRISIS

THE EROSION OF ELECTION INTEGRITY

WINTER 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 3
The Dangers of Election Fraud: A Comprehensive Analysis..... 3

CHAPTER I: The Impact of Mail-In Voting Fraud during the COVID-19 Pandemic.....5

- 1) ...PRESIDENT CARTER’S COMMISSION..... 6
- 2) ...FEWER SAFEGUARDS AT SAME TIME MAIL-IN VOTING EXPLODES..... 7
 - Signatures No Longer Required (Continue From Here)..... 7
 - Safeguarding Against Mail-In Voter Fraud Is Not Voter Suppression..... 8
- 3) ...MAIL-IN STANDARDS DRAMATICALLY REDUCED..... 9
 - Diluting Signature Verification:..... 10
- 4) ...EASIER THAN EVER FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS TO REGISTER TO VOTE..... 11
 - Legal And Logistical Challenges..... 11
- 5) ...REFUSING TO PURGE VOTER ROLLS..... 12
 - More Ballots Mailed Than There Are Actual Voters..... 13
- 6) ...THE DANGERS OF BALLOT HARVESTING..... 13
- 7) ...BOGUS SIGNATURES WERE VERIFIED..... 15
 - Many Lawsuits, But Little Analysis..... 17

CHAPTER II: Specific Examples of Election Irregularities In The 2020 Election..... 18

- State-by-State Examples..... 18
 - Much Fraud Goes Undetected..... 18
 - Destroying or Discarding Ballots..... 20
- 1) ...PENNSYLVANIA..... 21
 - Illegally contacting voters to redo ballots..... 23
 - Illegally Allowed Undated Ballots To Be Counted..... 23
 - Ballot Discrepancies..... 23
- 2) ...MICHIGAN..... 24
 - Eliminating Match To Signature On File..... 24
 - Judge Finds, After The Election, That Secretary Of State Violated Election Laws..... 24
 - Removed Requirement Of Ballot Being Stamped Proving Signature Verification..... 25
- 3) ...WISCONSIN..... 25
 - Illegal Use Of Drop Boxes Breaking Chain Of Custody..... 25
 - Eliminated Need To List Address And Have A Witness..... 26
 - Improperly Backdating Ballots..... 26
 - Wrongly Expanding Definition Of “Indefinitely Confined”..... 26
 - Chain of Custody Breaks For Flash Drive..... 26
- 4) ...GEORGIA..... 26

Limited Ability To Reject Faulty Ballots.....	27
Improperly Opening Ballots Prior To Election Day.....	27
CHAPTER III: Yes, Voter Challenges Were Rejected In Court, But Because of Technicalities, Not on The Merits.....	28
1)... SUPREME COURT FAILED TO ACT WHEN NEEDED.....	30
CHAPTER IV: The U.S. Is An Outlier In Using Mail-In and Electronic Voting.....	32
1)... MOST DEMOCRACIES OPPOSE MAIL-IN AND ELECTRONIC VOTING.....	32
2)... THE GROWTH OF NGOs IN VOTING.....	33
3)... THE BIG TECH CONSPIRACY.....	34
4)... THE COST IMPLICATIONS OF EARLY VOTING MIXED WITH MAIL-IN VOTING.....	34
5)... THE MACHINES.....	35
CONCLUSION: The Path Forward in Combating Election Fraud.....	38
1)... VIDEOTAPE BALLOT REVIEWS.....	38
2)... MATCH BALLOT SIGNATURES TO SIGNATURE ON FILE.....	38
3)... BAN BALLOT DROP OFF BOXES.....	39
4)... END BALLOT HARVESTING.....	39
5)... REQUIRE ID WHEN SEEKING A MAIL-IN BALLOT.....	39
6)... REQUIRE, AND ENFORCE, TWO PARTY OVERSIGHT.....	39
7)... BALLOTS MUST BE REQUESTED, NOT MAILED OUT INDISCRIMINATELY...	39
8)... PURGE THE ROLLS OF VOTERS WHO DIED OR MOVED.....	40
9)... LIMIT THE USE OF ELECTRONIC VOTING.....	40

INTRODUCTION

The Dangers of Election Fraud: A Comprehensive Analysis

In the midst of the 2020 campaign, a journalist for the Las Vegas Review-Journal, Victor Joecks, came in contact with nine individuals who stated they received ballots in the mail even though they never asked for them. Some were in the name of people who were deceased or had long ago moved away.

Joecks conducted an experiment by signing the names of these individuals in his penmanship and then having the voters trace his penmanship onto the ballots themselves. Of the nine ballots that were mailed into the board of elections, ONLY ONE was rejected.

The logical next question is: How many other such bogus ballots were accepted in that election and in others thereafter?

The only truthful answer is: We just don't know. This is of enormous concern since many elections are determined by a relative handful of votes. Such concerns have prompted our Center to do a deep dive into our rapidly changing electoral process, and the erosion of voting integrity safeguards that have been implemented since the advent of the pandemic.

Consideration should be given to the following:

- Election irregularities are demonstrably real, and are a concern regardless of their impact on election outcomes. Any amount of election irregularity should be prevented if we wish to maintain the American public's confidence in our electoral system.
- While the mainstream media maintains that claims of voter irregularities since the 2020 election have been "debunked", this white paper provides specific examples that said irregularities were indeed real and, at times, quite significant. Some examples are listed below.
- Secretaries of State usurped the exclusive jurisdiction of state legislators in enacting election reforms that diluted election safeguards.
- Mail-in signatures no longer needed to be compared to signatures on file.
- Some voters were allowed to correct their mail-in ballots, contrary to existing statutes, while others were not.
- Undated ballots were counted.
- There was sworn testimony of ballots being improperly backdated and counted.
- Drop boxes were allowed without proper chain of custody and without legal authority.

- The need to list an address and have a witness was eliminated in numerous jurisdictions.
- Computer glitches gave thousands of votes to the wrong candidate
<https://www.freep.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/11/06/antrim-county-vote-glitch-software-update/6194745002/>
- Mail-in ballots were illegally sent out to millions of voters who never requested them, in violation of state law.

Can it still be said that there was no proof of voter irregularities in 2020? The bigger question is whether we will do anything to eliminate the potential for such fraud and irregularities for future elections. Our faith in our precious electoral system is at stake, especially given the fact that a 2023 survey found that 75% of likely voters had concerns about the security of our elections.
<https://excellenceinpolling.com/poll/2023-national-voter-pulse-poll/>

CHAPTER I:

The Impact of Mail-In Voting Fraud during the COVID-19 Pandemic

For those on the fence about the efficacy of universal mail-in voting, take note that more than 500,000 mail-in ballots were rejected in the primaries preceding the vast electoral changes that followed COVID.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/rejected-mail-ballots/2020/08/23/397f92e9-809e-b8be57ba616e_story.html

That figure dropped dramatically in the 2020 general election, following the extensive dilution of absentee voter guardrails.

The new trend is to support universal mail-in voting, in part prompted by the COVID crisis. The original concept of allowing vulnerable people to have more access to an absentee ballot is very sensible during a pandemic, but the plan has now morphed into the mailing of ballots to every registered voter. This can have enormous unforeseen and unnecessary consequences. We must keep in mind that voting rolls get stale and are not adequately purged of the deceased or those who have moved away. Consequently, we might end up in a scenario of having more ballots circulating in the electorate than registered voters.

Some say there is little to no fraud in our voting process. While it's accurate that voter fraud is rare, just a few illegitimate votes can tilt an election. In a Minnesota Senate race years ago, the 312 vote margin of victory for the victor, Senator Al Franken, was smaller than the number of contested votes - 393.

<https://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/peter-roff/2010/07/20/al-franken-may-have-won-his-senate-seat-through-voter-fraud>

In 2016, Donald Trump won three states - Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania - by a combined 80,000 votes.

President George Bush won the Electoral College because he won Florida by a mere 537 votes.
<https://constitutioncenter.org/blog/on-this-day-bush-v-gore-anniversary>

In the town of Brookhaven, New York (which has a population of 475,000), Councilwoman Connie Kepert lost her election by four votes.

The congressman from that area was elected only after a recount and the absentee ballots were opened.

Every vote counts.

A 2018 Congressional race in North Carolina was overturned and rescheduled after it was determined that the Republican campaign collected mail-in ballots from various people and manipulated them.

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/understanding-the-election-scandal-in-north-carolinas-9th-district/>

There's a significant difference between an individual affirmatively asking for a ballot and the government sending them out indiscriminately to everyone on the voter rolls. A more open voting process is a laudable goal, as long as it is balanced by the need to retain the integrity of the voting process.

1) ...PRESIDENT CARTER'S COMMISSION

The Heritage Foundation referenced the 2005 commission headed by former President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State James Baker, which highlighted the importance of "signature verification" as a critical "safeguard to protect ballot integrity" for ballots cast by mail. Carter-Baker Report, at 35.

Without safeguards such as signature verification, the report stated that "vote by mail is ... likely to increase the risks of fraud and contested elections ... where the safeguards for ballot integrity are weaker."

<https://capitalresearch.org/article/todays-left-opposes-everything-jimmy-carter-proposed-on-elections/>

The importance of signature verification is hard to overstate because absentee-ballot fraud schemes often involve "common techniques of signature forging". Typically, the frauds are conducted by nefarious actors who are unfamiliar with the voter's signature. Verifying the voter's signature thus provides a fundamental safeguard against fraud.

Heritage noted further that the Carter-Baker Commission made recommendations in favor of preventing such insecurity in the handling of ballots. For example, the Commission recommended that:

States should make sure that absentee ballots received by election officials before Election Day are kept secure until they are opened and counted (at p46). It also recommended that States prohibit 'third-party' organizations, candidates, and political party activists from handling absentee ballots.

Even the liberal *New York Times* and *Washington Post* published articles warning of potential fraud with massive mail-in voting. Such warnings came as well from liberal SCOTUS Justice David Souter.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/07/us/politics/as-more-vote-by-mail-faulty-ballots-could-impair-elections.html>https://www.bdtonline.com/opinion/from-the-opinion-page-is-2020-the-most-unusual-presidential-election-in-american-history/article_643c73c0-2e01-11eb-8102-2f5743f77e9e.html

2) ...FEWER SAFEGUARDS AT SAME TIME MAIL-IN VOTING EXPLODES

It is not necessarily the case that fraud did not occur in the 2020 presidential election just because the number of proven voter fraud cases in Georgia did not exceed the 12,000 vote differential in that state.

The problem related to fraud is that we don't know what we don't know. Thus, we must endeavor to ensure that every logical measure is employed to at least reduce, to the greatest extent feasible, the possibility that fraud will occur.

If you adopt a system of leaving the door to your safe wide open and the money hasn't yet been stolen, that doesn't mean that you should keep that foolish system in place. While there was no proof of a theft, it's just a matter of time before it does occur, when such an illogical, counter-intuitive policy is allowed to stand.

The fraud and/or irregularities of the past were remarkably exacerbated in 2020, as the use of mail-in voting skyrocketed at the very same time that safeguards to protect the veracity of the mailed ballots were significantly eroded. As referenced above, the Carter-Baker Commission stated that absentee ballots are “**the largest source of potential voter fraud.**”

In the 2020 general election, 65 million votes were cast by mail compared to 33.5 million in the 2016 general election, a 94% increase.

<https://apnews.com/article/health-elections-coronavirus-pandemic-election-2020-campaign-2016-f6b627a5576014a55a7252e542e46508>

https://ballotpedia.org/Analysis_of_absentee/mail-in_voting%2C_2016-2018

Georgia had 1,305,659 absentee mail-in ballots in 2020 with a rejection rate of .37%.

<https://elections-blog.mit.edu/articles/deep-dive-absentee-ballot-rejection-2020-general-election>. 2016 had a rejection rate of 6.42%, which was 17 times greater. If the rejection rate was the same for the two elections there would have been 83,517 fewer ballots tabulated in 2020, which was more than the 12,670 vote differential between the candidates.

Voter safeguards were so diminished that year that it is just a matter of time before an election is indeed corrupted to the point of allowing a losing candidate to be declared the victor.

Signatures No Longer Required (Continue From Here)

An NPR article noted how some lawmakers were seeking to totally re-write election law rules by removing the requirement that signatures be on the ballot envelopes or that witness signatures be supplied.

<https://www.npr.org/2020/06/01/865043618/need-a-witness-for-your-mail-in-ballot-new-pandemic-lawsuits-challenge-old-rules>

<https://www.vox.com/2020/10/24/21531640/pennsylvania-supreme-court-ballots-mail-signatures>

“Among the main targets are witness and signature requirements for absentee ballots such as signing the envelope, or getting a witness or notary to sign it, or making sure the voter's signature is legible.”

500,000 mail-in ballots were invalidated in the 2020 primaries for not being verifiable.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/rejected-mail-ballots/2020/08/23/397f92db-3d11-ea809e-b8be57ba616e_story.html

The margin of victory for Joe Biden in swing states was as follows: PA. 47,000; WI 20,000; AR 15,000; and GA 12,000. The 94,000 total for all four states was far less than the number of mail-in ballots that were disqualified just a few months earlier in the primaries.

Because mail-in ballots are susceptible to fraud, lawmakers had in the past put safeguards in place to ensure their integrity. Those safeguards were eviscerated for the general election on Nov 3 in many

states. <https://abcnews.gov.com/Politics/750000-mail-ballots-rejected-2016-2018-matters/story?id=73645323>

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/>

<https://justthenews.com/politics-policy/elections/one-fifth-all-mail-ballots-disqualified-nyc-primary-signaling-possible>

Safeguarding Against Mail-In Voter Fraud Is Not Voter Suppression

A major movement was undertaken by some elements of academia, high-tech, the media, and the corporate world suggesting that efforts to guard against voter fraud were somehow disguised efforts of voter suppression. But concerns about maintaining the integrity of the electoral process are not harbored just in some factions of the political arena. They are privately held by the same corporations that, ironically, publicly advocate for more mail-in voting.

For instance, Amazon promoted itself as a major player in the movement to expand mail-in voting in the 2020 election. Their website states:

Amazon Studios announced a new digital initiative aimed at educating and engaging American voters by focusing on regionally-targeted activity. Inspired by the Amazon Original movie *All In: The Fight for Democracy*, an examination of our nation's history of voting and voter suppression, the initiative will assemble a team of 50 influential actors, artists, musicians, athletes, and newsmakers to use their platform to educate voters and mobilize participation in the upcoming elections.

Yet, when it came to Amazon's own internal elections to determine whether they would permit unionization of their employees, they suddenly became concerned about the integrity of the election process. While the union proponents were seeking mail-in voting opportunities for the employees, Amazon management fought vigorously against mail-in voting because they believed it could lead to voter fraud and manipulation.

According to an article from *The Guardian*:

“Amazon is attempting to force workers planning to unionize at an Alabama warehouse to vote in person rather than by mail as it fights off a landmark attempt by its staff to organize.”(<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2021/jan/27/amazon-seeks-to-block-workers-from-voting-by-mail-in-landmark-union-drive>)

3) ...MAIL-IN STANDARDS DRAMATICALLY REDUCED

Mail-in votes, which were vigorously supervised prior to the 2020 general election were allowed to pass muster with remarkably light oversight. About two percent of absentee ballots were rejected during the primaries prior to COVID, based on data from 25 states, according to Michael McDonald, a professor of political science at the University of Florida.<https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/elections/more-1-percent-mail-ballots-may-be-rejected-say-experts-n1245017>

In 2020 that rejection rate plummeted to a mere .2% (point two percent) in the general election.

Similar trends have been observed in Pennsylvania, whose rate was 0.03% in 2020 compared to around 1% in 2016.

In Nevada, the rejection rate more than halved from 1.60% in 2016 to around 0.75% in the 2020 general election.

North Carolina's rate fell from about 2.7% in 2016 to 0.8% in 2020.

<https://justthenews.com/politics-policy/elections/key-swing-states-year-mail-ballot-rejections-plummeted-2016-rates>

After the relatively high disqualification rate in the primaries, numerous political operatives got to work, changing laws and getting predictable decisions from friendly judges to eviscerate signature oversight. As a result, almost every ballot, regardless of their flaws which would have been disqualifying in the past, were sailing through in the general election. This discrepancy accounts for tens of thousands of mail-in votes that were accepted in the 2020 general election that ordinarily would have been rejected in the past.

At the very same time we were significantly expanding mail-in voting, we were dramatically reducing oversight and the rules that would bolster signature verification. Numerous Governors and Secretaries of State changed the laws in various jurisdictions to remove the requirement that the signature on the mail-in ballot matched the signature that the voter had on file when registered.

<https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-election/ballots-can-t-be-tossed-out-over-voter-signature-court-n1244585>

They allowed for the signature on the actual ballot to simply match the signature on the request for the ballot, rather than the one on file at the board of elections that was obtained when the individual registered. The difference is significant.

Many states require registration under penalty of perjury and often mandate providing proof of identity. Yet, in other states, anyone can fill out a ballot request for someone else and the state may not know the difference. If a fraudster files a request for the ballot of a deceased person who has not been purged from the voter rolls, the fraudster will receive the ballot, only to fill it out and send it back in with his own signature that matches the same signature - his own - when he requested the ballot in the first place. It will not match the dead person's signature on file, but no one will even check in these states.

The mail-in the ballot is secured within an envelope that must be signed. Once the envelope is opened, in some states it is now discarded. There is no longer a paper trail to determine if that signature is a match. This is especially venomous when there is no loyal opposition observing the opening of that envelope simultaneously.”

Diluting Signature Verification:

Meanwhile, there were other officials simultaneously engaging in efforts to water down or eliminate signature verification requirements.

In some states, the pre-Covid rules stated that **both** the Democrat and Republican poll watchers had to agree that a signature was legitimate. During Covid, the state legislature changed the rules allowing a signature to be accepted by just having one of the two poll watchers agree to it, eliminating the concept of checks and balances.

<https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/mail-voting-what-has-changed-2020>

Why would anyone want to encourage potentially illicit signatures to be counted? Some also took the mischievous step of automatically having individuals who obtain driver's licenses become registered to vote. This is the case, even if they are illegal aliens.

In the old days, the registration would not take effect unless the individual affirmatively checked the box that they wanted to be registered. Now, in some states, they are automatically registered unless they OPT OUT

<https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/automatic-voter-registration-summary>.

This is alarming since there is no requirement for proof of citizenship in getting a driver's license in New York and in numerous other states across America. Therefore, even if an illegal alien did not intend to become registered, it is possible that thousands and thousands around the country will be getting registered. Then, when they receive a ballot in their mailbox, they will believe they have the legitimate right to vote.

4) ...EASIER THAN EVER FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS TO REGISTER TO VOTE

Even though illegal aliens are technically not permitted to vote, at least in federal elections, some states have made it very easy for them to do so.

California actually brags about not requiring picture ID.

“Do you know you can register to vote and vote in California without having to show a picture ID?” asked EIPCa chief analyst Ellen Swensen. “The [voter] registration form says, ‘Give us your driver’s license number or your Social Security, if you have one.’ And if you don’t, you can still register,” said Swensen.

<https://www.foxnews.com/media/illegal-immigrants-voting-election-integrity>

Once registered, it’s not too difficult to simply request a ballot. What’s more alarming is that some states will automatically send you a ballot once registered.

How many illegal aliens voted is impossible to know. It’s certainly not the millions that Donald Trump claims, but in close elections, even a small amount can shift an election. Moreover, while the number of non-citizens voting was not in the millions, an astonishing 10% of noncitizens admitted to being registered to vote, according to the Heritage Foundation’s Oversight Project. Assuming there are twenty million illegal aliens in the country, that would mean about two million non-citizens are registered. <https://x.com/OversightPR/status/1808873149745803642>

Legal And Logistical Challenges

Some congressional leaders are taking affirmative action to actually prevent the mitigation of fraud within our electoral process. Then Speaker Nancy Pelosi actually went to the extraordinary step of introducing through the House, HR 1 back in 2021

<https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/1>. The bill sought to use a massive Covid relief bill as an umbrella under which major changes to the voting process could be nationalized. The bill would:

- 1)... Banned states from requiring notarization or witness signatures on absentee ballots.
- 2)... Ban any type of ID requirement.
- 3)... Require states to allow completed absentee ballots to be picked up by candidates, political consultants, and party activists (ballot harvesting), thereby eviscerating ballot chain of custody.
- 4)... And speaking of ending the chain of custody, what fair minded individual would promote a policy, as this bill does, that allows political operatives to dump hundreds of ballots into a box on a street corner instead of delivering them to an election board. This bill sought just that.
- 5)... Force states to allow same-day registration – the ability to register and vote at the same time on Election Day—providing no time for election officials to verify the accuracy and validity of the voter registration.

<https://www.heritage.org/election-integrity/commentary/avenues-voter-fraud-have-no-place-coronavirus-bill>

5) ...REFUSING TO PURGE VOTER ROLLS

Some members of Congress aggressively fought efforts to purge the voter rolls of individuals who died or moved within the last several years. Why would anyone oppose this? Some may claim that they want these names in the system so that operatives with nefarious intent can obtain one of the millions of ballots that are allowed to float within our system and thereafter sign the name of one of those individuals who died or moved away.

It was not a sketchy right-wing group but the universally respected Pew Research Center that reported in 2012 that 1 of every 8 voter registrations, about 24 million in the United States, “are no longer valid or are significantly inaccurate,” that “ [more than 1.8 million deceased individuals](#) are listed as voters,” and that “approximately 2.75 million people have registrations in more than one state.” Improved state laws and better enforcement since then have cleaned up some, but nowhere near all, of this mess.

<https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/restoring-america/fairness-justice/major-garrett-smears-citizens-for-policing-voter-rolls?dicbo=v2-UmkHpul>

The opposition to voting integrity became so extreme within some ranks that they even opposed Virginia’s Governor Glenn Younkin in his 2024 quest to remove from the voting rolls individuals who admitted they are not here legally.

<https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf> The Justice Department jumped into court to stop it. Once again we ask: Why would anyone seek to stop these measures intended on preventing fraud?

Dead people are voting.

In Nevada, where Biden was up by 40,000 votes, it’s been documented that 41,000 individuals are still on the voter rolls ten years after having last voted - meaning many, if not most, have died or moved out of state.

In Suffolk County , NY a man was indicted for seeking an absentee ballot on behalf of his deceased mother. How many such bogus requests were not caught by officials? We just don’t know. <https://www.danspapers.com/2020/10/hamptons-charged-absentee-ballots-dead-mom/>

In the past, it was common to purge voters off the lists if they’ve been inactive. But recently, many in the media nonsensically have claimed this is an attempt of voter suppression. So, the dead remain on the rolls and ballots are being cast in their name through the relaxed standards related to mail-in voting.

<https://theintercept.com/2020/05/28/pennsylvania-voter-rolls-purge-judicial-watch/>

More Ballots Mailed Than There Are Actual Voters

California sent out ballots to all of its 21 million registered voters whether they asked for them or not. Since we know many of those registrants are deceased or moved, it means there are huge

numbers of extra ballots circulating throughout the system. Some will be thrown in the trash, but many will be filled out and mailed back in by those with no authority to do so.

The mainstream media claims there was no evidence of fraud in the 2020 election. Whether there was enough illegality or irregularities to overturn the election is one question, but it should be beyond debate that we should take every measure possible to prevent potential fraud in the future. This has nothing to do with Joe Biden, Donald Trump, or Kamala Harris. It had everything to do with the faith Americans have in their electoral system.

6) ...THE DANGERS OF BALLOT HARVESTING

In a major 2024 decision, the United States Supreme Court upheld an Arizona statute that prohibits the use of ballot harvesting.

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2021/07/01/supreme-court-oks-ballot-harvesting-ban-amid-flurry-voting-laws/7327138002/> This is good news for those concerned about election integrity.

What is ballot harvesting?

Imagine that a country that was subjected to dictatorial rule for a century was finally going to be holding a public election. Imagine further that the United States was asked to monitor the proceedings to ensure that the election was fair. What if the dictator were to suggest that he can improve the election by having his agents knock on the doors of the voters and tell them that he and his people will take their ballots for them and deposit them at the election board?

Anyone concerned about election integrity would call this an outrageous attempt to intimidate voters and to inject fraud into the electoral process. But wait! That is exactly what many politicians are promoting for our US elections.

This is a complete obliteration of the chain of custody between the voter and the board of elections.

As noted above, many states, including Arizona and New York, had banned this practice because of the potential manipulation, intimidation and fraud involved. But others, such as California and Nevada, allow third parties, even non-related persons, to collect ballots for others.

<https://www.wnct.com/news/politics/ballot-harvesting-targeted-amid-fight-over-voting-rules/> And this year, New York joined the ranks of states permitting this odious process.

As the November election approached, the Nevada Assembly passed legislation that would allow the state to mail a ballot to every registered voter, and the bill allows for third parties to collect ballots. The Nevada law did not limit how many ballots a person can collect.

Some political operatives try to justify harvesting by claiming it is an expansion of the voting process and any objection to it is a racist attempt to suppress the minority vote. This is ridiculous, of course, but the argument has, unfortunately, gained traction. Though there are still a number of states that allow it, this Supreme Court decision will at least allow states the

autonomy to block this practice. You don't have to think we need to overturn the 2020 election to agree that ballot harvesting goes against everything a secret, secure, free ballot stands for.

The reason in person voting is so valued is because you can't transfer your body to someone else, as you can with a ballot. Once the ballot is placed in a mailbox the voter must rely on the ballot getting there on time, or even getting there at all. And because there is no real time signature that comes with them, as with in person vote, we rely on poll inspectors to verify the veracity of the signature on the mail-in the ballot.

An even more egregious example was caught on tape in St. Paul, Minnesota. There, a Democratic operative was seen bragging about how he went apartment by apartment in a housing complex, helping to fill out mail-in ballots and collecting them from the voters. <https://nypost.com/2020/09/27/project-veritas-uncovers-ballot-harvesting-fraud-in-minnesota/>

Under Minnesota law, no individual can be the “designated agent” for more than three absentee voters, but the operative collected more than 300, all for the same Democratic candidate.

According to the *New York Post's* Miranda Devine, a Minneapolis-based former political worker, said that before Minnesota's primary elections, ballot harvesters “took every single ballot” from elderly people in a Minneapolis public housing complex — the Charles Horn Towers.

“Knock on the door and say, ‘Your ballots come? Give it to me.’ ”

She alleges Omar's long-serving staffer, campaign deputy district director Ali (Isse) Gainey, was “coordinating everything.”

“Cash, cash, cash. They were carrying bags of money. . . . When you vote and they mark you off, then you get in the van, they give you the cash.”

Omar asks: “So they request for the elderly?”

Mohamed says: “Yes, they request for them.”

Omar: “And it is taken away from them?”

Mohamed: “Yes, it is taken away from them.”

Twenty six states allow a voter to designate someone else to return their ballot for them, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

7) ...BOGUS SIGNATURES WERE VERIFIED

As noted in the opening passage to this white paper, Las Vegas Review Journal columnist, Victor Joecks, was in contact with nine individuals who claimed they received ballots mailed to their homes in the name of people who no longer resided there.

<https://www.reviewjournal.com/opinion/opinion-columns/victor-joecks/victor-joecks-clark-county-election-officials-accepted-my-signature-on-8-ballot-envelopes-2182390/>

He signed the names of the nine individuals in his own penmanship on separate paper. The voters thereafter traced over his penmanship to sign their names on their ballots. Consequently, the election boards were receiving ballots in the penmanship of the investigative reporter, not the voters. Astonishingly, eight of the nine were approved.

So the next natural question is: How many other bogus ballots prevailed in that election and others thereafter? The only honest answer is: We simply don't know! And that is the main problem with absentee voting.

In another recent case, six individuals were indicted in Queens County, New York for absentee ballot mail fraud.

<https://qns.com/2024/07/six-indicted-voter-fraud-2023-gop-primary-northeast-queens-da/>

It's essential to understand that the only reason they were caught was because a voter whose name was improperly used by the suspects went to vote and discovered a vote had already been cast in his name. That was the fatal flaw employed by the suspected scammers. If they were more sophisticated, they would have asked for ballots from individuals they knew were still on the voter rolls, but had passed away or moved.

For professional scammers, it's not all that difficult. A well-funded operation can cross reference the county clerk's offices to discover which individuals moved over the last few years and who died. Then they simply request an absentee ballot in the names of those people. Once the ballot arrives to them in the mail, they scribble down a signature and place it in a dropbox. Rarely is a ballot with a fraudulent signature disqualified.

We know this firsthand since we've been experimenting with this process. For the last several years, we have just been scribbling our names on the voter roll when we vote. The scribble looks nothing like the one on record in the book in front of the inspector. We've never been questioned.

This past primary season our contact made a request for an absentee ballot. She signed the request with an illegible signature that did not match the signature on record. No questions were asked, and she received the ballot. She then illegibly scribbled her name again on the actual ballot and mailed it in. It was approved.

Before you say this warning is coming from a conservative analyst, note the individuals indicted in Queens were Republicans. Americans desiring election integrity should shut down all potential fraud, regardless from which side of the aisle it may emanate from.

Some have suggested that the grand design behind those pushing for these new rules is to combine mail-in voting with ballot harvesting and drop boxes.

This should be alarming. Perpetuating this fraud is not as complex as one would think.

Step One:

The elections board mails out to every individual whether a ballot was requested or not.

Step Two:

Allow mail-in ballots to be utilized regardless of reason.

Step Three:

Send political operatives (maybe paid for through Zuckerbucks?) to high density areas such as apartment complexes, college campuses, and nursing homes. Knock on the doors with a ballot in hand and ask the resident to check off the box, sign the ballot and give it back to the operative. The operative takes the ballot and puts it in a dropbox without anyone knowing where it came from. (If the voter checked the wrong box is it dumped in the trash?)

Combine that with seeking ballots from the board of elections for those already identified as having died or moved and are still on the rolls, and you've got a magnificent recipe for voter fraud.

And remember it doesn't take a great deal of fraud to tilt an election. The margin of victory in that Queens race was 181 votes.

Add into the equation that many states are automatically registering people to vote when they apply for a driver's license. Illegal aliens in numerous states can receive such licenses. While in the past, one would have to check off a box that you wanted to register to vote, now in New York, you automatically become registered unless you opt out.

<https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/governor-cuomo-signs-automatic-voter-registration-law-new-york>

How are the inspectors at the elections boards to know that an illegal alien is voting if they were registered to vote by our government?

How many of these individuals are being registered to vote? Again, we just don't know.

Many Lawsuits, But Little Analysis

But, you say, what about the fact that there were dozens of legal challenges in the 2020 electoral process, almost all of which were unsuccessful?

As more fully expanded upon in the final section below, these judicial decrees were based mostly on procedural matters, such as the plaintiffs lacking standing or the claims being declared moot now that the election was over, or that a plaintiff victory would not alter the ultimate outcome of the election. Such was the case with the lawsuit initiated by the Texas Attorney General Ken

Paxton.

<https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>

The suit petitioned the court to overturn various state election certifications because their alleged voting irregularities diluted the impact of Texas voters. The court never did delve into the very specific charges that were pleaded by the petitioners. The John Roberts Supreme Court ducked the issue by claiming Texas did not have standing to bring the case against other states.

Consequently, the underlying charges of fraud were never deliberated upon. It does not mean that no fraud existed.

An examination of the evidence laid out by Paxton could lead a neutral observer to conclude that election irregularities, and a dramatic dilution of electoral safeguards, were indeed prevalent in the 2020 election, and that action is needed to correct these threats to the integrity of the electoral process.

Below are just some examples that lay out specific instances of these diminished safeguards. After reading this synopsis, it's hard to comprehend how media outlets can continue to regurgitate the false narrative that claims voter irregularities were unsubstantiated.

CHAPTER II:

Specific Examples of Election Irregularities In The 2020 Election

Read just about any article by the Associated Press on the 2020 election and it will likely incorporate a sentence stating as fact that claims of voter fraud were debunked and that there is no evidence of such fraud. Many have taken these statements at face value and called for all of America to “move on, there’s nothing to see here.”

Unfortunately, too much of the discussion revolved around whether the election was “stolen.” This became a distraction because it tilted the conversation toward whether there was so much fraud as to have altered the outcome of the election. With a seven million popular vote differential, it is unlikely that the outcome would have been different had there been no fraud at all. But the question here isn’t just whether there was fraud, but also whether there was such a high degree of voter irregularity and such a dilution of voting safeguards that 30% of the American public wound up believing that the voting process was not fair, according to a Monmouth poll

<https://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meetthepressblog/almost-third-americans-still-believe-2020-election-result-was-fraudulent-rcna90145> .

Moreover, there is a persistent fear that there is at least a real potential that such a broken system can one day result in such a degree of irregularity that an election outcome can indeed be altered. This is especially so where in some congressional races the margin of victory was a mere six votes. The task at present is to ensure that voter safeguards that were eliminated or diluted these past election cycles due to the pandemic are reversed for future elections.

Much Fraud Goes Undetected

One of the problems here is that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to uncover and prove every fraudulent transaction. The US Government Accountability Office concluded that many crimes of election fraud likely go undetected. In 2014, the GAO reported that “crimes of fraud, in particular, are difficult to detect, as those involved are engaged in intentional deception.”

Remarkably, up to one in five people admitted to engaging in an action that violated election law. <https://fox59.com/business/press-releases/globenewswire/8993653/heartland-rasmussen-poll-one-in-five-mail-in-voters-admit-to-committing-at-least-one-kind-of-voter-fraud-during-2020-election/>

Even prior to the 2020 election, there were a significant number of voter fraud crimes, some of which indeed altered election outcomes.

A News21 expose, “Election Fraud in America,” identified 491 cases of absentee ballot fraud over the 12 years from 2000 to 2012. This database reports that “Absentee Ballot Fraud” was

“[t]he most prevalent fraud” in America, comprising “24 percent (491 cases)” of all cases reported in the public records surveyed.

<https://votingrights.news21.com/interactive/election-fraud-database/&xid=17259,15700023,15700124,15700149,15700186,15700191,15700201,15700237,15700242>

The Heritage Foundation, over a series of elections, identified 207 cases of voter fraud in the use of absentee ballots in the US.

In November 2019, the mayor of Berkeley, Missouri was indicted on five felony counts of absentee ballot fraud for changing votes and absentee ballots to help him and his allies get elected. The scheme included “going to the home of elderly residents“ to harvest absentee ballots, “filling out absentee ballot applications for voters and having his campaign workers do the same“ and “altering absentee ballots after he took them from voters.”

In 2016, a race in Missouri was overturned upon allegations of widespread absentee ballot fraud.

That same year, a politician in the Bronx, Ben Kochman, was indicted and pleaded guilty to 242 counts of election fraud based on absentee ballots. The race was decided by two votes.

As noted above, a 2018 congressional election in North Carolina was overturned due to operatives for a candidate illegally harvesting ballots and doctoring the ballots themselves.

In 2020, the leader of the New Jersey NAACP called for an election in Paterson, New Jersey to be overturned due to widespread mail-in ballot fraud. It was reported that 20% of the ballots were disqualified.

Also in 2020, the political advocacy group, Project Veritas, exposed Snapchat videos posted by Liban Mohamed, who was bragging about ballot harvesting to the brother-in-law of a city council candidate named Jamal Osman. Project Veritas described a portion of the video:

Mr. Mohamed displayed a vast number of ballots littering his car’s dashboard while boasting in Somali, ‘[n]umbers don’t lie! You can see my car is full here. All these here are absentee ballots. Can’t you see? Look at all these, my car is full,’ and ‘[j]ust today we got 300 (ballots) for Jamal Osman.’ In another video, Mr. Mohamed filmed himself exiting an apartment complex with his hand stuffed with voters’ ballots and boasting, ‘[t]wo in the morning. Still hustling.’ <http://www.repfrankryan.com/ElectionIrregularities>

Mollie Hemingway of The Federalist exclaimed:

“The video also included interviews with named sources, as well as multiple confidential sources. Omar Jamal, a community service officer for the Ramsey County Sheriff’s Office and a political consultant in the Minneapolis Somali-American community, said there was widespread corruption by Somali-American politicians, including cash payments to elderly voters in exchange for their absentee ballots.”

<https://thefederalist.com/2021/03/22/project-veritas-wins-early-round-in-defamation-lawsuit-against-new-york-times/>

In early 2021, a judge in Mississippi overturned an election that was decided by 37 votes. It was determined that at least 66 mail-in ballots had been improperly cast.

<https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/mississippi-election-thrown-out-for-absentee-ballot-fraud/>

Some insiders readily admit voter fraud is real.

An August *New York Post* article uncovered that, “A top Democratic operative says voter fraud, especially with mail-in ballots, is no myth. And he knows this because he’s been doing it, on a grand scale, for decades.”

<https://nypost.com/2020/08/29/political-insider-explains-voter-fraud-with-mail-in-ballots/>

“The whistleblower — whose identity, rap sheet and long history working as a consultant to various campaigns were confirmed by The Post — says he not only changed ballots himself over the years, but led teams of fraudsters and mentored at least 20 operatives in New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania — a critical 2020 swing state.’This is a real thing,’ he said. ‘And there is going to be a f—king war coming November 3rd over this stuff ... If they knew how the sausage was made, they could fix it.’”

He described creating counterfeit mail-in ballots that would be inserted into envelopes collected from elderly voters. He also mentioned colluding with a mail carrier who made 500 ballots disappear.

Destroying or Discarding Ballots

In Paterson, New Jersey, two officials were charged with election fraud last month after hundreds of mail-in ballots were discarded.

In Pennsylvania, nine military ballots from the 2016 election, most for Trump, were found in a dumpster.

One individual in Boston set fire to a drop off box, destroying 120 ballots. A week earlier a man was charged for setting ablaze a drop off box in CA

<https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/man-charged-burning-ballot-drop-box-boston-738373>
13

In Detroit, a city elections worker stated he was ordered to backdate ballots to ensure they were counted, even though they missed the deadline. It was thereafter falsely claimed that he recanted his testimony.

State-by-State Examples:

The legal brief submitted by Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton was just one source that got into the details as to how many states engaged in practices during the 2020 election that were quite questionable. It must be remembered that Paxton's allegations were never considered by the courts because his filing was dismissed on the dubious decision that the attorney general lacked standing to bring the suit.

1) ...PENNSYLVANIA

Under the US Constitution, the only entity empowered with authority to enact and oversee election law is a state legislature or Congress.

In Article I, Section 4, the Constitution states:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

Neither a governor, a Secretary of State, nor a state court, has the legal authority to change election law without approval of the state legislature. But that is exactly what happened in several states prior to the 2020 election.

As late as 2019, the Pennsylvania legislature in a bipartisan fashion stated that the deadline for receiving mail-in ballots was 8 PM on Election Day. PA STAT sec. 3146.6(c). The governor tried to extend the deadline beyond Election Day. The legislature refused.

A lawsuit was initiated by a non-profit aligned with the Governor to bypass the legislature.

The PA Supreme Court, according to many scholars, illegally extended the mail-in deadline by three days after the election.

The US Supreme Court agreed not to take up the Pennsylvania case before election on the promise by the Secretary of State that the additional questionable ballots received post Election Day would be segregated.

The development meant the court would not consider the case until after Election Day, though the court's three most conservative members indicated they would have preferred to rule on the extension before then.

Justice Amy Coney Barrett, who took the bench that same month, did not take part in considering the case. Justice Samuel Alito, in a statement joined by two fellow conservatives, wrote: "I reluctantly conclude that there is simply not enough time at this late date to decide the question before the election." The vote of five justices was needed to expedite a review of the case, which the GOP's request failed to garner. The denial, however, did not prevent the court from taking up the GOP request for a ruling on the merits.

Alito, along with Justices Clarence Thomas and Neil Gorsuch, held out the possibility that the court could still act on the request in time to impact how votes are counted in Pennsylvania.

They added that there is a "strong likelihood" the state court-ordered extension is unconstitutional.

After the election, the Republicans once again asked the court to rule on the actions of the state governor and Secretary of State, who settled the matter without Legislative approval. Remarkably the court punted. In essence it claimed that at this late date, the issue was moot and failed to rule on the merits. Basically, for those challenging the actions of the Pennsylvania officials it was "tails they win, heads you lose."

The Paxton brief also alleged that in addition to allowing the late ballots to be counted, the PA state court also:

- *...claimed that non-postmarked ballots were presumptively timely, and

- *...allowed the Secretary of State to illegally water down the signature verification process.

The wording of the PA law is clear:

"The application of any qualified elector...for an official absentee ballot in any primary or election shall be signed by the applicant..." PA STAT 3146.2 (d) and 3156.12 (c).

Additionally, the envelope of each ballot must be verified.

"When the county board meets...the board shall examine the declaration on the envelope of each ballot...and shall compare the information thereon with that contained in the registered absentee and mail-in voter file..." 25 PS section 3146.8.

Finally, signatures at the polling place must be verified according to Pennsylvania law, in that:

"Such a Watch officer... shall compare the electronic signature on his voter certificate with the signature in the district register." 25 PS section 30508 a3(2)."

Despite these legal requirements, the League of Women Voters sued Pennsylvania to eliminate the signature verification procedures for mail-in voting, seeking a declaratory judgment of Pennsylvania's existing signature verification procedures for mail-in voting as being unlawful. According to Paxton, the Secretary of State unilaterally, and illegally, settled with them, eliminating the verifications.

The settlement claimed: "The Pennsylvania election code does not authorize the county board of elections to set aside returned absentee or mail-in ballots based solely on signature analysis by the county board of elections."

According to many legal scholars the Pennsylvania Supreme Court improperly ratified the Secretary of State's action. The court said that even though a signature was required, it did not have to be verified. The amicus brief presented by Pennsylvania House members to the Texas lawsuit before the US Supreme Court stated:

Notwithstanding these clear textual requirements, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court eviscerated the signature matching safeguard and held 'that county boards of elections are prohibited from rejecting absentee or mail-in ballots based on signature comparison conducted by county election officials or employees, or as the result of third-party challenges based on signature analysis and comparisons.' In re November 3, 2020 General Election, 240 A.3d 591, 611 (Pa. 2020)..

Illegally contacting voters to redo ballots

Pennsylvania's Secretary of State allegedly improperly sent an email to local election officials providing an opportunity to contact voters to cure defective mail-in ballots. According to the Texas AG, this clearly violated state election code section 3146.8 (a), which requires:

The county board of elections, upon receipt of official absentee ballots in sealed official absentee ballot envelopes as provided in this article and mail-in ballots as in sealed official mail-in ballot envelopes as provided under article XIII-D (1), shall safely keep the ballots in sealed or locked containers until they are to be canvassed by the county board of elections.

Section 3146.8 G (1.1) states that the first look at the ballot shall be "no earlier than 7:00 AM on election day."

Paxton states that this scheme to correct ballots was only followed in Democratic majority counties and was clearly illegal.

Illegally Allowed Undated Ballots To Be Counted

On December 4, 2020, 15 members of the Pennsylvania House, led by representative Francis Ryan, issued a report to Congress. Their findings noted that 9,005 ballots had no mailing dates. <http://www.repfrankryan.com/ElectionIrregularities>

Ballot Discrepancies

On November 2, the day before the election, Pennsylvania stated that 2.7 million ballots had been sent out. By November 4, they changed it to 3.1 million, a difference of 400,000 ballots.

According to the US Election Assistance Commission report to Congress in 2016, Pennsylvania received 266,208 mail-in ballots; 2,534 of them were rejected, equating to a .95% rejection rate. The use of absentee ballots in Pennsylvania increased by 10 times that amount in 2020.

In another case after the Paxton brief, SCOTUS invalidated the secretary of state's unilateral change of law claiming ballots could be counted, even if not dated.

<https://why.org/articles/u-s-supreme-court-reverses-pennsylvania-mail-voting-law-decision/>

2) ...MICHIGAN

Illegally mailing out unrequested ballots.

Michigan law provides the only methods by which a voter may receive an absentee ballot.

“The clerk of the city or Township is the only government official empowered by statute to send a requested application.” M.C.L.section 168.75 9.3.

Michigan's Secretary of State nevertheless said she possesses unwritten authority under state law to mail absentee voter ballot applications to every registered voter in the state.

On May 19, 2020, Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson announced that she would send unsolicited ballots by mail to all 7.7 million registered Michigan voters. This, according to Paxton, violated the aforementioned Michigan law section 168.75 9.3, which states that absentee ballots can be gotten three ways: by a written request signed by the voter, by an absentee voter ballot application form provided by the clerk or by a federal postcard application.

Eliminating Match To Signature On File

The Secretary of State also allowed for the absentee ballots to be attained online without signature verification as required in Michigan law. MCL section 168.76 1.2 states:

The qualified voter file must be used to determine the genuineness of a signature on an application for an absentee voter ballot. And if the signatures do not agree sufficiently or the signature is missing, “the ballot must be rejected.”

Judge Finds, After The Election, That Secretary Of State Violated Election Laws

In March of 2021, over four months after the polls were closed, a Michigan Court of Claims judge ruled that Michigan's Secretary of State did indeed violate the law in conjuring up new rules for absentee ballots and signature verification without going through the state legislature.

According to a Michigan news site:

Michigan Court of Claims Judge Christopher Murray rendered a decision that will not fully appease either side in the state's most prominent lawsuit regarding the 2020 general election. Allegan County Clerk Robert Genetski and the Michigan GOP were seeking a full forensic audit of all absentee ballots to see if signature matches could be verified. That was denied, but on the whole, Murray sided with the plaintiffs against Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson.

She was found to have violated the Administrative Procedures Act when she gave guidance to local clerks on how to verify signatures in October of 2020. Murray said that directive was really a rule and fell outside of her purview to give. The state legislature has authority over how elections are conducted and Murray found the plaintiffs correct in asserting that it needed to come from them to be treated as binding.

[\(http://www.keweenawreport.com/featured/michigan-court-rules-secretary-of-state-violated-law/\)](http://www.keweenawreport.com/featured/michigan-court-rules-secretary-of-state-violated-law/)

Removed Requirement Of Ballot Being Stamped Proving Signature Verification

Michigan law, said Paxton, also required that each absentee ballot have a written statement or stamp by the election department where the voter signature was placed, indicating that the voter signature was in fact checked and verified with a signature on file. Wayne County ignored the signature requirement.

3) ...WISCONSIN

In Wisconsin, there was a 900% increase in mail-in ballots from 2016 to 2020 (146,932 versus 1,275,019).

Illegal Use Of Drop Boxes Breaking Chain Of Custody

Wisconsin's statute says, "the legislature finds that the privilege of voting by absentee ballot must be carefully regulated to prevent potential for fraud and abuse." Wisconsin statute section 6.84 (1).

Without legislative approval, the Wisconsin Election Commission positioned over 500 drop boxes in the state. Paxton argued this violated state law, which notes that any alternative absentee ballot site:

"shall be staffed by the municipal clerk with the executive director of the board of election commissioners, or employees of the clerk of the board of election commissioners." Wisconsin statute 6.85 5.3.

The Drop Boxes also violated another statute that states the absentee ballots may only be "mailed by the elector, or delivered in person to the municipal clerk issuing the ballot or ballots." Section

6.87(4)(b)1. The law further states: "Ballots counted in contravention of the procedure specified in those provisions may not be included in the certified result of any election. Section 6.87(6)

The state Supreme Court ruled that the actions taken by state officials without legislative approval was illegal.

<https://www.npr.org/2022/07/08/1100696685/wisconsin-supreme-court-ballot-drop-boxes-disability-assistance>

Two years later, after Democrats regained control of the state's highest court, the earlier ruling was reversed. Nevertheless, a state Supreme Court had indeed at one time ruled such activity as being illegal, which countered the argument that each and every one of the court challenges to the 2020 election procedures were frivolous.

Eliminated Need To List Address And Have A Witness

Wisconsin law also requires voters to complete a certification, including the listing of their address and the need to have a witness sign the envelope. The only way to cure a defect is for "the clerk to return the ballot to the elector."

Yet, an alleged Milwaukee Election Commission training video said that the witness address may be written in by election overseers for the applicant, directly contravening the law. Some overseers submitted affidavits certifying that this illegal action was actually carried out.*

Improperly Backdating Ballots

A Post Office contractor, Ethan Pease, testified that Post Office employees were backdating ballots received after the November 3 election. The boss said "an order came down from the Wisconsin Illinois chapter of the Postal Service that 100,000 ballots" had been misplaced.

Wrongly Expanding Definition Of "Indefinitely Confined"

Wisconsin officials circumvented Wisconsin law, Paxton alleged, by issuing guidance stating that all voters should identify themselves as "indefinitely confined" on absentee ballot applications because of the COVID-19 pandemic. *A Wisconsin court struck this down.* <https://www.wicourts.gov/sc/opinion/DisplayDocument.pdf?content=pdf&seqNo=315283>

Yet, Wisconsin violated its law again by issuing a directive to Wisconsin clerks prohibiting the removal of voters for indefinite confinement status *even if the voter was no longer indefinitely confined.*

Chain of Custody Breaks For Flash Drive

A flash drive containing tens of thousands of votes was left unattended at a Milwaukee tabulation center the day after the election, without anyone aware of it and no proper chain of custody. Even if it did not result in vote tampering, it is concerning to realize that a flash drive

containing election results became unaccounted for.
<https://www.wisconsinrightnow.com/milwaukee-election-flash-drive/>

4) ...GEORGIA

The Paxton brief states that Georgia's Secretary of State exceeded his authority by eliminating double signature requirements without legislative approval.

Section 21.2.386.8.1.D requires that the signature of any returned absentee ballot be compared with both the registration signature and the signature of the application for an absentee ballot. Yet, the secretary agreed in March 2020 to a settlement that allowed absentee ballots to be deemed invalid only if the signature did not match "*any* of the voter signatures on file or on the ballot absentee application." (emphasis added)

Attorney General Paxton stated:

In other words, the settlement agreed to by the Secretary of State, without approval from the state legislature, allowed for an absentee ballot to be deemed valid if the signature matched only the signature on the absentee ballot application. That's removing a significant statutory check against the fraudulent application for and then voting of absentee ballots in the name of someone else.

Limited Ability To Reject Faulty Ballots

The Secretary, without obtaining the required legislative approval, agreed to a requirement that no ballot could be rejected except through an agreement by a three person verification panel, violating O.C.G.A sec. 21-2-386(a)(1)B-C.

The Georgia rejection rate in 2016 was 17 times greater than 2020. This was despite the fact that there were six times as many mail-in ballots used in 2020. (Page 37 of the Paxton report.)

Improperly Opening Ballots Prior To Election Day

In Georgia, O.C.G.A section 21-2-386(a)2 prohibited the opening of absentee ballots until after the polls had opened on Election Day.

The settlement approved, without legislative confirmation, allowed the board to start processing the absentee ballots up to three weeks before Election Day.

Other alleged irregularities included:

Denying access to minority party poll watchers. Affidavits were submitted by numerous poll watchers, one of whom testified under oath that she was denied getting close enough to the examining process to determine if there was a proper signature match. A University of Georgia

student signed an affidavit that she was told by a poll inspector in Fulton County that someone applied for and cast an absentee ballot in her name¹.

CHAPTER III

Yes, Voter Challenges Were Rejected In Court, But Because of Technicalities, Not on The Merits

You might have heard time after time that claims of voter fraud in the 2020 election were debunked. Those making that claim reference the many court cases that were dismissed against those posing challenges to the election outcome.

However, a closer look shows that the actual, specific accusations of fraud were rarely, if ever, addressed by these courts. This is more clearly delineated in an analysis conducted by Bob Anderson of The Federalist.

<https://thefederalist.com/2021/03/11/courts-repeatedly-refused-to-consider-trumps-election-claims-on-the-merits/>

Here are some of the things he wrote:

We learned nothing from a lawsuit dismissed by a state judge in Georgia (Boland v. Raffensperger) on the basis that the plaintiff had sued an “improper party” rather than hearing the merits of why the ballot rejection rate allegedly dropped from 1.53 percent in 2018 to 0.15 percent in the 2020 general election. A Trump lawsuit in Michigan (Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Benson) alleging state law was violated by the failure to allow access by observers, and seeking to stop counting, was ruled moot since it was not filed until 4:00 p.m. on Nov. 4, after votes were counted.

Petitioners in Metcalfe v. Wolf claimed “approximately 144,000 to 288,000 completed mail-in and/or absentee ballots” in Pennsylvania may have been illegal based on testimony from a U.S. Postal Service contractor. The contractor said he was hired to haul a truck of what he believed to be this many completed mail-in ballots from New York to Pennsylvania. The complaint also alleged there was “evidence” of ballots that were backdated at a postal facility in Erie.

The judge tossed it since the state’s Election Code required their request to be filed within 20 days of the alleged violation, which was Nov. 23. They filed Dec. 4. We’ll never know if that truck brought in pallets of completed ballots—an amount sufficient to overturn the state’s Electoral College vote.

In Wisconsin, the Trump v. Evers suit alleged that violations of state election law had occurred in Milwaukee and Dane Counties as municipal clerks issued absentee ballots without the required written application, that they illegally completed missing info on

¹ **Additional Remarks.** According to a statistical analysis in the Texas brief conducted by Charles Chicchetti: In 2018 there were 218,858 mail-in ballots counted and 7512 rejected in the state of Georgia. Using the same rejection rate of 2018 (3.32%) there would be 38,937 fewer ballots counted in 2020.

ballots, that absentee ballots were wrongly cast by voters claiming “Indefinite Confinement” status (and for which no ID was provided), and that Madison’s “Democracy in the Park” event violated election laws. A divided Wisconsin Supreme Court refused to hear the lawsuit, sidestepping a decision on the merits of the claims and instead ruling the case must first wind its way through lower courts—an effective death sentence given the timing.

A state Supreme Court judge in Pennsylvania was tasked with reviewing the eligibility of 2,349 mail-in ballots that were purportedly defective according to the state Election Code (*Zicarelli v. Allegheny County Board of Elections*).

In the court’s decision, the judge noted “We agree with the Campaign’s observation that...the General Assembly set forth the requirements for how a qualified elector may cast a valid absentee or mail-in ballot ... We further agree that these sections of the Election Code specifically provide that each voter ‘shall (emphasis added) fill out, date, and sign’ the declaration on the outside envelope. We do not agree with the Campaign’s contention, however, that because the General Assembly used the word ‘shall’ in this context, it is of necessity that the directive is a mandatory one ...”

(Basically, the court ruled that “shall” does not mean “shall.”)

A federal lawsuit in the same state (*Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Boockvar*) included a claim that some Democrat counties implemented a “notice and cure” policy, allowing defective ballots to be fixed and counted, while Republican counties did not, thereby creating an equal protection issue.

The judge found that two individual plaintiffs had indeed been harmed by the denial of their votes, but that they lacked standing since the defendant (Democrat) counties “had nothing to do with the denial of Individual Plaintiff’s ability to vote” as their “ballots were rejected by Lancaster and Fayette [Republican] Counties, neither of which is a party to this case.” So the judge effectively created a legal “Catch 22” in which one must show direct harm from an unrelated party in order to prevail. Logically, under this standard, no equal protection claim could ever be substantiated.

In a Nov. 5 filing (*Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Philadelphia County Board of Elections*), Republicans alleged that the Philadelphia County Board was “intentionally refusing to allow any representatives and poll watchers for President Trump and the Republican Party ... [and] continuing to count ballots, without any observation” by Republican poll watchers. The Commonwealth Court agreed on appeal that observers be allowed within six feet of vote counting while complying with COVID-19 protocols.

However, the state Supreme Court reversed that ruling, finding that the Election Code allows the board to make rules “for protecting its workers’ safety from COVID-19 and physical assault,” and that the only requirement is that “one authorized representative of each candidate in an election and one representative from each political party shall be permitted to remain in the room”— not necessarily within close-enough range to observe

vote-counting (emphasis original in court decision). So what is the point of an observer who cannot observe anything?

In the case of *Ward v. Jackson et al.* in Arizona, an issue over election observers was ruled as “untimely” since “the observation procedures for the November general election were materially the same as for the August primary election, and any objection to them should have been brought at a time when any legal deficiencies could have been cured.” Lacking in that statement was an explanation as to why any Republican observers would have been needed in a Democrat-only party primary.

In *Georgia Republican Party, Inc. et al. v. Raffensperger et al.*, candidates Kelly Loeffler and David Perdue sued prior to their U.S. Senate run-offs, alleging harm would occur from unconstitutional election procedures. Their counsel noted (on appeal) that the court “dismissed the case for lack of standing, reasoning that ‘the Supreme Court instructs that a theory of future injury is too speculative to satisfy the well-established requirement that threatened injury must be certainly impending.’” It was stated that the case was filed too early.

In the same state, a federal judge dismissed Sidney Powell’s lawsuit (*Pearson v. Kemp*), in part citing that it was filed too late—it should have been filed before the election. As another example, in *Trump v. Wisconsin Elections Commission*, a judge dismissed the president’s suit saying it involved “issues he plainly could have raised before the vote occurred.”

1)... SUPREME COURT FAILED TO ACT WHEN NEEDED

Most discouraging was the failure of the U.S. Supreme Court to provide needed guidance. In essence, the court punted.

Numerous legal scholars have laid out their ardent positions that the actions of Pennsylvania’s Supreme Court in enacting election policy clearly violated the U.S. Constitution, which reserves election law solely to state legislatures and Congress.

The court could have avoided massive confusion had it taken the case prior to the election. Alas, it did not, hoping their need to take a position would eventually be mooted by a not too close election result. Instead, the Pennsylvania results were of major significance. Yet, even after the election, the court again refused to take up the issue.

It was bad enough the court failed to provide clarity in the election that just passed, but was now sidestepping the opportunity to erase confusion on future elections. The Court's non-action prompted a scathing dissent from Justice Clarence Thomas.

As the election system lacks clear rules when, as here, different officials dispute who has authority to set or change those rules. This kind of dispute brews confusion because voters may not know which rules to follow. Even worse, with more than one system of

rules in place, competing candidates might each declare victory under different sets of rules.

<https://www.heritage.org/election-integrity/commentary/supreme-courts-decision-not-hear-elections-cases-could-have-serious>

Thomas astutely noted that the nation was

..fortunate that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court’s decision to change the receipt deadline for mail-in ballots does not appear to have changed the outcome in any federal election. ... But we may not be so lucky next time.”

One wonders what this Court waits for. We failed to settle this dispute before the election, and thus provide clear rules. Now we again fail to provide clear rules for future elections. The decision to leave election law hidden beneath a shroud of doubt is baffling. By doing nothing, we invite further confusion and erosion of voter confidence. Our fellow citizens deserve better and expect more of us. I respectfully dissent.

In the week after the 2020 election there were serious and concrete reports of voter irregularities. Even though the number of illegal and improper ballots were more than nominal, it is highly unlikely that the number could overcome the lead that former Vice-President Joe Biden garnered over President Trump. So it is indeed possible that both Joe Biden won, and yet there still was an unacceptably high volume of voting irregularities.

The chaos was predicted.

None of the chaos that transpired in the vote count in 2020 should have come as a surprise. Many who study voter security put out clear warnings months prior to the election that massive mail-in voting and a relaxation of voting standards were going to lead to bedlam and a mistrust by a large sector of the population in the ultimate results. That’s exactly what happened. Seventy percent of Republicans polled stated that they are not confident in the integrity of the election results, and that’s not simply a reaction to conservative media.

<https://www.politico.com/news/2020/11/09/republicans-free-fair-elections-435488>

Almost 40 percent of all voters have harbored concerns about the integrity of the election. A startling number for a mature Western democracy.

<https://news.northwestern.edu/stories/2020/12/38-of-americans-lack-confidence-in-election-fairness/>

The only way to unify the nation after a contentious election is for the public as a whole to have confidence that the election results were fair. The more we weaken our voting standards, the less confidence the people have in the process.

And make no mistake, there have been concerted efforts to water down ballot integrity.

The media started off with their narrative that there is no voter fraud. When specific examples were presented, they moved the goalposts, saying the fraud is small and not systemic. Then, when the number of irregularities grew even further, they said it wasn't enough to make a difference in the outcome. But clearing up these irregularities is essential if we wish to maintain public confidence in the systems and the election results.

CHAPTER IV

The U.S. Is An Outlier In Using Mail-In and Electronic Voting

Being concerned about the integrity of America's electoral system has nothing to do with whether you supported or opposed Donald Trump or Joe Biden in 2020.

In fact, concerns were raised well before the soon to be 45th president strolled down the escalator to declare his candidacy.

As noted above, it was way back in 2005 that then former President Jimmy Carter, a Democrat, issued a white paper concluding that mail-in ballots posed the greatest threat to election integrity in America.

1)... MOST DEMOCRACIES OPPOSE MAIL-IN AND ELECTRONIC VOTING

Those concerns echoed fears harbored by our Western allies who ended their experiments with mail-in voting because of the fraud that resulted. Today, their systems are quite intact. People show up to vote on Election Day, the votes are counted, and the winner announced the same day. None of these nations experience any controversy regarding the results.

<https://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/ensuring-election-integrity-anti-democratic/>

We are now the outliers by, for instance, allowing ballot harvesting in many states. Imagine Venezuelan President Maduro announcing that he was going to have his party's minions going to the doors of voters with ballot in hand, asking them to fill it out and assuring them that they would bring it to the election board. We would laugh at how corrupt that system is. But that's what many politicians and media outlets want to become the norm for America. Ballot harvesting was used in the last several elections and will be a big part of election strategy in years to come.

It's the reason why European countries that flirted with the process abandoned it after experiencing unacceptable amounts of fraud.

There is nary a western European democracy that uses mass mail-in voting today. It is the United States that is now the outlier, and Covid was the excuse. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3666259

Why is it that in Europe there is no concern by the public as to whether their elections are being rigged?

These countries have rejected electronic voting, and still use the old-fashioned paper ballots. just like we used to do a decade ago and everyone accepted the results.

<https://apnews.com/article/covid-health-france-elections-europe-96859198666d51b2c4482c3cdb0eb6aa>

We in the US have perpetuated a system that has eroded confidence of the public in the integrity of the system. That's not good for democracy.

The Europeans have secured their election system. Why don't we? Could it be that some operatives think they benefit from a loosey-goosey system that prohibits voter ID, allows illegal immigrants to be registered when they apply for a drivers license, and refuses to purge dead people from the voter rolls?

All of this naturally creates suspicion for half of the American population. There was a time not too long ago where you lost to your opponent and you accepted it. Now it's harder to do after FBI agents pressured social media to suppress negative information about their preferred candidate. We are Americans. We can do better than this.

2)... THE GROWTH OF NGOs IN VOTING

It is illegal for federal workers or not-for-profits to engage in partisan election activity on the job, but it appears it's happening anyway. Under the guise of expanding voter participation and overcoming the challenges of COVID, some politically-driven officials have been spending billions of dollars and enlisting the assistance of not-for-profits in targeting specific demographically favorable areas for maximum voter turnout.

We all remember the famous statement about Obamacare that we have to pass the bill before we can find out what's in it. That ridiculous concept seemed to apply as well to the COVID relief packages (which we now know were riddled with billions of dollars of fraud), the so-called Inflation Reduction Act, and the \$1.7 trillion omnibus bill that was passed in the waning hours of the 2022 congressional session.

So much money was spent under the false premise of dealing with the pandemic that many of those not in leadership didn't even know what was contained within these trillion dollar packages. Huge sums were folded into these plans under the radar, and went to not-for-profit throughout the country to promote Critical Race Theory and expand the voter rolls in preferred precincts throughout the nation.

The Hatch Act, which prohibits federal workers from engaging in political activity, was passed in the 1930s as a reaction to the Roosevelt administration rewarding campaign workers with government jobs under the Works Progress Administration. But now it looks like the political activity promoting the act is happening all over again in a different form.

In the 2020 election we saw how Facebook's CEO, Mark Zuckerberg, funneled over \$300 million to boards of election and not-for-profits, primarily in big cities in key swing states to enhance the vote.

<https://www.cnn.com/2020/09/01/business/zuckerberg-300-million-voting/index.html>

Zuckerberg and his minions will say they did not choose sides, but when you direct the money primarily to some precincts over others, what else can you be doing? There is a sort of a wink and nod where the agencies get tremendous government grants and then turn around with grassroots knocking on doors on behalf of those candidates and/or causes come election time.

3)... THE BIG TECH CONSPIRACY

If that's not enough, consider how political operatives, Big Tech and the mainstream media teamed up to rig the dialogue prior to the election.

Molly Ball's Time Magazine article in 2021 provided a concession by Democratic insiders that they successfully "conspired" with big tech and the media to create algorithms to quash Republican conservative speech prior to the election.

<https://time.com/5936036/secret-2020-election-campaign/>

This included the Big Tech/media shut down of any coverage of the *New York Post* blockbuster revelations about Hunter Biden's laptop.

And as noted above, social media billionaire Mark Zuckerberg provided hundreds of millions of dollars to community organizers to pull out the vote in predominantly blue cities while claiming to be a not-for-profit charity. Some allege this was legally questionable, given that the huge donations were not declared as in kind contributions and that private money was being coordinated with government run boards of

elections. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/the-amistad-project-zuckerberg-needs-to-be-transparent-about-political-donations-through-partisan-nonprofit-301151356.html>

It would be wise not to fall into the trap of saying that the election was stolen from one candidate or that the other was illegitimately elected. Everyone must accept finality of the process once it wound its way through the courts, regardless of how milquetoast these decisions were.

But voters do not have to accept the media claim that this was the safest election ever. Whether or not the election was stolen, there are enough facts to prove that there were an enormous amount of voting irregularities that should not be acceptable in future elections.

4)... THE COST IMPLICATIONS OF EARLY VOTING MIXED WITH MAIL-IN VOTING

This is a case of good intentions that wind up costing the taxpayers a fortune. The reports of the first day of early voting in New York State showed that about 51,000 people took advantage of the additional polling dates put into place that year. That, however, doesn't mean that any of those 51,000 would not have voted on the usual election day.

Most can all agree that removing barriers from people being able to vote is a good thing. But New York State has taken this noble concept and parlayed it into a colossal waste of money.

As of just a few years ago, New York was one of just twelve states remaining that did not allow for early voting. If you wanted to cast a vote, you showed up on election day. In most places in New York, polling sites were usually open from 6 AM to 9 PM. Or, if you had a valid reason, such as traveling out of state, you could submit an absentee ballot.

Some states allow for voters to cast a ballot on one of ten different days prior to election. Others allow for a far more liberal mail-in voting system. Despite New York having provided just the one day to vote, those wanting to vote had nothing standing in their way. They made it their civic duty to carve out a few minutes of the day to go to the polling place and then move on with their business.

Yet, in some cases, lines could be quite long. And stuff sometimes happens that can divert your attention that day. So expanding the process within reason can be a good thing. But it has become politically correct to now demand more and more unnecessary time to vote. And this isn't cheap.

Some had recommended that besides the first Tuesday in November in which to vote, we open some polling places on a weekend day prior to that Tuesday. Apparently, that wasn't enough for the New York State Legislature. No, they demanded ten days of early voting, and in Suffolk County, for instance, required ten voting locations throughout the county - one in each town.

But even that was insufficient for many of the naysayers, including numerous editorial boards. We need to fund even more sites, they say. People will travel quite a long way to pick up a check from the government. They can just as easily plan out a relatively short trip to cast a vote, if they don't want to just wait to go to their regular election day polling place.

This is a double standard similar to the one we've seen from those opposing photo ID requirements for voting. How dare we insist that people show ID in order to vote, they protest, yet it's already commonplace that they'll need ID to collect a government check or, in most cases, even to enter a government building. The most obvious irony was exhibited by those inside the 2016 Convention who were decrying voter ID plans, yet required all the attendees in that convention to first show photo ID to enter that very building. But that's an article for another day.

Nassau County had to come up with \$3 million to abide by this early voting mandate. Suffolk County says it will cost them \$5 million. This is on top of the tens of millions funneled in from the state and federal governments. And guess who pays the bill?

But it gets even better. The free spending, union pandering New York officials decided to mandate three hours of paid leave for employees to vote. So now, all employees get part of the day off at the employer's expense, purportedly to allow them sufficient time to vote. This is despite the fact that they now have ten additional days in which to cast their ballots. You can't make this stuff up.

And we wonder why our kids can't afford to live here?

5)... THE MACHINES

It's not just conservatives who had sounded the alarm about dangers of these machines and mail-in voting

It's noteworthy that in 2019 it was numerous Democrats that had sounded the alarm about the potential fraud related to some electronic voting machines. Senators Klobuchar, Wyden and Warren were among them. A letter was written to (Treasury Secretary) Hank Paulson on October 6, 2006 by Congresswoman Carolyn B. Maloney about potential machine flaws.

<https://yubanet.com/usa/democratic-senators-investigate-vulnerabilities-and-shortcomings-of-election-technology-industry-with-ties-to-private-equity/>

The 2000 election fiasco, famous for its hanging chads, led to a radical overhaul of our voting system. Prior to the controversy, voters cast a ballot either via paper or through a lever machine. The process was smooth, reliable, and inexpensive. And most importantly, the results were readily accepted by the public.

But a poorly designed paper ballot in Broward County, Florida led to some voters punching a vote for one candidate, thinking it was for another. Instead of doing away with this woefully poorly crafted ballot, Congress embarked on one of the greatest overreactions in American history. It was the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) in 2002 claiming that it would make elections safer and more efficient. It pushed for the purchase of multimillion dollar electronic machines under the theory that newer is better. It wasn't. Electronic machine succeeded in doing one thing at least: diminishing the American public's confidence in the integrity of the electoral process.

It's not as though the electronic machines are hooked up to a centralized Internet system. It's not as though the hacking of one machine can poison the results in all the others. But there is no doubt that there does exist the potential to tamper within individual machines. And as noted elsewhere herein, when the margin of victory in many elections is so de minimis in many cases, such tampering can be a difference-maker.

Our center has also been concerned about the dramatic increase in the use of mail-in ballots.

We have to make sure that these ballots are not sent out to people who don't ask for them.

We should at least require that the signatures on these ballots match the signatures that are on file with the boards of election.

We should also require some type of ID, as Florida just mandated.

Many of those safeguards were removed in 2020 due to the COVID pandemic and have not been reversed back to their former safer condition. And anyone questioning the safety of the electronic machines continues to get falsely accused of being a conspiracy nut wearing a tinfoil hat.

You can bet that the Chinese, the Russians, and the Iranians at some point will be able to bribe an election official or hack their way in and make changes to these electronic systems.

The algorithms used in these machines are only as good or honest as the individuals programming them. Remember, it doesn't take a great deal of tampering to shift an American election and history itself.

Our center has for years concentrated deeply on protecting the integrity of the electoral process. We've been raising concerns about the use of electronic voting machines. And now, a new report issued by highly regarded Michigan University professor, Alex Halderman, suggests these machines are more vulnerable than many pundits have thought. https://www.newsmax.com/newsfront/dominion-voting-systems-expert-hack/2024/01/23/id/1150621/?ns_mail_uid=6077c7b2-d74c-4965-8b2a-29a14d391d9f&ns_mail_job=DM573413_01232024&s=acs&dkf_nbr=010102vh2r1f. In real time he showed a judge how a machine could be hacked with merely a credit card and a Bic pen.

As far back as 2006, Suffolk County government brought a lawsuit seeking to prevent the federal government from mandating the use of electronic machines. <http://www.wheresthepaper.org/Northender061005SuffolkSuesState.htm> While the lawsuit was unsuccessful, it did raise questions regarding these new machines.

There was nothing wrong with the old level machines which were inexpensive, easy to use, and were unhackable.

The so-called experts will consistently claim there is nothing to worry about, and that hacking is nearly impossible. But these are the same experts from huge companies such as Yahoo, JP Morgan Chase and Microsoft, all of whom claimed they could never be hacked, but eventually were. And of course, the Suffolk County Government was hacked in the last two years.

Even the US military got hacked by China.

<https://wpde.com/news/nation-world/chinese-hackers-infiltrate-critical-us-infrastructure-systems-report-says-peoples-liberation-army-pla-hawaii-port-oil-gas-taiwan-invasion-national-security-intelligence-washington-post-beijing-ccp-communist-party>

We think the old fashioned lever machines were their surest way to get a quick election day result with little controversy.

It is quite noteworthy that one of the first advocates of the use of electronic machines was the corrupt former Marxist dictator of Venezuela, Hugo Chavez. Chavez was so keen on electronic machines because he knew he and his minions had the potential to doctor the votes tabulated. It was his successor, fellow Marxist dictator Nicolas Maduro, who some believe manipulated the electronic system in such a manner that he served as vindication to the numerous scholars, pundits, and elected leaders who warned that such mischief was now made possible due to a reliance on an electronic voting system.

CONCLUSION:

The Path Forward in Combating Election Fraud

Policy Recommendations For Strengthening Election Security

Our center has been quite vocal over the years in seeking to preserve the integrity of our electoral process. These concerns predated the most recent elections and have been nonpartisan.. We warned of the needless expenditure on non-secure electronic voting machines. We promoted a return to the cheaper, reliable, hack-proof lever machines. Now, there are new concerns.

A Politico/Morning Consult poll notes that a significant percentage of the populace is not satisfied that the election was fair in 2020. That skepticism continues to this day. This is simply unacceptable if we wish to maintain a free and open democracy.

Never in our nation's history have more measures been taken in such a short period of time to dilute election safeguards. Some of it was due to the extraordinary conditions created by a once in a century pandemic, but some of it was also a continuation of a trend to lessen dependence on in-person voting.

If we wish to continue the trend toward mail-in voting, we must take the steps enumerated below to help ensure our citizens are willing to accept the outcome.

1)... VIDEOTAPE BALLOT REVIEWS

Why is it that Off-Track Betting will require video surveillance to ensure that a dealer or player at the blackjack table can't cheat, but we have no such requirement when ballots are counted or reviewed on Election Day? We spent billions on unnecessary electronic voting machines, but investing just a fraction of that amount for video would do wonders in enhancing voter confidence in the integrity of the system.

2)... MATCH BALLOT SIGNATURES TO SIGNATURE ON FILE

Signatures on mail-in ballots must be matched to the signature of the registration form on file, not the request for the ballot. In many states there is a need for presentation of identification when signing up to vote. The signature on that type of form means something. Oftentimes, there is no identification necessary when someone asks for a mail-in ballot. Comparing the signature on the ballot itself to the one on the request accomplished nothing. All you might be doing is comparing the signature of the fraudster (when he illegally seeks the mail-in ballot) to his signature on the ballot itself. Only by comparing it to the registration form on file can we feel secure that a fraudster has not intervened.

Do not discard mail-in envelopes. In some states, ballot envelopes were quickly discarded after their opening. That inhibits the ability to conduct an audit as to whether they match the signatures on file with the board of elections. Statutes must be passed to ensure the retention of these envelopes for sixty days after election.

3)... BAN BALLOT DROP OFF BOXES

Chain of custody of mail-in ballots is essential to maintain the integrity of the process. That's why it is so problematic to allow the expanded use of ballot drop off boxes. Once a ballot is dropped in such a box, it becomes susceptible to sabotage. There were a number of cases where the boxes and the ballots within were easily set on fire by a passerby. The collection of these ballots within the boxes are not monitored by both a Democrat and Republican observer.

4)... END BALLOT HARVESTING

Prior to the 2020 election reforms, ballot harvesting was banned in most states. And for good reason. Harvesting erodes the ballot chain of custody. It allows a third party the possibility of doctoring the ballot and to discard ballots deemed favorable to the opposition. It also allows a political operative to apply undue pressure upon a vulnerable voter.

Do we want a system allowing ballots to be harvested at nursing homes, with pressure exerted upon the elderly residents therein?

5)... REQUIRE ID WHEN SEEKING A MAIL-IN BALLOT

Even prior to the pandemic, the concept of mail-in voting was on the rise. The virus accelerated that movement exponentially. The number of mail-in votes indeed increased dramatically. It was not hard to predict that problems could thereafter ensue. Unprepared election inspectors could be overwhelmed. Validating a signature by visual observation is a difficult, unscientific process. It can be subjective and subject to abuse. So why not simply require that those seeking a mail-in ballot enclose a copy of their photo ID with their legal address in their application, as they are doing in Florida?

This would both allow an expansion of the mail-in process and the convenience it affords, while simultaneously giving confidence to the public that only valid votes will be counted.

6)... REQUIRE, AND ENFORCE, TWO PARTY OVERSIGHT

Some have suggested we replace partisan overseers with nonpartisan civil servants. Bad idea. If there is one place where you want both parties looking over each other's shoulders, it is when counting ballots. No vote should be counted unless approved by both a Democrat and Republican watcher. While this is already the law in almost every jurisdiction, it is not always enforced. It must be.

7)... BALLOTS MUST BE REQUESTED, NOT MAILED OUT INDISCRIMINATELY

Perhaps the biggest accelerant for fraud in the electoral process is the indiscriminate mailing of ballots into the community. That can result in more ballots than voters. Story after story was documented of people getting multiple ballots at their home even when they were never requested. Most of these extras will probably be discarded, but the potential has now been created for fraudsters to fill out these ballots and send them back to the elections board. Some

people appearing to vote in person were told they already voted by mail even though they never did. Other votes were logged for dead people.

8)... PURGE THE ROLLS OF VOTERS WHO DIED OR MOVED

A purging of the rolls was commonplace throughout our nation's history. It is important to remove the names of those who passed away or moved away. Leaving them on the rolls means ballots will be mailed to those last known addresses. It also gives fraudsters a crop of voters on the rolls whose names could be used to camouflage a bogus vote. Recently, claims were made that purging the rolls is a form of voter suppression. To the contrary, a failure to purge is an invitation to fraud.

9)... LIMIT THE USE OF ELECTRONIC VOTING

Simply put, there is no need for electronic voting. Our system fared quite well with the old fashioned paper ballots and/or lever machines. While electronic machines are not interconnected via the Internet, the vote at individual precincts can be corrupted by nefarious sources, especially foreign adversaries. By tampering with these machines, as noted above, it doesn't take the changing of many votes to change the course of history. There's a reason other Western democracies have shied away from electronic voting machines, while corrupt banana republics such as Venezuela encourage their use.

CENTER FOR
Cost Effective
GOVERNMENT