



The Navarro Report

Volume One: The Immaculate Deception

Volume Two: The Art of the Steal

Volume Three: Yes, President Trump Won



FEDERAL OFFICES	
President and Vice President of the United States (You may vote for ONE)	
<input type="radio"/>	Donald J. Trump Michael R. Pence Republican
<input type="radio"/>	Joseph R. Biden Kamala D. Harris Democrat
<input type="radio"/>	Don Blankenship William Mohr Constitution
<input type="radio"/>	Howie Hawkins Angela Walker Green

A NOTE FROM THE AUTHOR

On January 13, 2021, the Democrat-controlled House of Representatives passed House Resolution 24 “impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors.” A primary justification for this overwhelmingly partisan impeachment is that “President Trump repeatedly issued false statements asserting that the Presidential election results were the product of widespread fraud and should not be accepted by the American people or certified by State or Federal officials.”

If it can be demonstrated that President Trump had a good faith belief that the November 3, 2020 Presidential election results were, indeed, the poisonous fruit of widespread fraud and election irregularities, POTUS45 must not only be found Not Guilty. The U.S. Senate must also call for a prompt investigation of these alleged irregularities.

The three volumes of the Navarro Report provide just such a demonstration. These three volumes have been consolidated herein into a single document explicitly designed as a useful evidentiary handbook and reference guide for the upcoming Senate impeachment trial.

Evidence used in the preparation of the Navarro Report includes more than 50 lawsuits and judicial rulings, thousands of affidavits and declarations, testimony in a variety of state venues, published analyses by think tanks and legal centers, videos and photos, public comments, and extensive press coverage.

Volume One finds significant election irregularities across six key battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. These irregularities range from outright voter fraud, ballot mishandling, and contestable process fouls to Equal Protection Clause violations, voting machine irregularities, and significant statistical anomalies.

Volume Two examines a two-pronged Grand “Stuff the Ballot Box” Strategy used by the Democrat Party and its political operatives to flood the battleground states with enough illegal absentee and mail-in ballots to turn a decisive Trump victory into a narrow, and arguably illegitimate, Biden “win.” To strategically game the Presidential election, the Democrats and their operatives were found to have at times bent or broken both election rules and laws.

Volume Three provides the most up-to-date statistical “receipts” with respect to the potential number of illegal votes cast in each battleground state. Volume III thereby provides investigators with a well-documented tally of potentially illegal votes on a state-by-state and category-by-category basis. A key finding is that the number of potentially illegal votes dwarfs the very thin alleged Biden “victory” margins across all six battleground states.

To read this report is to understand at a granular and evidentiary level why the impeachment charges against President Donald J. Trump must not only be dismissed. These highly partisan charges are absurd on their face and an affront to the more than 74 million patriotic Americans who voted for President Trump.



THE IMMACULATE DECEPTION:

Six Key Dimensions of Election Irregularities

Volume One of the Navarro Report

Executive Summary

This report assesses the fairness and integrity of the 2020 Presidential Election by examining six dimensions of alleged election irregularities across six key battleground states. Evidence used to conduct this assessment includes more than 50 lawsuits and judicial rulings, thousands of affidavits and declarations,¹ testimony in a variety of state venues, published analyses by think tanks and legal centers, videos and photos, public comments, and extensive press coverage.

The matrix below indicates that significant irregularities occurred across all six battleground states and across all six dimensions of election irregularities. This finding lends credence to the claim that the election may well have been stolen from President Donald J. Trump.

	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Outright Voter Fraud	✓	✓	*	✓	*	✓
Ballot Mishandling		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Contestable Process Fouls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Equal Protection Clause Violations	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Voting Machine Irregularities	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	*
Significant Statistical Anomalies	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

From the findings of this report, it is possible to infer what may well have been a coordinated strategy to effectively stack the election deck against the Trump-Pence ticket. Indeed, the observed patterns of election irregularities are so consistent across the six battleground states that they suggest a coordinated strategy to, if not steal the election outright, strategically game the election process in such a way as to “stuff the ballot box” and unfairly tilt the playing field in favor of the Biden-Harris ticket. Topline findings of this report include:

- The weight of evidence and patterns of irregularities are such that it is irresponsible for anyone – especially the mainstream media – to claim there is “no evidence” of fraud or irregularities.
- The ballots in question because of the identified election irregularities are more than sufficient to swing the outcome in favor of President Trump should even a relatively small portion of these ballots be ruled illegal.

- All six battleground states exhibit most, or all, six dimensions of election irregularities. However, each state has a unique mix of issues that might be considered “most important.” To put this another way, all battleground states are characterized by the same or similar election irregularities; but, like Tolstoy’s unhappy families, each battleground state is different in its own election irregularity way.
- This was theft by a thousand cuts across six dimensions and six battleground states rather than any one single “silver bullet” election irregularity.
- In refusing to investigate a growing number of legitimate grievances, the anti-Trump media and censoring social media are complicit in shielding the American public from the truth. This is a dangerous game that simultaneously undermines the credibility of the media and the stability of our political system and Republic.
- Those journalists, pundits, and political leaders now participating in what has become a Biden Whitewash should acknowledge the six dimensions of election irregularities and conduct the appropriate investigations to determine the truth about the 2020 election. If this is not done before Inauguration Day, we risk putting into power an illegitimate and illegal president lacking the support of a large segment of the American people.
- The failure to aggressively and fully investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities assessed in this report is a signal failure not just of our anti-Trump mainstream media and censoring social media but also of both our legislative and judicial branches.
 - Republican governors in Arizona and Georgia together with Republican majorities in both chambers of the State Legislatures of five of the six battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin² – have had both the power and the opportunity to investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities presented in this report. Yet, wilting under intense political pressure, these politicians have failed in their Constitutional duties and responsibilities to do so – and thereby failed both their states and this nation as well as their party.
 - Both State courts and Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have failed the American people in refusing to appropriately adjudicate the election irregularities that have come before them. Their failures pose a great risk to the American Republic.
- If these election irregularities are not fully investigated prior to Inauguration Day and thereby effectively allowed to stand, this nation runs the very real risk of never being able to have a fair presidential election again – with the down-ballot Senate races scheduled for January 5 in Georgia an initial test case of this looming risk.

I. Introduction

At the stroke of midnight on Election Day, President Donald J. Trump appeared well on his way to winning a second term. He was already a lock to win both Florida and Ohio; and no Republican has ever won a presidential election without winning Ohio while only two Democrats have won the presidency without winning Florida.³

At the same time, the Trump-Pence ticket had substantial and seemingly insurmountable leads in Georgia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin. If these leads held, these four key battleground states would propel President Trump to a decisive 294 to 244 victory in the Electoral College.

Shortly after midnight, however, as a flood of mail-in and absentee ballots began entering the count, the Trump red tide of victory began turning Joe Biden blue. As these mail-in and absentee ballots were tabulated, the President's large leads in Georgia, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin simply vanished into thin Biden leads.

At midnight on the evening of November 3, and as illustrated in Table 1, President Trump was ahead by more than 110,000 votes in Wisconsin and more than 290,000 votes in Michigan. In Georgia, his lead was a whopping 356,945; and he led in Pennsylvania by more than half a million votes. By December 7, however, these wide Trump leads would turn into razor thin Biden leads – 11,779 votes in Georgia, 20,682 votes in Wisconsin, 81,660 votes in Pennsylvania, and 154,188 votes in Michigan.

Table 1: A Trump Red Tide Turns Biden Blue

	GEORGIA	PENNSYLVANIA	MICHIGAN	WISCONSIN
Trump Lead Midnight 11/3	356,945	555,189	293,052	112,022
Biden "Lead" 12/15	11,779	81,660	154,188	20,682

Sources: Associated Press & Edison/Decision Desk HQ
*Midnight based on state's time zone

There was an equally interesting story unfolding in Arizona and Nevada. While Joe Biden was ahead in these two additional battleground states on election night – by just over 30,000 votes in Nevada and less than 150,000 votes in Arizona – internal Trump Campaign polls predicted the President would close these gaps once all the votes were counted. Of course, this never happened.

In the wake of this astonishing reversal of Trump fortune, a national firestorm has erupted over the fairness and integrity of one of the most sacrosanct institutions in America – our presidential election system. Critics on the Right and within the Republican Party – including President Trump himself – have charged that the election was stolen. They have backed up these damning charges with more than 50 lawsuits,⁴ thousands of supporting affidavits and declarations, and seemingly incriminating videos, photos, and first-hand accounts of all manner of chicanery.⁵

Critics on the Left and within the Democrat Party have, on the other hand, dismissed these charges as the sour grapes of a whining loser. Some of these critics have completely denied any fraud, misconduct or malfeasance altogether. Others have acknowledged that while some election irregularities may have existed, they strenuously insist that these irregularities are not significant enough to overturn the election.

There is a similar Battle Royale raging between large anti-Trump segments of the so-called “mainstream” media and alternative conservative news outlets. Across the anti-Trump mainstream media diaspora – which includes most prominently print publications like the New York Times and Washington Post and cable TV networks like CNN and MSNBC – a loud chorus of voices has been demanding that President Trump concede the election.

These same anti-Trump voices have been equally quick to denounce or discredit anyone – especially anyone within their own circle – that dares to investigate what may well turn out to be THE biggest political scandal in American history. Social media outlets like Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube likewise have been actively and relentlessly censoring anyone who dares to call the results of the election into question.

In contrast, alternative news outlets, primarily associated with the American conservative movement, have provided extensive, in-depth coverage of the many issues of fraud, misconduct, and other irregularities that are coming to light. From Steve Bannon’s War Room Pandemic⁶ and John Solomon’s Just the News⁷ to Raheem Kassam’s National Pulse,⁸ to Newsmax,⁹ and One America News Network,¹⁰ Americans hungry for facts and breaking developments have been able to find such critical information only by following this alternative coverage.

That the American public is not buying what the Democrat Party and the anti-Trump media and social media are selling is evident in public opinion polls. For example, according to a recent Rasmussen poll: “Sixty-two percent (62%) of Republicans say it is ‘Very Likely the Democrats stole the election’” while 28% of Independents and 17% of Democrats share that view.¹¹

If, in fact, compelling evidence comes to light proving the election was indeed stolen after a *fait accompli* Biden inauguration, we as a country run the very real risk that the very center of our great American union will not hold.

To put this another way, if the greatest democracy in world history cannot conduct a free and fair election, and if much of the mainstream media of this country won’t even fully investigate what is becoming a growing mountain of evidence calling into question the election result, there is little chance that our democracy and this Republic will survive as we know it. It is therefore critical that we get to the bottom of this matter. That is the purpose of this report.

II. Six Dimensions of Election Irregularities across Six Battleground States

This report assesses the fairness and integrity of the 2020 presidential election across six key battleground states where the Democrat candidate Joe Biden holds a slim lead, and the results continue to be hotly contested. As documented in the extensive endnotes, the evidence used to conduct this assessment includes more than 50 lawsuits and judicial rulings, thousands of affidavits and declarations, testimony presented in a variety of state venues, published reports and analyses by think tanks and legal centers, videos and photos, public comments and first-hand accounts, and extensive press coverage.

From a review and analysis of this evidence, six major dimensions of alleged election irregularities have been identified and assessed on a state-by-state basis across six key battleground states: Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. These six dimensions include outright voter fraud, ballot mishandling, contestable process fouls, Equal Protection Clause violations, voting machine irregularities, and significant statistical anomalies.

The matrix in Table 2 provides an overview of the presence or absence of each of the six dimensions of alleged election irregularities in each of the six battleground states. Column 1 lists each of the six dimensions along with the alleged Biden victory margin and the possible illegal ballots due to election irregularities. Columns 2 through 7 in the matrix then indicate the presence or absence of the election irregularities in any given state.

Note that a checkmark in matrix cell indicates there is *widespread* evidence in a given state for a particular dimension of election irregularity while a star indicates there is at least *some* evidence.

Table 2: 2020 Alleged Election Irregularities across the Six Battleground States

2020 Alleged Election Irregularities						
	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Outright Voter Fraud	✓	✓	*	✓	*	✓
Ballot Mishandling		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Contestable Process Fouls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Equal Protection Clause Violations	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Voting Machine Irregularities	✓	✓		✓	✓	*
Significant Statistical Anomalies	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Biden "Victory" Margin	10,457	12,670	154,188	33,596	81,660	20,682
Ballots in Question	>100,000	>400,000	>379,000	>100,000	>600,000	>200,000

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

Two key points stand out immediately from the matrix. First, significant irregularities appear to be ubiquitous across the six battleground states. Only Arizona is free of any apparent widespread ballot mishandling while only Pennsylvania lacks significant statistical anomalies. The rest of the matrix in Table 2 is a sea of checkmarks and occasional stars.

Second, if one compares the alleged Biden victory margin in Column 7 of the figure with the possible illegal ballots in Column 8, it should be clear that the number of possible illegal ballots dwarfs the alleged Biden victory margin in five of the six states.

For example, the alleged Biden victory margin in Nevada is 33,596 votes yet the number of ballots in question is more than three times that. In Arizona, which has the narrowest alleged Biden victory margin at 10,457 votes, there are nearly 10 times that number of possible illegal ballots; and the ratio of the alleged Biden vote lead to possible illegal ballots is even higher for Georgia.

Only Michigan is the exception to the rule. This is not because it is likely to be a true exception but simply because there remains insufficient estimates of how the various types of irregularities in Michigan translate into possible illegal votes.

Clearly, based on this matrix, the American people deserve a definitive answer as to whether this election was stolen from Donald J. Trump. Absent a thorough investigation prior to Inauguration Day, a cloud and a stain will hang over what will be perceived by many Americans as an illegitimate Biden administration.

The next six sections of this report examine in more detail each of the six dimensions of alleged election irregularities.

III. Outright Voter Fraud

Outright voter fraud ranges from the large-scale manufacturing of fake ballots, bribery, and dead voters to ballots cast by ineligible voters such as felons and illegal aliens, ballots counted multiple times, and illegal out-of-state voters. Table 3 provides an overview across the six battleground states of the various types of outright voter fraud that have been alleged to be present.

Table 3: Outright Voter Fraud in the 2020 Presidential Election

	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Bribery	✓			✓		
Fake Ballot Manufacturing & Destruction of Legally Cast Real Ballots	✓	✓		*	*	
Indefinitely Confined Voter Abuses		*			*	✓
Ineligible Voters & Voters Who Voted in Multiple States	✓	✓		✓		
Dead Voters & Ghost Voters	✓	✓	*	✓	*	
Counting Ballots Multiple Times			*	*	*	✓
Illegal Out-of-State Voters	✓	✓		✓	*	

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

From the figure, we see that different types of fraud may be present in all six states. Let’s more precisely define each of these different types of fraud using examples that are designed to be illustrative rather than exhaustive.

Bribery

In a voter fraud context, *bribery* refers to the corrupt solicitation, acceptance, or transfer of value in exchange for official action, such as voter registration or voting for a preferred candidate.¹² At least in Nevada, there is a slam dunk case that such bribery occurred.

What is so stunning about the Nevada case is the brazen disregard for our federal bribery laws. In the Silver State, in an effort orchestrated by the Biden campaign, Native Americans appear to have traded their votes not for pieces of silver but rather for Visa gift cards, jewelry, and other “swag.”¹³ According to the Epoch Times, such vote buying schemes also may have occurred in eight other states, including Arizona and Wisconsin.¹⁴

Fake Ballot Manufacturing and Destruction of Legally Cast Real Ballots

Fake ballot manufacturing involves the fraudulent production of ballots on behalf of a candidate; and one of the most disturbing examples of possible fake ballot manufacturing involves a truck driver who has alleged in a sworn affidavit that he picked up large crates of ballots in New York and delivered them to a polling location in Pennsylvania.¹⁵ There may be well over 100,000 ballots involved, enough fake ballots alone to have swung the election to Biden in the Keystone State.

Likewise in Pennsylvania, there is both a Declaration and a photo that suggests a poll worker used an unsecured USB flash drive to dump an unusually large cache of votes onto vote tabulation machines. The resultant tabulations did not correlate with the mail-in ballots scanned into the machines.¹⁶

Arguably the most flagrant example of possible fake ballot manufacturing on behalf of Joe Biden may have occurred at the State Farm Arena in Atlanta, Georgia. The possible perpetrators were caught *in flagrante delicto* on surveillance video.

In one version of this story, poll watchers and observers as well as the media were asked to leave in the middle of the night after a suspicious water leak. Once the room was cleared, several election officials pulled out large boxes of ballots from underneath a draped table. They then proceeded to tabulate a quantity of fake manufactured ballots estimated to be in the range of tens of thousands.¹⁷ Note that a large surge in Biden votes following the tabulation of these ballots can be clearly observed after these votes were processed.¹⁸

Despite what appears to be damning evidence of a possible crime, a spate of stories appeared across the anti-Trump media diaspora dismissing any concerns. According to these whitewash stories, these were regular and authorized ballot boxes, observers in the media were not asked to leave but simply left on their own, and it is perfectly acceptable to count ballots in the absence of observers.¹⁹ Or so the spin goes.

Of course, this is precisely the kind of incident that should be fully investigated both by Georgia's Attorney General as well as by the Federal Department of Justice. Yet it remains unclear as to whether such investigations are underway. Meanwhile, the videotape itself, absent an adequate explanation, has contributed to the current climate of skepticism surrounding the fairness and integrity of the election.

Finally, as an example of the possible *destruction of legally cast real ballots* there is this allegation from a court case filed in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona: Plaintiffs claim that over 75,000 absentee ballots were reported as unreturned when they were actually returned. These absentee ballots were then either lost or destroyed (consistent with allegations of Trump ballot destruction) and/or were replaced with blank ballots filled out by election workers or other third parties.²⁰

Indefinitely Confined Voter Abuses

Indefinitely confined voters are those voters unable to vote in person because of old age or some disability. There are two types of possible abuses associated with such indefinitely confined voters.

The first kind of abuse involves exploiting the elderly or the infirm by effectively hijacking their identities and votes. For example, in Georgia, the family of an elderly man in a nursing home facility discovered that a mail-in ballot had been requested and submitted under his voter registration identity, yet it was done without his consent.²¹ In a similar situation in Pennsylvania, two parents and their daughter who has Downs Syndrome went to vote in person and discovered that a mail-in ballot had both been requested and submitted for the daughter without her consent.²²

The second kind of indefinitely confined voter abuse is far more consequential, at least in the state of Wisconsin. The key allegation here in several court filings is that “bad-faith voters” registering as “indefinitely confined” intentionally broke “Wisconsin election law to circumvent election integrity photo identification requirements.” In a nutshell, they were able to vote without showing a voter identification photo and therefore underwent a far less rigorous I.D. check than would otherwise have been conducted.

This abuse happened, according to one press account, after “clerks in Dane and Milwaukee counties offered illegal advice that encouraged individuals to use indefinite confinement as a way to ignore the state’s photo I.D. requirement.”²³ The Trump side has called this correctly an open invitation to fraud; and stories and pictures abound of Wisconsin voters who registered as indefinitely confined but were seen also attending weddings, riding their bikes, going on vacation, and otherwise be anything but confined.²⁴

Here is what is most important about this particular type of election fraud: In the wake of the expanded definition of indefinitely confined voters – a definition ruled legally *incorrect* by the Wisconsin Supreme Court²⁵ – the number of indefinitely confined voters surged from just under 70,000 voters in 2019 to over 200,000 in 2020.²⁶ This 130,000 vote increment of new indefinitely confined voters is more than five times the Biden victory margin in Wisconsin.

Ineligible Voters and Voters Who Voted in Multiple States

Ineligible voters include felons deemed ineligible, underage citizens, nonregistered voters, illegal aliens, illegal out-of-state voters, and voters illegally using a post office box as an address.²⁷

In a court filing by the Trump campaign legal team, lead counsel Ray Smith provided a list of more than 70,000 allegedly ineligible voters casting ballots in Georgia in the 2020 election.²⁸ Also in Georgia, over 20,000 people appear to have filed a Notice of Changed Address form to the Georgia state government or had other indications of moving out of state. Yet, these clearly ineligible out-of-state voters appeared to have remained on the voter rolls and voted in the 2020 election.²⁹

As additional data points regarding ineligible out-of-state voters, there are these: Between 80 and 100 self-proclaimed Black Lives Matter-affiliated members from other states have admitted to having voted in Pennsylvania.³⁰

As for those *voters who vote in multiple states*, one lawsuit claims that roughly 15,000 mail-in or absentee ballots were received in Nevada from voters who were known to have voted in other states.³¹ It is useful to note here that in Nevada, poll workers allegedly were not consistent in their procedures when checking voters in to vote about whether they accepted California or Nevada Voter Identification as proof of eligibility to register to vote.³²

Dead Voters and Ghost Voters

According to widespread evidence, there was a surprising number of ballots cast across several key battleground states by deceased voters, sparking one wag to quip, in reference to a classic Bruce Willis movie, this was the “Sixth Sense” election – I see dead people voting.

In Pennsylvania, for example, a statistical analysis conducted by the Trump Campaign matching voter rolls to public obituaries found what appears to be over 8,000 confirmed dead voters successfully casting mail-in ballots.³³ In Georgia – underscoring the critical role any given category of election irregularities might play in determining the outcome – the estimated number of alleged deceased individuals casting votes almost exactly equals the Biden victory margin.

In Michigan, according to one first-hand account offered in a declaration, computer operators at a polling location in Detroit were manually adding the names and addresses of thousands of ballots to vote tabulation systems with voters who had birth dates in 1900.³⁴ And in Nevada, a widower since 2017 saw that his deceased wife had successfully cast a mail-in ballot on November 2, 2020, three and a half years after her death.³⁵

It may be useful to note here that dead voters played a critical role in stealing the election from Richard Nixon, a theft orchestrated by Mayor Richard Daley and his Chicago political machine. According to one report “more than 3,000 votes [were] cast in the names of individuals who were dead, and more than 31,000 individuals voted twice in different locations in the city.” President Kennedy’s victory margin in Illinois was less than 9,000 votes.

On the Ghost Voter front, a “Ghost Voter” is a voter who requests and submits a ballot under the name of a voter who no longer resides at the address where that voter was registered. In Georgia for example, it is alleged that over 20,000 absentee or early voters – almost twice the Biden victory margin – cast their ballots after having moved out of state.³⁶ In Nevada, a poll worker reported that there were as many as 50 ballots per day being delivered to homes vacated by their former residents.³⁷

Counting Ballots Multiple Times

Counting ballots multiple times occurs most egregiously when batches of ballots are repeatedly rescanned and re-tabulated in electronic voting machines. It can also happen when the same person votes multiple times within the same day. Evidence of these particular kinds of “ballot stuffing” are present across all six battleground states.

For example, in Wisconsin, poll workers were observed running ballots through tabulation machines more than once.³⁸ In Wayne County, Michigan, Republican poll watchers observed canvassers re-scanning batches of ballots through vote tabulation machines up to 3 to 4 times.³⁹

In Pennsylvania, a poll worker observed a woman vote twice in the same day by changing her appearance.⁴⁰ Another poll worker observed people in voting lines in one corner of a polling location voting, and then coming to another polling location at the other side of the building to vote.⁴¹ Still another poll worker witnessed a woman voting twice at voting machines on Election Day.⁴²

IV. Ballot Mishandling

Ballot mishandling represents the second major dimension of alleged election irregularities in the 2020 presidential election. As Table 4 illustrates, this is a multifaceted problem across the battleground states. Let’s work our way through this figure starting with the failure to properly check the identification of voters.

Table 4: Ballot Mishandling in the Battleground States

	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
No Voter I.D. Check			*	*		✓
Signature Match Check Abuses		✓		✓	✓	
“Naked Ballots” Lacking Outer Envelope			*		✓	
Broken Chain of Custody & Unauthorized Ballot Handling or Movements		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ballots Accepted Without Postmarks & Backdating of Ballots			*			*

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

No Voter I.D. Check

It is critical for the integrity of any election for poll workers to properly verify a voter’s identity and registration when that voter comes in to cast an in-person ballot. However, there is at least some evidence of a lack of adequate voter ID check across several of the battleground states.

For example, in Michigan, the chairperson of a polling location permitted an individual to vote without presenting voter identification and another with only a photocopy of a driver’s license.⁴³

In Nevada, poll workers were instructed to advise people who wanted to register to vote and did not have proper Nevada IDs or Driver's Licenses to do the following: These unregistered voters could go outside into the parking lot and make an appointment with the Department of Motor Vehicles as late as January 2021 to obtain a Nevada Driver's License as proof of their identity. They could then bring in confirmation of their DMV appointment in either paper or digital form; and that would be sufficient to allow them to be registered.⁴⁴

Signature Matching Abuses

It is equally critical that ballot counters legally verify mail-in and absentee ballots by checking if the signatures on the outer envelopes match the voters' registration records.⁴⁵ Note, however, that a variety of signature matching abuses represent a major issue in Nevada, Pennsylvania, and especially in Georgia.

In Georgia, contrary to state law, the Secretary of State entered into a Consent Decree with the Democrat Party that weakened signature matching to just one verification instead of two. This illegal weakening of the signature match test has called into question more than 1.2 million mail-in ballots cast in Georgia.⁴⁶

Georgia is not the only state where signature match check abuses have surfaced. Nevada law requires that *persons* – not machines – review all signatures and ballots. Yet the Clark County Registrar of Voters used a defective signature matching computer system called Agilis to conduct such checks.⁴⁷ As will be discussed further below, this problem of machines replacing humans contrary to Nevada state law was compounded by the fact that the Agilis system has an unacceptably low accuracy rate, making it easier for illegal ballots to slip through its screen.⁴⁸

Signature match abuses also surfaced in Wisconsin where mandatory voter information certifications for mail-in ballots were reduced and/or eliminated, again contrary to state law. As noted in one lawsuit, this change “undermined the authority of the state legislature, reduced the security and integrity of the election by making it easier to engage in mail-in ballot fraud and created another standard-less rule in conflict with the clear terms of the Wisconsin Election Code, preventing uniform treatment of absentee ballots throughout the State.”⁴⁹

“Naked Ballots” Lacking Outer Envelope

A *naked ballot* is a mail-in or absentee ballot lacking an outer envelope with the voter's signature on it. It is illegal to accept the naked ballot as the outer envelope provides the only way to verify a voter's identity.

The illegal acceptance of naked ballots appears to be particularly acute in Pennsylvania as a result of ill-advised “guidance” issued by the Secretary of State – a registered Democrat⁵⁰ – that such naked ballots be counted.

This issuance of such guidance, in violation of state law,⁵¹ appears to be a blatant attempt by a Democrat politician to boost the count for Joe Biden as it was clear that Democrats would be voting disproportionately higher through mail-in ballots. This incident is especially egregious because when the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rejected this guidance, the Secretary of State refused to issue new guidance directing election officials to NOT count non-compliant mail-in or absentee ballots.⁵²

Broken Chain of Custody & Unauthorized Ballot Handling or Movements

The maintenance of a proper chain of custody for ballots cast is the linchpin of fair elections. Chain of custody is broken when a ballot is fraudulently transferred, controlled, or moved without adequate supervision or oversight.⁵³

While chain of custody issues can apply to all ballots, the risk of a broken chain of custody is obviously higher for mail-in and absentee ballots. This is because the ballots have to go through more hands.

In the 2020 presidential election, the increased use – often illegal use – of unsupervised drop boxes arguably has enhanced the risk of a broken chain of custody. So, too, has the increased practice of so-called “ballot harvesting” whereby third parties pick up ballots from voters and deliver them to drop boxes or directly to election officials.

Both drop boxes and ballot harvesting provide opportunities for bad actors to insert fraudulent ballots into the election process. That this is a very serious matter is evident in this observation by BlackBoxVoting.org: “In court cases, chain of custody violations can result in refusal to admit evidence or even throwing a case out. In elections, chain of custody violations can result in ‘incurable uncertainty’ and court orders to redo elections.”⁵⁴ (emphasis added)

As an example of the drop box problem, in Pennsylvania, ballots were illegally dumped into drop boxes at the Nazareth ballot drop center in violation of state law.⁵⁵ Likewise in Pennsylvania, a man caught on videotape and photos came out of an unmarked Jeep extracting ballots from an unsupervised ballot drop-box to bring them into a ballot counting center. That same man was observed to come back with an empty ballot container to place in the unsupervised drop box.⁵⁶

In Wisconsin, the state’s Election Committee illegally positioned five hundred drop boxes for collection of absentee ballots across the state. However, these drop boxes were disproportionately located in urban areas which tend to have much higher Democrat registration, thereby favoring the candidacy of Joe Biden. Note: Any use of a drop box in Wisconsin is illegal by statute. Therefore, the votes cast through them cannot be legally counted in any certified election result.⁵⁷

As an example of ballot harvesting – in this case at the front end of the process – 25,000 ballots were requested from nursing home residents in Pennsylvania at the same time.⁵⁸

As additional examples of a possible broken chain of custody, there are these: Large bins of absentee ballots arrived at the Central Counting Location in Wisconsin with already opened envelopes, meaning that ballots could have been tampered with.⁵⁹ They were nonetheless counted.

Also in Wisconsin, an election worker was observed moving bags of blank ballots into a vehicle and then driving off without supervision.⁶⁰ There is also the previously referenced case whereby a truck driver has offered a firsthand account of moving large quantities of fake manufactured ballots from New York to Pennsylvania.

As a final note on the unauthorized handling or movement of ballots, there is the problem of *illegal ballot counters*. These are persons who not legally permitted and/or certified to be counting ballots.

In one curious case, an individual who worked as an official photographer for Kamala Harris' campaign in 2019⁶¹ was alleged to be involved in scanning ballots in Floyd County, Georgia. Ballot counters cannot have any ties to candidates in a presidential election.

Ballots Accepted Without Postmarks and Backdating of Ballots

Across all of the battleground states, it is against state law for poll workers to count either mail-in or absentee ballots that lack postmarks. It is also illegal to backdate ballots so that they may be considered as having met the election deadline for the receipt and counting of such ballots. There is some evidence of these irregularities in several of the battleground states.

For example, in Wisconsin, according to one Declaration, employees of the United States Postal Service (USPS) in Milwaukee were repeatedly instructed by two managers to backdate late-arriving ballots so they could still be counted.⁶² In addition, the USPS was alleged to have backdated as many as 100,000 ballots in Wisconsin.⁶³

Similarly, in Detroit, Michigan, as noted in a court case, poll workers were instructing ballot counters to backdate absentee ballots so they could be counted.⁶⁴ One poll watcher also observed ballots in Michigan being run through vote tabulation machines without postmarks on them.⁶⁵

V. Contestable Process Fouls

Contestable process fouls represent the third dimension of election irregularities in the 2020 presidential election. The various forms such process fouls can take are illustrated in Table 5 across the six battleground states.

Table 5: Contestable Process Fouls in the Battleground States

	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Abuses of Poll Watchers & Observers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mail-In & Absentee Ballot Rules Violated Contrary to State Law		✓			✓	✓
Voters Not Properly Registered Allowed to Vote		✓	*	✓	*	✓
Illegal Campaigning at Poll Locations			*		*	*
Ballots Cured by Poll Workers or Voters Contrary to Law	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

Abuses of Poll Watchers and Observers

Central to the fairness and integrity of any election is the processes by which observers monitor the receipt, opening, and counting of the ballots. You can see in the Table 5 that poll watcher and observer abuses were present across all six battleground states.

In Georgia,⁶⁶ Michigan,⁶⁷ and Pennsylvania,⁶⁸ poll watchers and observers were denied entry to ballot counting centers by Judges of Elections and other poll workers. This was despite presenting proper certification and identification.

In Georgia,⁶⁹ Michigan,⁷⁰ Nevada,⁷¹ and Pennsylvania,⁷² Republican poll watchers were also forced inside confined areas, thereby limiting their view. In some cases, this confinement was enforced by local law enforcement.

Across these four battleground states, Republican poll watchers were also directed to stand at unreasonably lengthy distances from ballot counters. In Michigan – arguably the “first among equals” when it comes to observer abuses – poll workers put up poster boards on the windows of the room where ballots were being processed and counted so as to block the view.⁷³ In Pennsylvania, tens of thousands of ballots were processed in back rooms where poll observers were prohibited from being able to observe at all.⁷⁴

This is an extremely serious matter because it is these poll watchers and observers who represent the frontline defenders of a fair election process. Their job is to make sure all ballots are handled properly and tabulated accordingly. They seek to answer questions like: Is there a signature match process being conducted? Does each ballot have an outer envelope or is it a naked ballot? Are ballots being run more than once through the tabulation machines?

When poll watchers or observers are barred from viewing or forced to view from unacceptably large distances, these watchdogs cannot accurately answer these questions. They, therefore, cannot fulfill their critical watchdog function.

Mail-In Ballot and Absentee Ballot Rules Violated Contrary to State Law

In Georgia, more than 300,000 individuals were permitted to vote who had applied for an absentee ballot more than 180 days prior to the Election Day. This is a clear violation of state law.⁷⁵

In both Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, Democrat election officials acted unilaterally to accept both mail-in and absentee ballots after Election Day. State Republicans have argued this is contrary to state law.

In Pennsylvania, absentee and mail-in ballots were accepted up to three days after Election Day.⁷⁶ On November 7th, in anticipation of a legal challenge, the United States Supreme Court ordered that the approximately 10,000 absentee and mail-in ballots that had arrived past November 3rd be separated from ballots that had arrived on Election Day.⁷⁷ This direction notwithstanding, a poll watcher reported on November 7th that, in Delaware County, ballots received the previous night were not being separated from ballots received on Election Day, contrary to state law.⁷⁸

Wisconsin state law does not permit early voting. Nonetheless, city officials in the Democrat stronghold of Madison, Wisconsin assisted in the creation of more than 200 “Democracy in the Park” illegal polling places.

These *faux* polling places were promoted and supported by the Biden campaign. They provided witnesses for absentee ballots and acted in every way like legal polling places. Moreover, they received ballots outside of the limited 14-day period preceding an election that is authorized by statute for in-person or absentee balloting. These were clear violations of state law.⁷⁹

Voters Not Properly Registered Allowed to Vote

One of the jobs of poll workers is to ensure that in-person voters are legally registered and are who they say they are. Across at least three of the six battleground states – Georgia, Nevada, and Wisconsin – this job may not have been effectively done.

In Wisconsin, for example, officials refused to allow poll watchers to challenge the qualifications of people applying to vote or require proof of such persons' qualifications.⁸⁰ In Georgia, more than 2,000 individuals appear to have voted who were not listed in the State's records as having been registered to vote.⁸¹

In Pennsylvania, a poll watcher observed poll workers taking individuals whose names did not appear in voter registration books back into a separate area that was unobserved by any poll watchers. There, these apparently unregistered voters met with a Judge of Elections who allegedly told them: "you go back in, tell them this is your name, and you can vote."⁸²

Illegal Campaigning at Poll Locations

Poll workers are supposed to remain politically neutral. When a poll worker displays bias for one political candidate over another at a polling location, this is contrary to state law. Unfortunately, this law appears to have been repeatedly violated in Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

For example, in Pennsylvania, poll workers were wearing paraphernalia from a group called "Voter Protection." This is a 100% Democrat-funded Political Action Committee dedicated to Democrat redistricting in Pennsylvania; and the wearing of its paraphernalia constitutes illegal campaigning at the polls.⁸³

In a similar type of illegal campaigning in Michigan, poll workers were allowed to wear Black Lives Matter shirts and were seen carrying tote bags of President Obama paraphernalia.⁸⁴ In addition, poll workers with Biden and Obama campaign shirts on were allowed on the ballot counting floor.⁸⁵

In Wisconsin, representatives from the Biden campaign were outside with clipboards talking to voters on their way in to vote. They were clearly inside the prohibited perimeter for electioneering. Poll workers did nothing to address this illegal campaigning despite the objections of observers.⁸⁶

Ballots Cured by Poll Workers or Voters Contrary to Law

Under prescribed circumstances, both poll workers and voters may fix ballots with mistakes or discrepancies. This process is known as "ballot curing."

In nineteen states, poll workers must notify voters if there are errors or discrepancies on their ballots and allow them to "cure" or correct any errors so their votes will count.⁸⁷ However, in states that do not allow curing, ballots with discrepancies such as missing or mismatched signatures must be discarded.⁸⁸

In Pennsylvania, and contrary to state law, poll workers were trained to allow voters to cure or “correct” their ballots.⁸⁹ According to one court filing, Democrat-controlled counties in Pennsylvania participated in pre-canvass activities prior to Election Day “by reviewing received mail-in ballots for deficiencies.”⁹⁰ Such discrepancies included “lacking the inner secrecy envelope or lacking a signature of the elector on the outer declaration envelope.” Voters were then notified so that they could cure their ballots – a clear violation of state law.⁹¹

Numerous other examples of illegally cured ballots abound. For example, in Wisconsin, tens of thousands of ballots were observed to be corrected or cured despite election observer objections.⁹²

In Pennsylvania, poll workers sorted approximately 4,500 ballots with various errors into bins. Poll workers then re-filled out the 4,500 ballots so that they could be read by tabulation machines, an action contrary to state law.⁹³

In Michigan, poll workers altered the dates on the outer envelopes of the ballots so that they would be able to count them.⁹⁴ Michigan poll workers also filled out blank ballots to “correct” mail-in and absentee ballots according to what they believed the “voter had intended.”⁹⁵

VI. Equal Protection Clause Violations

The Equal Protection Clause is part of the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and a fundamental pillar of the American Republic. This Equal Protection Clause mandates that no State may deny its citizens equal protection of its governing laws.⁹⁶

Table 6 illustrates three major alleged violations of the Equal Protection Clause in the 2020 presidential election. As the table illustrates, each violation was observed to occur across all six battleground states.

Table 6: Equal Protection Clause Violations in the Six Battleground States

	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Higher Standards of Certification & I.D. Verification Applied to In-Person Voters	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Different Standards of Ballot Curing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Differential & Partisan Poll Watcher Treatment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

Higher Standards of Certification & I.D. Verification Applied to In-Person Voters

The first alleged violation focuses on the application of higher standards of certification and voter identification for in-person voters than mail-in and absentee ballot voters. In effect, these higher standards disproportionately benefited the candidacy of Joe Biden because President Trump had a much higher percentage of in-person voters than mail-in and absentee voters. Indeed, mail-in and absentee ballots were largely skewed for Joe Biden across the country by ratios as high as 3 out of 4 votes in some states.⁹⁷

Note here that much of the alleged fraud and ballot mishandling focused on mail-in voters and absentee ballots. Therefore, the lower the level of scrutiny of these voters, the more illegal votes for Joe Biden relative to Donald Trump could slip in. It should likewise be noted here that this particular violation of the Equal Protection Clause was further enabled by poll watchers being denied meaningful observation.

Perhaps the most egregious examples of this particular violation of the Equal Protection clause occurred in Georgia and Michigan. Georgia, for example, requires ID for voting in-person and Michigan will only allow provisional voting without an ID. However, in both Georgia and Michigan, a valid ID is not required to vote by mail so long as the person has already registered in a previous election.

These procedures are ripe for fraud. In fact, there is evidence that election fraudsters targeted voters who had voted in past elections but not voted in more recent ones. These fraudsters could then cast ballots on behalf of these infrequent voters with little likelihood they would be caught. Numerous affidavits, however, detail persons arriving to vote at polls only to be informed that records indicate they had already voted. At least fourteen such affidavits have been made by Georgians.

As a further example, in Wisconsin, mail-in ballots were accepted without witness signatures placed properly in the allocated envelope location.⁹⁸ A comparable process for in-person voting would have resulted in the invalidation of the vote.

Different Standards of Ballot Curing

As a second major violation of the Equal Protection Clause, likewise observed across all six battleground states, different standards for correcting mistakes on ballots (ballot curing) were applied across different jurisdictions within the states. Often, jurisdictions with predominantly Democrat registration were more expansive about allowing the curing of ballots than jurisdictions with predominantly Republican registration.

In Pennsylvania, there was a clear difference between how ballots were – or were not – cured in Republican counties versus Democrat counties. When Pennsylvania’s Secretary of State Kathy Boockvar issued illegal guidance authorizing counties to cure ballots, this illegal guidance was not followed in at least eight different Republican counties.⁹⁹ Meanwhile, ballots were cured in Democrat counties under this illegal guidance.¹⁰⁰

In Arizona, there likewise was a clear difference between how in-person voters were treated versus mail-in ballots. On the one hand, mail-in voters had up to 5 days to “cure” or “fix” invalid mail-in ballots sent prior to Election Day.¹⁰¹ On the other hand, in-person voters in Maricopa County, for example, had to deal with poll workers who did not know how to work electronic voting machines properly. This resulted in thousands of in-person votes being marked incorrectly and disregarded rather than cured.¹⁰²

Differential and Partisan Poll Watcher Treatment

In most states, political party candidates and ballot issue committees are able to appoint poll watchers and observers to oversee the ballot counting process.¹⁰³ Such poll watchers and observers must be registered voters and present certification to the Judge of Elections in order to be able to fulfill their duties at a polling location.¹⁰⁴

Such certified poll watchers should be free to observe at appropriate distances regardless of their party affiliation. Yet in key Democrat strongholds, e.g., Dane County in Wisconsin and Wayne County in Michigan, which yielded high Biden vote counts, Republican poll watchers and observers were frequently subject to different treatment ranging from denial of entry to polling places to harassment and intimidation.

For example, in Georgia, a certified poll watcher witnessed other poll workers at a polling location discussing how they should not speak to her due to her party affiliation.¹⁰⁵ In Pennsylvania, a Republican poll watcher was harassed and removed from the polling location due to his party affiliation.¹⁰⁶ In Wisconsin, a Republican poll watcher was prevented from observing due to the fact that polling locations were not allowing Republicans in.¹⁰⁷

Note the synergy here between the problem of the process foul involved with denying access to certified poll watchers (discussed in the previous section) and the violation of the Equal Protection Clause such conduct entails when such denial, harassment, and intimidation differs by party affiliation.

VII. 2020 Election Voting Machine Irregularities

Perhaps no device illustrates that technology is a double-edged sword than the machines and associated software that have come to be used to tabulate votes across all 50 states.¹⁰⁸ Types of voting equipment include optical scanners used to process paper ballots, direct recording electronic systems which voters can use to directly input their choices, and various marking devices to produce human-readable ballots.¹⁰⁹

Two main types of voting machine irregularities have been alleged in the 2020 presidential election. As Table 7 illustrates, these types of irregularities include large-scale voting machine inaccuracies together with inexplicable vote switching and vote surges, often in favor Joe Biden.

Table 7: 2020 Voting Machine Irregularities

	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Large-Scale Voting Machine Inaccuracies	✓		✓	✓		
Inexplicable Vote Switching and Vote Surges In Favor of Biden	✓	✓	✓			

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

Large-Scale Voting Machine Inaccuracies

Much has been made about the shadowy genesis of a company called Dominion which provides voting machines and equipment to 28 states.¹¹⁰ According to critics, Dominion’s roots may be traced to an effort by the Venezuelan dictator Hugo Chavez to rig his sham elections.¹¹¹ Dominion is also alleged to have ties to the Clinton Foundation,¹¹² while the Smartmatic software used in the Dominion machines is alleged to have links to the shadowy anti-Trump globalist financier George Soros.¹¹³

The controversy swirling over Dominion and Smartmatic notwithstanding, one of the biggest problems with machine inaccuracies may be traced to a company called Agilis. Nevada election officials in Clark County, a Democrat stronghold in Nevada, used Agilis signature verification machines to check over 130,000 mail-in ballot signatures.

According to a court case filed in the First Judicial District Court in Carson City, the Agilis machines used a “lower image quality than suggested by the manufacturer.” Clark County Election Department officials also lowered the accuracy rate below the manufacturer’s recommendations, making the whole verification process unreliable.¹¹⁴

In a test run, it was proven that, at the manufacturer's setting, the Agilis machine already had a high tolerance for inaccuracies—as high as 50% non-matching. In other words, half of the ballots that might be moved through the machine would be impossible to verify; and Clark County officials lowered that threshold even further.¹¹⁵

As a final comment on this case, there is also the broader legal matter that the Agilis machines were used to “entirely replace signature verification by election personnel.” This is contrary to Nevada state law.

As noted in a court case: “In violation of Nevada law, the Clark County Election Department allows the Agilis machine to solely verify 30% of the signatures accompanying the mail-in ballots without ever having humans inspect those signatures.”¹¹⁶

A similar problem has been alleged in a court filing in Arizona with a software known as the Novus 6.0.0.0. In cases where ballots were too damaged or illegible to be read by vote tabulation machines, Novus was used in an attempt to cure or restore the ballots. The system would do so by trying to read the applicable scans of the original rejected ballots. However, as noted in a court case filed by Kelli Ward, Chairwoman of the Arizona Republican Party: “the software was highly inaccurate, and it often flipped the vote.”¹¹⁷

Inexplicable Vote Switching and Vote Surges In Favor of Biden

As a further complication to the Novus software problem in Arizona referenced above, the software was not only highly inaccurate. According to observers, and as an example of inexplicable vote switching, “the software would erroneously prefill ‘Biden’ twice as often as it did ‘Trump.’”¹¹⁸

At least one instance of a large and inexplicable vote switching and vote surge in favor of Joe Biden took place in Antrim County, Michigan – and it is associated with the controversial aforementioned Dominion-Smartmatic voting machine hardware-software combo.¹¹⁹ In this Republican stronghold, 6,000 votes were initially, and incorrectly, counted for Joe Biden. The resulting vote totals were contrary to voter registration and historical patterns and therefore raised eyebrows. When a check was done, it was discovered that the 6,000 votes were actually for Donald J. Trump.

A subsequent forensic audit of the Antrim County vote tabulation found that the Dominion system had an astonishing error rate of 68 percent.¹²⁰ By way of comparison, the Federal Election Committee requires that election systems must have an error rate no larger than 0.0008 percent.¹²¹

Perhaps even more troubling given concerns over hackers and Dominion's alleged ties to bad foreign actors, the records that would have allowed the detection of remote internet access went missing from the Antrim County system. This was in direct violation of Michigan state law,¹²² which requires retention of voting records for 22 months -- such information was in place for previous election years, but not this election. At the very least, the results of this audit indicates the need for further investigation of the Dominion system across other states in the country.

In Georgia, there were numerous "glitches" with the Dominion machines where the results would change. The most notable of these changes was a 20,000 vote surge for Biden and 1,000 vote decrease for Trump.¹²³

VIII. Statistical Anomalies in the Six Battleground States

The 2020 presidential election appears to feature at least four types of statistical anomalies that raise troubling questions. Table 8 illustrates the incidence of these statistical anomalies across the six battleground states. As you can see from the table, Wisconsin and Georgia are characterized by the highest degree of statistical anomalies, with three of the four anomalies present. Nevada and Arizona show two anomalies present while Michigan has at least one. Let's take a more granular look now at each of these types of statistical anomalies.

Table 8: Statistical Anomalies in the Battleground States

	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Significant Changes In Absentee Ballot Rejection Rates From Previous Elections		✓		✓	✓	
Excessively High Voter Turnout (at times exceeding 100%)	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Statistically Improbable Vote Totals Based on Party Registration & Historical Patterns	✓					✓
Unusual Vote Surges		✓	*			✓

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

Dramatic Changes in Mail-in and Absentee Ballot Rejection Rates from Previous Elections

It is routine across the 50 states for mail-in-and absentee ballots to be rejected for any number of reasons. These reasons may include: the lack of a signature or adequate signature match, a late arrival past a deadline,¹²⁴ the lack of an external envelope that verifies voter-identification (a naked ballot),¹²⁵ or if voters provide inaccurate or incomplete information on the ballots.¹²⁶

In the 2020 presidential race, Joe Biden received a disproportionately high percentage of the mail-in and absentee ballots. Perhaps not coincidentally, we saw a dramatic fall in rejection rates in Pennsylvania, Nevada, and especially Georgia.

For example, in Nevada, the overall rejection rate dropped from 1.6%¹²⁷ in 2016 to 0.58% in 2020.¹²⁸ In Pennsylvania, the 2016 rejection rate of 1.0%¹²⁹ dropped to virtually nothing at 0.28%.¹³⁰ The biggest fall in the overall absentee ballot rejection rate came, however, in Georgia. Its rejection rate fell from 6.8%¹³¹ in 2016 to a mere 0.34%¹³² in 2020.

These dramatically lower rejection rates point to a conscious effort by Democrat election officials across these key battleground states to subject mail-in and absentee ballots to a lower level of scrutiny. That this kind of government conduct and gaming of our election system may have contributed to tipping the scales in favor of Joe Biden can be illustrated in this simple calculation:

In the 2020 race, Georgia election officials received 1,320,154 mail-in and absentee ballots. If these ballots had been rejected at the 2016 rate of 6.8% instead of the 2020 rate of 0.34%, there would have been 81,321 ballots rejected instead of the 4,489 ballots that were actually rejected.

Under the conservative assumption that 60% of these mail-in and absentee ballots went to Joe Biden,¹³³ this dramatic fall in the rejection rate provided Joe Biden with an additional 16,264 votes. That's more than the margin of the alleged Biden victory in Georgia.

Excessively High Voter Turnout (at times exceeding 100%)

When there are more ballots cast than registered or eligible voters, fraud has likely taken place. During the 2020 presidential election, excessively high voter turnout occurred across all six swing states.

In analyzing this problem, it is important to distinguish between states that have same-day registration and those that don't. States with same-day registration can plausibly have voter turnout that is higher than 100%. However, is impossible for that to happen in states without same-day registration without fraud having taken place.

Consider, then, Arizona which does not allow same-day voter registration. According to testimony from an MIT-trained mathematician, Candidate Biden may have received a weighted 130% total of Democrat votes in Maricopa County to help him win the state due to an algorithm programmed into the Dominion voting machines used there.¹³⁴

Although Michigan does allow same-voter registration, voter turnout was still abnormally high. Here again, the Dominion voting system has been implicated. To wit:

Cybersecurity executive and former NASA analyst, Russ Ramsland, testified that in Wayne County, Michigan, where Dominion Voting Systems equipment was used, 46 out of 47 precincts in the county displayed greater than a 96% voter turnout. 25 out of those precincts showed a 100% voter turnout.¹³⁵

Wisconsin, which also allows same-day voter registration, also reported abnormally high voter turnout when compared to 2016 numbers. For example, Milwaukee reported a record 84% voter turnout during the 2020 presidential election versus 75% in 2016.¹³⁶ Of the city's 327 voting wards, 90 reported a turnout of greater than 90%.¹³⁷

Statistically Improbable Vote Totals Based on Party Registration and Historical Patterns

The 2020 presidential election was characterized by strong partisan voting patterns consistent with historical patterns. As a rule, heavily Republican jurisdictions voted heavily for President Trump and heavily Democrat jurisdictions voted heavily for Joe Biden.

In some cases, however, there were instances where these partisan and historical patterns were violated. It is precisely in such instances where either outright fraud or machine inaccuracies or manipulations are most likely to be operative.

As one example of such statistically improbable vote totals, there are the results in Arizona's Fifth Congressional District. In one precinct in the suburb of Queen Creek, the vote percent for President Trump dropped dramatically relative to 2016, from 67.4 to 58.5 percent.¹³⁸ This was attributed to an "unusually high" number of duplicate ballots.¹³⁹

Unusual Vote Surges

Several unusual vote surges took place in the very early hours of the morning of November 4th in Georgia, Michigan, and Wisconsin. An analysis conducted by the Voter Integrity Project of *The New York Times* publicly reported data on Election Day that showed several vote "spikes" that were unusually large in size with unusually high Biden-to-Trump ratios. Such spikes or surges could well indicate that fraudulent ballots had been counted.

In Georgia, for example, an update at 1:34 AM on November 4th showed 136,155 additional ballots cast for Joe Biden, and 29,115 additional votes cast for President Trump.¹⁴⁰ An update in Michigan at 3:50 AM on November 4th showed an update of 54,497 additional votes cast for Joe Biden, and 4,718 votes cast for President Trump.¹⁴¹ And an update in Wisconsin at 3:42 AM on November 4th showed 143,379 additional ballots cast for Joe Biden, and 25,163 votes cast for President Trump.¹⁴²

IX. A State-By-State Analysis and Signal Failure of Our Legislative and Judicial Branches

All happy families are alike; each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.

– *Anna Karenina, by Leo Tolstoy*

It should be clear at this point that all six battleground states suffer from most or all of the six dimensions of election irregularities documented in this report. However, like Tolstoy’s unhappy families, it is also true that each battleground state is different in its own election irregularity way. That is, each battleground state may be characterized by a unique mix of issues that, impressionistically, might be considered “most important” in swinging that state for Joe Biden.

Consider Arizona, a state with the lowest alleged Biden victory margin at 10,457 votes. This is a state with statistically improbable high voter turnouts in Maricopa and Pima counties; widespread ballot mishandling; and 1.6 million mail-in ballots (which tended towards Biden) subjected to much lower standards of certification and ID verification than in-person voters (who tended towards Trump).

In Georgia, the alleged Biden victory margin was just 11,779 votes. What perhaps jumps out most in the Peach State is the illegal Consent Decree that effectively gutted the signature match requirements for millions of mail-in ballots. There is also the quite unresolved fake ballot manufacturing matter of the roughly 100,000 ballots that were mysteriously pulled, in the dead of night, out from underneath tables and expeditiously tabulated. Of course, we saw that Georgia’s electoral version of a Three-card Monte sleight-of-hand led to a strong Biden vote surge.

Of all of the six battleground states which suffered from numerous observer and poll watcher abuses, Michigan must rank as “first among equals.” With its “board up the windows” and “rough up the observers” tactics, Detroit in Wayne County was the center of this “see no evil” universe. When two local Republican officials tried to withhold certification of the votes in this county for practices such as these and demanded an audit, they were subject to extreme intimidation and “doxing” and quickly capitulated.¹⁴³

As for Nevada, this is a state likewise with a very narrow alleged victory margin for Joe Biden – 33,596 votes. Here, voting machine irregularities associated with the Agilis machine have called into question as many as 130,000 votes. There may also be an unusually large number of ballots cast by out-of-state voters and others who did not meet residency requirements. Of course, the brazen bribery of Native Americans to vote for Joe Biden is a dark stain on the state and the Democrat Party.¹⁴⁴

In Pennsylvania, an equally brazen Democrat Secretary of State issued illegal guidance for the acceptance of naked ballots and ignored direction from the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to fix the matter. She allowed ballots to be illegally cured in contravention of state law and pushed the legal envelope for accepting ballots after Election Day.

In the Keystone State, and as with Georgia's Three-card Monte, shuffle fake ballots out from underneath a table scandal, there is also the equally unresolved matter of possible fake ballot manufacturing. Recall, here, the testimony of a truck driver who swears he picked up as many as 100,000 fake manufactured ballots in New York and delivered them to Pennsylvania. Both the tractor-trailer and the ballots involved remain unaccounted for – and what might have been in this tractor-trailer were enough ballots alone to swing the election to Joe Biden.

Finally, in Wisconsin, the mother of all contestable process fouls is arguably that of the roughly 170,000 mail-in ballots entering the tabulation process under the guise of absentee ballots in clear violation of state law. That's more than eight times the number of ballots of the alleged Biden victory margin of 20,682 votes.

In Wisconsin, there is likewise the large-scale abuse associated with an overly expansive definition of "indefinitely confined voters." Recall here that the increment of new indefinitely confined voters in the 2020 election in Wisconsin was more than five times the alleged Biden victory margin.

While Democrat Party government officials cheated and gamed the electoral process across all six battleground states, many Republican government officials – from governors and state legislators to judges – did little or nothing to stand in their way.

Consider that the Republican Party controls *both* chambers of the State Legislatures in five of the six battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.¹⁴⁵ These State Legislatures clearly have both the power and the opportunity to investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities presented in this report. Yet, wilting under intense political pressure, these politicians have failed in their Constitutional duties and responsibilities to do so – and thereby failed both their states and this nation as well as their party.

The same can be said for the Republican governors in two of the six battleground states – Arizona and Georgia. Both Arizona's Doug Ducey and Georgia's Brian Kemp have cowered in their Governor's mansions and effectively sat on their hands while their states have wallowed in election irregularities.

The judicial branch of the American government should be the final backstop for the kind of issues examined in this report. Yet both our State courts and Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have failed the American people in refusing to properly adjudicate the election irregularities that have come before them. Their failures likewise pose a great risk to the American Republic.

Concluding Observations

From the findings of this report, it is possible to infer what may well have been a coordinated strategy to effectively stack the election deck against the Trump-Pence ticket. Indeed, the patterns of election irregularities observed in this report are so consistent across the six battleground states that they suggest a coordinated strategy to, if not steal the election, then to strategically game the election process in such a way as to unfairly tilt the playing field in favor of the Biden-Harris ticket.

A major part of this “stuff the ballot box” strategy has been aptly summarized in a complaint filed before the US Supreme Court by the State of Texas:

Using the COVID-19 pandemic as a justification, [Democrat] government officials [in Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin] usurped their legislatures’ authority and unconstitutionally revised their state’s election statutes. They accomplished these statutory revisions through executive fiat or friendly lawsuits, thereby weakening ballot integrity.¹⁴⁶

According to the Texas complaint – which the Supreme Court sadly refused to hear – the goal of this strategy was to flood the battleground states “with millions of ballots to be sent through the mails, or placed in drop boxes, with little or no chain of custody.” At the same time, Democrat government officials also sought to “weaken the strongest security measures protecting the integrity of the vote signature verification and witness requirements.”¹⁴⁷

The findings of the assessment conducted in this report are consistent with the Texas complaint. Key takeaways include:

- The weight of evidence and patterns of irregularities uncovered in this report are such that it is irresponsible for anyone – especially the mainstream media – to claim that there is “no evidence” of fraud or irregularities.
- The ballots that have come into question because of the identified election irregularities are more than sufficient to swing the outcome in favor of President Trump should even a relatively small portion of these ballots be ruled illegal.
- While all six battleground states exhibit most, or all, six dimensions of election irregularities, each state has a unique mix of issues that might be considered “most important.” To put this another way, all battleground states are characterized by the same or similar election irregularities; but, like Tolstoy’s unhappy families, each battleground state is different in its own election irregularity way.
- This was theft by a thousand cuts across six dimensions and six battleground states rather than any one single “silver bullet” election irregularity.

- In refusing to investigate a growing number of legitimate grievances, the anti-Trump media and censoring social media are complicit in shielding the American public from the truth. This is a dangerous game that simultaneously undermines the credibility of the media and the stability of our political system and Republic.
- Those journalists, pundits, and political leaders now participating in what has become a Biden Whitewash should acknowledge the six dimensions of election irregularities and conduct the appropriate investigations to determine the truth about the 2020 election. If this is not done before Inauguration Day, we risk putting into power an illegitimate and illegal president lacking the support of a large segment of the American people.
- The failure to aggressively and fully investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities assessed in this report is a signal failure not just of our anti-Trump mainstream media and censoring social media but also of both our legislative and judicial branches.
 - Republican governors in Arizona and Georgia together with Republican majorities in both chambers of the State Legislatures of five of the six battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin¹⁴⁸ – have had both the power and the opportunity to investigate the six dimensions of election irregularities presented in this report. Yet, wilting under intense political pressure, these politicians have failed in their Constitutional duties and responsibilities to do so – and thereby failed both their states and this nation as well as their party.
 - Both State courts and Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, have failed the American people in refusing to appropriately adjudicate the election irregularities that have come before them. Their failures pose a great risk to the American Republic.
- If these election irregularities are not fully investigated prior to Inauguration Day and thereby effectively allowed to stand, this nation runs the very real risk of never being able to have a fair presidential election again – with the down-ballot Senate races scheduled for January 5 in Georgia an initial test case of this looming risk.

ENDNOTES

¹ All witnesses who have signed sworn affidavits or declarations who are referenced in this report but whose names are not referenced in the public record, e.g., a court case, are referred to as “Jane Doe” or “John Doe” based on gender. This has been done to ensure their safety and security.

² Ballotpedia, “Partisan composition of state legislatures,” December 4, 2020. https://ballotpedia.org/Partisan_composition_of_state_legislatures

³ Bump, Philip. “The two states that almost always predict which candidate is headed for defeat,” *The Washington Post*, 7 September 2016. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/09/07/the-two-states-that-almost-always-predict-which-candidate-is-headed-for-defeat/>

*The two Democrat candidate exceptions were John F. Kennedy in 1960 and Bill Clinton in 1992.

⁴ Williams, Pete. “Trump’s election fight includes over 50 lawsuits. It’s not going well.” *NBC News*, November 23, 2020. <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-election/trump-s-election-fight-includes-over-30-lawsuits-it-s-n1248289>

⁵ All witnesses who have signed sworn affidavits and declarations referenced in this report are referred to as “Jane Doe” and “John Doe” based on gender, in order to ensure their safety and security.

⁶ Bannon, Steve, *War Room Pandemic*, <https://pandemic.warroom.org/>

⁷ Solomon, John, *Just the News*, <https://justthenews.com/john-solomon>

⁸ Kassam, Raheem, *National Pulse*, <https://americasvoice.news/the-national-pulse/>

⁹ *Newsmax*, <https://www.newsmax.com/>

¹⁰ *One America News Network*, <https://www.oann.com/>

¹¹ “Most Say Mail-In Voting Worked, But 47% Say Fraud Likely.” *Rasmussen Reports*, December 7, 2020. https://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/elections/election_2020/most_say_mail_in_voting_worked_but_47_say_fraud_likely

¹² Legal Information Institute, “Bribery,” *Cornell University*, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/bribery>

¹³ Bedard, Paul, “Pro-Biden effort offered Native Americans \$25-\$500 Visa gift cards and jewelry to vote,” *Washington Examiner*, December 14, 2020. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/washington-secrets/pro-biden-effort-offered-native-americans-25-500-visa-gift-cards-jewelry-to-vote>

¹⁴ Pentochoukov, Ivan, “Illegal Money-for-Votes Raffles Conducted in Several States in 2020 Election,” *Epoch Times*, December 2, 2020. https://www.theepochtimes.com/illegal-money-for-votes-raffles-conducted-in-several-states-in-2020-election_3598915.html

¹⁵ Morgan, Jessy. Testimony. “A truck driver with USPS says he was suspicious of his cargo load of 288,000 completed ballots.” December 1, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R0xA4dYsbQ>

¹⁶ Declaration of John Doe, Delaware County Pennsylvania, November 9, 2020.

¹⁷ Bedard, Paul, “20 House Republicans demand Barr investigate ‘suitcases’ of ballots in Georgia,” *The Washington Examiner*, December 4, 2020. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/washington-secrets/20-house-gop-demand-ag-barr-investigate-suitcases-of-ballots-in-georgia>

¹⁸ “Trump Campaign lawyers present video ‘evidence’ of ballot fraud,” *Senate Judiciary Subcommittee*, December 4, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LJ0xDWhWUxk>

Real American Politics, December 4, 2020. <https://twitter.com/RealAPolitics/status/1334754269052997635?s=20>

¹⁹ See, for example: Weber, Peter, “Georgia’s top election investigator debunks a vote fraud conspiracy involving ‘suitcases’ of ballots, a urinal,” December 7, 2020. <https://news.yahoo.com/georgias-top-election-investigator-debunks-115236191.html>

²⁰ In the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, *Tyler Bowyer et al v.. Doug Ducey*, December 2, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Bower-Complaint-AZ.pdf>

²¹ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Cobb County, Georgia, November 12, 2020.

²² Declaration of Jane Doe, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Nov 7, 2020

²³ *WisGOP*, “WisGOP: Trump lawsuit highlights indefinitely confined voter increase,” <https://www.wispolitics.com/2020/wisgop-trump-lawsuit-highlights-indefinitely-confined-voter-increase/>

²⁴ *WisGOP*, “WisGOP: Some indefinitely confined voters are not indefinitely confined,” <https://www.wispolitics.com/2020/wisgop-some-indefinitely-confined-voters-are-not-indefinitely-confined/>

²⁵ *WisGOP*, “WisGOP: Some indefinitely confined voters are not indefinitely confined,” <https://www.wispolitics.com/2020/wisgop-some-indefinitely-confined-voters-are-not-indefinitely-confined/>

- ²⁶ WisGOP, “WisGOP: Trump lawsuit highlights indefinitely confined voter increase,” <https://www.wispolitics.com/2020/wisgop-trump-lawsuit-highlights-indefinitely-confined-voter-increase/>
- ²⁷ Legal Information Institute, “18 U.S. Code § 611.Voting by aliens,” <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/611>
- ²⁸ The Superior Court Of Fulton County State Of Georgia, *Trump v. Raffensperger*, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v.-Raffensperger.pdf>
- ²⁹ In the Superior Court of Fulton County State of Georgia, November 30, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/2020-11-30-Verified-Complaint.pdf>
- ³⁰ Declaration of Jane Doe, Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania, November 8, 2020.
- ³¹ In the First Judicial District Court Carson City, Nevada *Jesse Law v. Judith Whitmer*, November 17, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/nov-17-doc-2.pdf>
- ³² Declaration of John Doe, Las Vegas, Nevada, November 22, 2020.
- ³³ “Rudy Giuliani claims 8,000 dead people voted in election in Pennsylvania,” November 25, 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2_VUKB2jAcg
- See Also*
- “Pennsylvania Senate Republican Lawmaker Hearing Transcript on 2020 Election,” *Rev*, November 26, 2020. <https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/pennsylvania-senate-republican-lawmaker-hearing-transcript-on-2020-election>
- ³⁴ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Oakland County, Michigan, November 11, 2020.
- ³⁵ Declaration of John Doe, Clark County, Nevada, November 7, 2020.
- ³⁶ In the Superior Court of Fulton County State of Georgia, *Paul Andrew Boland v Brad Raffensperger*, November 29, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/2020-11-30-Verified-Complaint.pdf>
- ³⁷ Statement of John Doe, Las Vegas, Nevada, November 20, 2020.
- ³⁸ Declaration of Jane Doe, Wisconsin, November 12, 2020.
- ³⁹ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Washtenaw County, Michigan, November 9, 2020.
- ⁴⁰ Declaration of Jane Doe, Northampton County, November 8, 2020.
- ⁴¹ Declaration of John Doe, Philadelphia County, November 14, 2020.
- ⁴² Declaration of Jane Doe, Northampton County, Pennsylvania, November 7, 2020.
- ⁴³ Affidavit of John Doe, Michigan, November 10, 2020.
- ⁴⁴ Declaration of Jane Doe, Clark County, November 8, 2020.
- ⁴⁵ *Ballotpedia*, “How do election workers match signatures? (2020),” [https://ballotpedia.org/How do election workers match signatures%3F\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/How_do_election_workers_match_signatures%3F(2020))
- ⁴⁶Democratic Party of Georgia, Inc. (“DPG”), the DSCC, and the DCCC, Compromise Settlement and Release, March 6, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/07/GA-Settlement-1.pdf>
- ⁴⁷Petition for Writ of Madamus and Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, “*Daniel Rodimer v. Joseph Gloria*, November 19, 2020. https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/Rodimer-v-Gloria_A-20-825130-W_Writ-of-Madamus.pdf
- ⁴⁸ In the First Judicial District Court Carson City, Nevada *Jesse Law v. Judith Whitmer*, November 17, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/nov-17-doc-2.pdf>
- ⁴⁹ In the United States District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin Milwaukee Division, *Donald J. Trump v. the Wisconsin Elections Commission*, December 2, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v-WEC-EDWI.pdf>
- ⁵⁰ *Ballotpedia*, “Pennsylvania Secretary of State,” https://ballotpedia.org/Pennsylvania_Secretary_of_State
- ⁵¹ The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, *Donald J. Trump for President et al v. Kathy Boockvar et al*, November, 18 2020. <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057.169.0.pdf>
- ⁵² The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, *Donald J. Trump for President et al v. Kathy Boockvar et al*, November, 18 2020. <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057.169.0.pdf>
- ⁵³ The Elections Assistance Commission, “Ballot Building,” https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac_assets/1/6/Chapter_5_Ballot_Building.pdf
- ⁵⁴ Harris, Bev, “About Chain of Custody,” *Election Watch*, February 16, 2016. <https://blackboxvoting.org/about-chain-of-custody/>
- ⁵⁵ Declaration of Jane Doe, Pennsylvania, November 7, 2020. Northampton County.
- ⁵⁶ Declaration of John Doe, Delaware County, Pennsylvania, November 7, 2020. (3 Pictures, 2 Videos)

-
- ⁵⁷ In the Supreme Court of the United States, *The State of Texas v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin*, December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>
- ⁵⁸ Chaitin, Daniel, "Lindsey Graham: Possible ballot harvesting in Pennsylvania involving 25,000 nursing home residents," *Microsoft News*, November 10, 2020. <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/politics/lindsey-graham-possible-ballot-harvesting-in-pennsylvania-involving-25-000-nursing-home-residents/ar-BB1aR3R4>
- ⁵⁹ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Brookfield, Wisconsin, November 10, 2020.
- ⁶⁰ Declaration of John Doe, Brown County, November 11, 2020.
- ⁶¹ Greenberg, Jay, "Dominion Technician Exposed as Anti-Trump Ex-Kamala Harris Worker," December 1, 2020. <https://neonnettle.com/news/13425-dominion-technician-exposed-as-anti-trump-ex-kamala-harris-worker>
- ⁶² Declaration of Jane Doe, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, November 11, 2020.
- ⁶³ " 'USPS contractor: "Something profoundly wrong occurred in Wisconsin during the presidential election' " December 1, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hRUvP6cbtZk&feature=youtu.be&t=69>
- See also*
- Van Brugen, Isabel, "Wisconsin USPS Subcontractor Alleges Backdating of Tens of Thousands of Mail-In Ballots," December 2, 2020. https://www.theepochtimes.com/wisconsin-usps-subcontractor-alleges-backdating-of-tens-of-thousands-of-mail-in-ballots_3601580.html
- ⁶⁴ State of Michigan Judicial District, *Cheryl A. Constantino and David A. Kallman v. City of Detroit*, November 8, 2020. <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20403147/wayne-county-michigan-election-fraud-lawsuit.pdf>
- ⁶⁵ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Oakland County, Michigan November 10, 2020.
- ⁶⁶ Declaration of John Doe, Cobb County, Georgia, November 5, 2020.
- ⁶⁷ Affidavit John Doe, Eagle County, Colorado November 12, 2020.
- ⁶⁸ The Declaration of John McBlain, Esquire. *See*, The Supreme Court of the United States, *State of Texas v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, and State of Wisconsin*, December 7, 2020. https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22O155/163048/20201208132827887_TX-v-State-ExpedMot%202020-12-07%20FINAL.pdf
- ⁶⁹ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Gwinnett County, Georgia, November 12, 2020.
- ⁷⁰ Affidavit John Doe, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, November 10, 2020.
- ⁷¹ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Clark County, Nevada, November 10, 2020.
- ⁷² The Declaration of John McBlain, Esquire. *See*, The Supreme Court of the United States, *State of Texas v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, and State of Wisconsin*, December 7, 2020. https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22O155/163048/20201208132827887_TX-v-State-ExpedMot%202020-12-07%20FINAL.pdf
- ⁷³ Affidavit of John Doe, November 10, 2020, Waukesha County, Wisconsin.
- ⁷⁴ The Declaration of John McBlain, Esquire. *See*, The Supreme Court of the United States, *State of Texas v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, and State of Wisconsin*, December 7, 2020. https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22O155/163048/20201208132827887_TX-v-State-ExpedMot%202020-12-07%20FINAL.pdf
- ⁷⁵ The Superior Court Of Fulton County State Of Georgia, *Trump v. Raffensperger*, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracymot.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v.-Raffensperger.pdf>
- ⁷⁶ Liptak, Adam, "Supreme Court Allows Longer Deadline for Absentee Ballots in Pennsylvania and North Carolina," *New York Times*, October 28, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/28/us/supreme-court-pennsylvania-north-carolina-absentee-ballots.html>
- ⁷⁷ Southwick, Ron, "Pa. received 10,000 ballots after polls closed on Election Day," *PennLive*, Nov10, 2020. <https://www.pennlive.com/elections/2020/11/pa-received-10000-late-ballots-that-arrived-after-polls-closed-on-election-day.html>
- ⁷⁸ Declaration of Jane Doe, Delaware County, Pennsylvania, November 7, 2020.
- ⁷⁹ The Supreme Court of Wisconsin, "Donald J. Trump et al v. Anthony Evers et al" December 1, 2020. https://cdn.donaldjtrump.com/public-files/press_assets/wisconsin-filing-12-1-20_compressed.pdf
- ⁸⁰ Declaration of Jane Doe, Oak Creek, Wisconsin, November 11, 2020.
- ⁸¹ The Superior Court Of Fulton County State Of Georgia, *Trump v. Raffensperger*, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracymot.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v.-Raffensperger.pdf>
- ⁸² Declaration of John Doe, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, November 7, 2020.
- ⁸³ Declaration of John Doe, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, November 9, 2020.
- ⁸⁴ Declaration of John Doe, Ingham County, Michigan, November 11, 2020.
- ⁸⁵ Declaration of Jane Doe, Ingham County, Michigan, November 11, 2020.

-
- ⁸⁶ Declaration of Jane Doe, Wheaton, Illinois, November 9, 2020.
- ⁸⁷ “Cure period of absentee and mail-in ballots,” *Ballotpedia*, Accessed on December 14, 20. https://ballotpedia.org/Cure_period_for_absentee_and_mail-in_ballots
- ⁸⁸ “Cure period of absentee and mail-in ballots,” *Ballotpedia*, Accessed on December 14, 20. https://ballotpedia.org/Cure_period_for_absentee_and_mail-in_ballots
- ⁸⁹ Declaration of Jane Doe, Centre County, Pennsylvania, November 11, 2020.
- ⁹⁰ The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, *Donald J. Trump for President et al v. Kathy Boockvar et al*, November 18, 2020. <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057.169.0.pdf>
- ⁹¹ The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, *Donald J. Trump for President et al v. Kathy Boockvar et al*, November 18, 2020. <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057.169.0.pdf>
- ⁹² Declaration of Bartholomew W. and Jean B. W., Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, November 16, 2020. *See Also* <https://www.jsonline.com/story/news/2020/11/11/fact-check-republicans-claim-wisconsin-clerks-illegally-altered-ballots/6234023002/>
- ⁹³ Declaration of John Doe, Delaware County Pennsylvania, November 9, 2020.
- ⁹⁴ State of Michigan Court of Appeals, “*Donald J. Trump for President et. al v. Jocelyn Benson*,” November 30, 2020. <https://www.democracymonitor.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/Trump-brief-FINAL.pdf>
- ⁹⁵ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Washtenaw County, Michigan, November 9, 2020.
- ⁹⁶ Cornell University, “Equal Protection,” *Legal Information Institute*, https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/equal_protection
- ⁹⁷ Lai, Jonathan et al, “Joe Biden won 3 of every 4 mail ballots in Pennsylvania. Trump won 2 of 3 votes cast in person. What does that mean for the future?” *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, <https://www.inquirer.com/politics/election/mail-ballots-pennsylvania-election-trump-biden-20201119.html>
- ⁹⁸ Declaration of John Doe, County of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, November 11, 2020
- ⁹⁹ Blair County, Berks County, Lancaster County, Carbon County, Clinton County, Lycoming County, Dauphin County, and Perry County.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Joseph D. Hamm v. Kathy Boockvar*, Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, November 3, 2020. <http://www.pacourts.us/assets/files/setting-7723/file-10362.pdf?cb=f327ff>
- ¹⁰¹ Secretary of State of Arizona, “Voters have a limited amount of time to correct certain ballot issues,” November 9, 2020. <https://azsos.gov/about-office/media-center/press-releases/1248>
- ¹⁰² In the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, *Tyler Bowyer et al v. Doug Ducey*, December 2, 2020. <https://www.democracymonitor.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Bower-Complaint-AZ.pdf>
- ¹⁰³ *National Conference of State Legislatures*, “Poll Watchers and Challengers,” October 1, 2020. <https://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/poll-watcher-qualifications.aspx>
- ¹⁰⁴ *National Conference of State Legislatures*, “Poll Watchers and Challengers,” October 1, 2020. <https://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/poll-watcher-qualifications.aspx>
- ¹⁰⁵ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Rockdale County, Georgia, November 2020.
- ¹⁰⁶ Declaration of John Doe, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November 8, 2020.
- ¹⁰⁷ Affidavit of Jane Doe, Brookfield, Wisconsin, November 10, 2020.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ballotpedia*, “Voting Equipment and Methods by State,” https://ballotpedia.org/Voting_methods_and_equipment_by_state
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ballotpedia*, “Voting Equipment and Methods by State,” https://ballotpedia.org/Voting_methods_and_equipment_by_state
- ¹¹⁰ *Dominion Voting Systems*, “About,” <https://www.dominionvoting.com/about/>
- ¹¹¹ Varnona, Frank “2020 Stolen Election by Dominion Voter Systems – Hammer & Scorecard,” *Conservative Business Journal*, <https://www.conservativebusinessjournal.com/2020-stolen-election-hammer-and-scorecard/>
- ¹¹² *Clinton Foundation*, “The Delian Project,” <https://www.clintonfoundation.org/clinton-global-initiative/commitments/delian-project-democracy-through-technology>
- ¹¹³ For example, the Chairman of Smartmatic, Mark Malloch-Brown, is on the board of George Soros’ Open Society Foundation. *Open Society Foundation*, “Leadership,” <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/who-we-are/leadership/mark-malloch-brown>
- ¹¹⁴ The First Judicial Court in Carson City, Nevada, “*Jesse Law et al v. Judith Whitmer et al*,” November 17, 2020. <https://www.democracymonitor.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/nov-17-doc-2.pdf>
- ¹¹⁵ The First Judicial Court in Carson City, Nevada, “*Jesse Law et al v. Judith Whitmer et al*,” November 17, 2020. <https://www.democracymonitor.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/nov-17-doc-2.pdf>

¹¹⁶ “In violation of Nevada law, the Clark County Election Department allows the Agilis machine to solely verify 30% of the signatures accompanying the mail-in ballots without ever having humanize inspect those signatures.”

¹¹⁷ In the Superior Court of Arizona in and For the County of Maricopa, “*Kelli Ward v. Constance Jackson et al*,” November 24, 2020. <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20417265/ward-v-jackson-complaint-and-petition-for-discovery.pdf>

¹¹⁸ In the Superior Court of Arizona in and For the County of Maricopa, “*Kelli Ward v. Constance Jackson et al*,” November 24, 2020. <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20417265/ward-v-jackson-complaint-and-petition-for-discovery.pdf>

¹¹⁹ Affidavit of John Doe, Dallas County, Texas. November 17, 2020. https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.gand.283580/gov.uscourts.gand.283580.7.1_2.pdf

¹²⁰ Ramsland Jr., Russell. “Antrim Michigan Forensics Report.” *William Bailey v. Antrim County, Michigan*, December 13, 2020. [https://depernolaw.com/uploads/2/7/0/2/27029178/antrim_michigan_forensics_report_\[121320\]_v2_\[redacted\].pdf](https://depernolaw.com/uploads/2/7/0/2/27029178/antrim_michigan_forensics_report_[121320]_v2_[redacted].pdf)

¹²¹ “Excerpts from the 2002 FEC Voting System Standards – 3.2.1 Accuracy Requirements.” *Michigan Secretary of State*. <https://www.michigan.gov/sos/0,4670,7-127-1583-130621--,00.html>

¹²² “Document Retention Schedule.” *Michigan Bureau of Elections*, May 2019. https://www.michigan.gov/documents/sos/Document_Retention_Schedule_412493_7.pdf

¹²³ Sperry, Paul. “Georgia voting irregularities: The curious case of Biden’s 20,000-vote surge.” *The Citizen*, November 15, 2020. <https://thecitizen.com/2020/11/15/georgia-voting-irregularities-the-curious-case-of-bidens-20000-vote-surge/>

¹²⁴ Parks, Miles, “Why Some Mail-In Ballots Are Rejected As Invalid,” *NPR*, October 4, 2020. <https://www.npr.com/2020/10/04/920175418/why-some-mail-in-ballots-are-rejected-as-invalid>

¹²⁵ Livingston, Doug, “Why absentee ballots get rejected, and how to make yours count,” *USA Today*, September 21, 2020. <https://www.beaconjournal.com/story/news/2020/09/21/why-absentee-ballots-rejected-presidential-and-other-elections/3486553001/>

¹²⁶ Livingston, Doug, “Why absentee ballots get rejected, and how to make yours count,” *USA Today*, September 21, 2020. <https://www.beaconjournal.com/story/news/2020/09/21/why-absentee-ballots-rejected-presidential-and-other-elections/3486553001/>

¹²⁷ Election Assistance Commission, “The Election Administration and Voting Survey; A Report to the United States Congress,” 2016. https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac_assets/1/6/2016_EAVS_Comprehensive_Report.pdf

¹²⁸ *Ballotpedia*, “Election results, 2020: Analysis of rejected ballots,” December 11, 2020. https://ballotpedia.org/Election_results,_2020:_Analysis_of_rejected_ballots

See Also

Office of Nevada Secretary of State Barbara K. Cegavske, “2020 General Election Turnout Mail Ballot Information,” <https://www.nvsos.gov/sos/home/showdocument?id=9058>

¹²⁹ Election Assistance Commission, “The Election Administration and Voting Survey; A Report to the United States Congress,” 2016. https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac_assets/1/6/2016_EAVS_Comprehensive_Report.pdf

¹³⁰ *Ballotpedia*, “Election results, 2020: Analysis of rejected ballots,” December 11, 2020. https://ballotpedia.org/Election_results,_2020:_Analysis_of_rejected_ballots

See Also

U.S. Elections Project, “Pennsylvania Early Voting Statistics,” November 20, 2020. <https://electproject.github.io/Early-Vote-2020G/PA.html>

¹³¹ Election Assistance Commission, “The Election Administration and Voting Survey; A Report to the United States Congress,” 2016. https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac_assets/1/6/2016_EAVS_Comprehensive_Report.pdf

¹³² The Superior Court Of Fulton County State Of Georgia, *Trump v. Raffensperger*, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v.-Raffensperger.pdf>

¹³³ For example, in Pennsylvania, 3 out of every 4 absentee/mail-in ballots went to Joe Biden <https://www.inquirer.com/politics/election/mail-ballots-pennsylvania-election-trump-biden-20201119.html>

And in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 84% of absentee/mail-in ballots went to Joe Biden

<https://www.tmj4.com/news/election-2020/no-joe-biden-did-not-get-100-percent-of-all-milwaukee-absentee-ballots>

¹³⁴ Heine, Debra, “Mathematician Says Biden May Have Received 130 Percent of the Democrat Vote in Maricopa County, Arizona,” December 2, 2020. <https://themichiganstar.com/2020/12/02/mathematician-says-biden-may-have-received-130-percent-of-the-democrat-vote-in-maricopa-county-arizona/>

¹³⁵ Affidavit of Russel R., Dallas County, Texas. November 17, 2020. https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.gand.283580/gov.uscourts.gand.283580.7.1_2.pdf

-
- ¹³⁶ *Milwaukee City Wire News Service*, “Analysis: Five Milwaukee wards report 89% turnout in 2020 presidential vote; Biden nets 146K votes in city,” November 4, 2020. <https://mkecitywire.com/stories/564495243-analysis-seven-milwaukee-wards-report-more-2020-presidential-votes-than-registered-voters-biden-nets-146k-votes-in-city>
- ¹³⁷ *Milwaukee City Wire News Service*, “Analysis: Five Milwaukee wards report 89% turnout in 2020 presidential vote; Biden nets 146K votes in city,” November 4, 2020. <https://mkecitywire.com/stories/564495243-analysis-seven-milwaukee-wards-report-more-2020-presidential-votes-than-registered-voters-biden-nets-146k-votes-in-city>
- ¹³⁸ Duda, Jeremy. “GOP lawsuit questions 'duplicate' ballots in Queen Creek,” *San Tan Valley Sentinel*, November 27, 2020. https://www.pinalcentral.com/san_tan_valley_sentinel/local_news/gop-lawsuit-questions-duplicate-ballots-in-queen-creek/article_ee9557d0-97e4-53e9-a269-5beb4b64370a.html
- ¹³⁹ In the Superior Court of Arizona in and For the County of Maricopa, *Kelli Ward v. Constance Jackson et al*, November 24, 2020. <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20417265/ward-v-jackson-complaint-and-petition-for-discovery.pdf>
- ¹⁴⁰ *Voter Integrity Project*, “Anomalies in Vote Counts and Their Effects on Election 2020,” November 24, 2020. <https://votepatternanalysis.substack.com/p/voting-anomalies-2020>
- ¹⁴¹ *Voter Integrity Project*, “Anomalies in Vote Counts and Their Effects on Election 2020,” November 24, 2020. <https://votepatternanalysis.substack.com/p/voting-anomalies-2020>
- ¹⁴² *Voter Integrity Project*, “Anomalies in Vote Counts and Their Effects on Election 2020,” November 24, 2020. <https://votepatternanalysis.substack.com/p/voting-anomalies-2020>
- ¹⁴³ *News Now*, “Michigan Republican Electors Harassed And Forced To Change Vote,” November 18, 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YW1YzQY_1Ro
- Dowling, M. “Michigan’s largest county refuses to certify the election – Update, evil wins,” *Independent Sentinel*, November 17, 2020. <https://www.independentsentinel.com/michigans-largest-county-refuses-to-certify-the-election/>
See Also
- Institute for Political Economy*, “Wayne County Michigan Withdraws Election Certification, Security Expert Concludes Michigan Was Stolen.” <https://www.newsbreak.com/news/2105758771365/wayne-county-michigan-withdraws-election-certification-security-expert-concludes-michigan-was-stolen>
- ¹⁴⁴ Pentchoukov, Ivan, “Illegal Money-For-Votes Raffles Conducted in Several States in 2020 Election,” December 1, 2020. https://www.theepochtimes.com/illegal-money-for-votes-raffles-conducted-in-several-states-in-2020-election_3598915.html
- ¹⁴⁵ Ballotpedia, “Partisan composition of state legislatures,” December 4, 2020. https://ballotpedia.org/Partisan_composition_of_state_legislatures
- ¹⁴⁶ *State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin*, “Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint,” December 7, 2020. https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22O155/162953/20201207234611533_TX-v-State-Motion-2020-12-07%20FINAL.pdf pg. 1
- ¹⁴⁷ *State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin*, “Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint,” December 7, 2020. https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22O155/162953/20201207234611533_TX-v-State-Motion-2020-12-07%20FINAL.pdf pg. 1
- ¹⁴⁸ Ballotpedia, “Partisan composition of state legislatures,” December 4, 2020. https://ballotpedia.org/Partisan_composition_of_state_legislatures

Democrat Party Grand Strategy

**Dramatically
INCREASE
Absentee & Mail-In
Ballots in
Battleground States**

**Dramatically
DECREASE
Ballot Verification**

**Tip Election to Biden
with FLOOD of
Illegal Ballots**

“Stuff the Ballot Box”

THE ART OF THE STEAL

**Volume Two of the Navarro Report
January 5, 2021**

Executive Summary – The Art of the Steal

The Democrat Party and its political operatives, with the unwitting aid of “useful idiots” from the Republican Party, stole the presidential election from Donald J. Trump.

The Democrat Party used a two-pronged Grand “Stuff the Ballot Box” Strategy to flood six key battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin – with enough illegal absentee and mail-in ballots to turn a decisive Trump victory into a narrow and illegitimate Biden alleged “win.”

Prong One dramatically INCREASED the amount of absentee and mail-in ballots in the battleground states. Prong Two dramatically DECREASED the level of scrutiny of such ballots – effectively taking the election “cops” off the beat. This pincer movement resulted in a FLOOD of illegal ballots into the battleground states more than sufficient to tip the scales from a decisive legal win by President Trump to a narrow and illegitimate alleged “victory” by Joe Biden.

The Democrat Party relied primarily on legal means such as legislative and rule changes at the state level to implement its Grand Strategy and thereby achieve its illegal outcome. However, at times, political operatives advancing the Democrat Party’s Grand Strategy also bent, and sometimes broke, the laws and rules of that which is most sacred to our American public – our election system.

Key methods used by the Democrat Party to strategically game America’s presidential election included changes in the law approved by State Legislatures; rule changes and new guidance initiated by Secretaries of State or other election officials; court rulings and interventions; and the aggressive use of so-called “public-private partnerships” to commandeer and manipulate the election process in key Democrat strongholds such as Wayne County, Michigan and Dane County, Wisconsin.

Prong One of the Democrat Party’s Grand Strategy used seven basic gambits to dramatically INCREASE the flood of absentee and mail-in ballots: relaxing mail-in and absentee ballot rules; sending absentee or mail-in ballots or applications for such ballots to every voter (universal mailing); increasing both the legal and illegal use of drop boxes; ballot harvesting; and the use of corrupted voting machines.

Prong Two of the Democrat Party’s Grand Strategy used five additional gambits to dramatically DECREASE the level of scrutiny of the new flood of absentee and mail-in ballots into the battleground states: relaxation of ID verification; reduced signature matching requirements; illegally counting naked ballots to increase ballot curing – both legal and illegal; and reduced poll watching and observing.

Democrat Party operatives frequently hid behind the shield of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) virus and resultant pandemic to further their goals of boosting the absentee and mail-in ballot counts in the key battleground states.

The practical result of the Democrat Party's two-pronged Grand "Stuff the Ballot Box" Strategy was to flood the six key battleground states with enough illegal absentee and mail-in ballots to turn a decisive Trump victory into a narrow alleged Biden "victory." Key political operatives assisting the Democrat Party included Wall Street oligarch George Soros, Silicon Valley oligarch and Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg, and Marc Elias, former Hillary Clinton Campaign General Counsel and one of the alleged architects and financial conduits for Fusion GPS and the Russia Hoax designed to topple a duly-elected President.

Soros money helped fund efforts to change election laws and rules through instruments such as referenda. Soros and his network of organizations such as the political action committee "Secretary of State Project" also helped to elect puppet Secretaries of State in Michigan (Jocelyn Benson) and Pennsylvania (Kathy Boockvar) who would play instrumental roles in bending or breaking election rules and thereby advancing the Grand "Stuff the Ballot Box" Strategy. Zuckerberg money – nearly half a billion dollars – helped engineer what was effectively a hostile Democrat Party "public-private partnership" takeover of what should otherwise be a nonpartisan election process in key Democrat strongholds such as Wayne County, Michigan and Dane County, Wisconsin.

Useful idiots for the Democrat Party included Georgia's Republican Governor Brian Kemp and Republican Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger who entered into a Consent Decree that dramatically INCREASED the number of absentee and mail-in ballots while dramatically DECREASING the rejection rate of such ballots. Republican state legislators who voted for the bills that would help the Democrats advance its Grand Strategy likewise were unwitting dupes.

By implementing its Grand "Stuff the Ballot Box" Strategy, the Democrat Party and its political operatives have strategically gamed one of the most sacred elements of American democracy, our election system. This was brass knuckle politics played at the highest level which has delivered a brutal punch to the nose of the American people and a vicious kick to the groin of American democracy.

That the Democrat Party and its operatives have, up to this point, gotten away with their Immaculate Deception and Art of the Steal, represents a signal failure of the media, Republican state legislators, other Republican government officials across the battleground states, the US Congress, and our judicial branch of government at both the state and federal levels.

Volumes 1 and 2 of the Navarro Report – *The Immaculate Deception* and *The Art of the Steal* – together make the strong case for a full investigation of the election irregularities and strategic gaming of our political process that in all likelihood have led to a stolen presidential election. Any such investigation must begin immediately as this nation simply cannot risk the inauguration of a president who will be perceived by a large segment of the American people as illegitimate.

Introduction

Volume 1 of The Navarro Report, *The Immaculate Deception*, revealed a coordinated Democrat Party strategy to steal the 2020 Presidential Election. That strategy was to stuff ballot boxes with illegal absentee and mail-in ballots across six battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

As illustrated in Figure One, this Democrat gaming of our political process was manifested by six types of election irregularities observed across the battleground states. These irregularities included outright voter fraud, ballot mishandling, due process fouls, violations of the 14th amendment’s Equal Protection clause, voting machine irregularities, and statistical anomalies.

Figure One

The Immaculate Deception						
	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Outright Voter Fraud	✓	✓	*	✓	*	✓
Ballot Mishandling		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Contestable Process Fouls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Equal Protection Clause Violations	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Voting Machine Irregularities	✓	✓		✓	✓	*
Significant Statistical Anomalies	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Biden “Victory” Margin	10,457	11,779	154,188	33,596	81,660	20,682
Possible Illegal Ballots	>100,000	>400,000	>379,000	>100,000	>600,000	>200,000

✓ = Wide-Spread Evidence * = Some Evidence

By exploiting these election irregularities – by bending, and at times breaking, the law or election rules – the Democrat Party thereby illicitly transformed substantial Trump leads into alleged narrow Biden leads across each of the battleground states. However, as *The Immaculate Deception* documented, these alleged Biden “victory margins” are dwarfed by the number of potentially illegal ballots in every single battleground state as illustrated in Columns 7 and 8 of Figure One above.

For example, the alleged Biden “victory margin” is less than 12,000 votes in Arizona, while the number of potentially illegal ballots was is than 10 times that. In Georgia, the alleged Biden “victory margin” is a mere 12,670 votes, yet the number of ballots in question is more than 400,000.

In the wake of the release of the Navarro Report on December 17, 2020, I received numerous requests to explain just exactly how the Democrat Party and its operatives managed to pull off its Immaculate Deception. That is the purpose of Volume 2 of the Navarro Report, *The Art of the Steal*.


The Art of the Steal takes a more granular look at the Democrats' Grand "Stuff the Ballot Box" Strategy. It seeks to answer some of the most basic questions now rising in the minds of an American public and an American political leadership increasingly skeptical about the fairness and legitimacy of the 2020 election. How did the Democrats pull off its Immaculate Deception without detection and appropriate countermeasures by the Republican Party? When did the Democrats' effort to topple a sitting president start? How much of what the Democrats did was illegal? And how much of what the Democrat Party and its agents did was done within the bounds of the law and rules but nonetheless led to an illegal outcome?

The Democrat Party's Grand "Stuff the Ballot Box" Strategy

This section of the report provides a broad overview of all of the various moving pieces and parts of the Democrat Party's Grand "Stuff the Ballot Box" Strategy. In the sections of the report that follow, we will provide additional granularity to each of these moving pieces and parts.

As illustrated in Figure Two, the Democrat Party and its political operatives used a two-pronged Grand "Stuff the Ballot Box" Strategy to FLOOD six key battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin – with enough illegal absentee and mail-in ballots to turn a decisive Trump victory into a narrow and illegitimate Biden alleged "win."

Figure Two



The first and most *obvious* prong of the strategy was to dramatically INCREASE the number of registered Democrat absentee and mail-in ballots cast in six battleground states – Arizona, Georgia Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. As President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State James Baker warned in their landmark 2005 Carter-Baker Commission Report, the best way to stuff illegal ballots into our election system without detection is by increasing absentee and mail-in ballots.¹

The second and more *subtle* prong of the strategy was to dramatically DECREASE the scrutiny and concomitant certification or verification of this new flood of absentee and mail-in ballots. By essentially taking the ballot verification cops off the beat, the practical result would be to dramatically INCREASE the number of illegal ballots that would be counted in the battleground states.

Figure Three illustrates the various (mostly) legal means and gambits the Democrat Party used to strategically game the presidential election system and thereby achieve what was, in effect, an illegal end – a FLOOD of illegal ballots sufficient to tip the election to Joe Biden.

These gambits included: law changes by state legislatures; rule changes by Secretaries of State (SOS) and other election officials; various court rulings, court interventions, and petitions; the aggressive use of so-called “Public-Private Partnerships” often funded by oligarchs like Mark Zuckerberg and George Soros; and the equally aggressive use of propaganda campaigns under the guise of “public awareness” messaging.

Figure Three

Democrat Party Strategically Games the 2020 Presidential Election						
	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
State Law Changes – Bills & Referenda			✓	✓	✓	
Rule Changes – Secretary of State (SOS)		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Rule Changes – Other Officials				✓		
Guidance – SOS or Election Officials			✓	✓	✓	✓
Court Rulings	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Court Interventions/Petitions			✓	✓		
Public-Private Partnerships (Zuckerberg/Soros Effect)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Propaganda/“Public Awareness” Campaigns	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

You can see from the checkmarks in Figure Three that each of these gambits are present in a significant degree in all six battleground states. Of the six states, Nevada, with its Democrat Governor and Democrat Legislature, is the worst offender followed by Michigan and Pennsylvania, each of which have a Democrat Governor.

Figure Four illustrates the variety of means and gambits the Democrat Party employed to dramatically INCREASE the flood of absentee and mail-in ballots. These gambits – many of them legal but some of them clearly bending or breaking the law or rules – included: relaxing mail-in and absentee ballot rules; sending absentee or mail-in ballots or applications for such ballots to every voter (universal mailing); increasing both the legal and illegal use of drop boxes; ballot harvesting; and the use of corrupt voting machines.

Figure Four

Dramatically INCREASE Absentee and Mail-In Ballots						
	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Relax Mail-In & Absentee Ballot Rules	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Universal Mailing of Absentee & Mail-in Ballots				✓		✓
Universal Mailing of Absentee / Mail-in Ballot Applications		✓	✓			✓
Increase Voting by Drop Boxes		✓	✓		✓	
Illegal Use of Ballot Drop Boxes		✓	✓			✓
Ballot Harvesting	✓	✓		✓		✓
Use of Potentially Corrupt Voting Machines	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Figure Five similarly illustrates the variety of gambits the Democrat Party employed to DECREASE scrutiny of absentee and mail-in ballots. These gambits included: relaxation of ID verification; reduced signature matching requirements; illegally counting naked ballots to increase ballot curing – both legal and illegal; and reduced poll watching and observing. Again, it is important to point out here that much of what the Democrats did was legal; but some of what they did at times also bent, and arguably sometimes broke, the rules or the law.

Figure Five

Dramatically DECREASE Absentee and Mail-in Ballot Verification						
	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Relax ID Verification	✓	✓		✓		✓
Reduce Signature Matching Requirements	✓	✓		✓		
Illegally Counting Naked Ballots		✓				
Increased Ballot Curing	✓	✓		✓		✓
Reduced Poll Watching/Observing		✓	✓		✓	

In the remainder of this report, we shall further deconstruct the Grand Strategy of the Democrat Party following the flow and logic of the figures above.

Strategically Gaming America’s Presidential Election

Let’s work our way now systematically through various means and gambits the Democrat Party used to strategically game America’s presidential election. Note that the examples that we will offer throughout the remainder of this report are designed to be illustrative rather than exhaustive.

This previously introduced figure summarizes the eight major means and gambits the Democrat Party used in its gaming of our presidential election:

Democrat Party Strategically Games the 2020 Presidential Election						
	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
State Law Changes – Bills & Referenda			✓	✓	✓	
Rule Changes – Secretary of State (SOS)		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Rule Changes – Other Officials				✓		
Guidance – SOS or Election Officials			✓	✓	✓	✓
Court Rulings	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Court Interventions/Petitions			✓	✓		
Public-Private Partnerships (Zuckerberg/Soros Effect)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Propaganda/“Public Awareness” Campaigns	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Law Changes by State Legislatures

Three battleground states – Michigan, Nevada, and Pennsylvania – issued major changes to their individual State Election Laws in the year leading up to the 2020 General Election. These are illustrated in Table One.

Table One

Law Changes by State Legislatures to Impact 2020 Election			
State	Law	Date	Provisions
Michigan	Senate Bill 757	10/6/2020	Cities and townships with population over 25,000 granted ballot counting timeframe extension
Nevada	Assembly Bill 4	8/3/2020	Universal mail-in ballots, ballot harvesting, ballot receipt deadline extension, ballot curing extension, and relaxed signature-matching
Pennsylvania	Act 12	3/27/2020	Ballot counting timeframe extension
Pennsylvania	Act 77	10/31/2019	"No-excuse" absentee voting, absentee voting period extension, permanent absentee ballot list, vote registration timeframe extension, and absentee ballot receipt deadline extension

For example, after the Nevada State Primary Election, a Special Session of the State Legislature was called by the Democrat Governor Steve Sisolak of Nevada to change the state's voting procedures. Notably, the CCP virus pandemic was used as a justification for this action. Consequently, AB-4 was an omnibus measure modifying election procedures during periods of declared emergency in Nevada as currently exists due to the CCP Virus.²

In Pennsylvania, on October 31, 2019, Democrat Governor Tom Wolf signed Act 77 after its passage in the Republican-Controlled State Legislature. This is the most drastic election law change Pennsylvania has made in modern history.

Act 77 made numerous major changes to state election law. In particular, the bill enabled “no-excuse” absentee ballot voting so voters no longer have to provide a reason for requesting absentee ballots; and it created a “new option” to vote by mail up to 50 days before an election and enabled voters to be placed on a list to “permanently receive a ballot application by mail.”³

This was a clear case where an unwitting “useful idiot” Republican legislature played right into the hands of the Democrat Party's Grand Strategy. Note: the term “useful idiot” is attributed to Vladimir Lenin. It describes naïve people who can be manipulated to advance a political cause.

This sweeping bill also extended the amount of time voters could register to vote; extended mail-in and absentee submission deadlines; and authorized a \$90 million bond to “reimburse counties for 60 percent of their actual cost to replace voting systems.”⁴

Rule Changes by the Secretaries of State

Secretaries of State in Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, and Pennsylvania bypassed their State Legislatures to issue rule changes that effectively allowed the counting of illegal ballots. They did so under the theory that the executive agency makes the rules while power is derived by legislation passed.

For example, on May 19, 2020, Michigan Democrat Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson, elected with the help of George Soros,⁵ announced that all registered voters in the August 4, 2020, primary and the November 3, 2020, General Election would receive mail-in ballot applications automatically.⁶ This was a sweeping change.

Regrettably, it wasn't just Democrat officials who were involved in promulgating such rule changes. As another useful idiot for the Democrats' Grand Strategy, Georgia's Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger played right into their hands. On March 24, he announced that election officials would mail absentee ballot request forms to all of Georgia's 6.9 million active voters for the primary election. This *universal ballot* measure was taken not just for the Presidential Primary Election on May 19 but also for the General Election on November 3.⁷

Rule Changes by Election Officials Other than Secretaries of State

Rule changes were also enacted by other election officials, effectively bypassing any chain of command running through either the Secretary of State or State Legislature. These changes likewise contributed to the expansion of absentee and mail-in ballot voting.

For example, in Georgia, the State Election Board approved a rule in April of 2020 to allow Georgia voters to cast ballots by drop boxes on a twenty-four hours a day basis,⁸ using the CCP Virus pandemic as justification.⁹ This was a clear case of bending or breaking the rules, as Georgia state law does not permit counties to collect ballots outside of the normal business hours of Election Offices. Moreover, as this expanded drop box capability was implemented, poll observers testified that they were obstructed from observing ballot counting and processing, meaning that fraudulent ballots could have been dumped into these 24/7 drop boxes prior to collection.¹⁰

Similarly, on October 18, 2016, the Wisconsin Election Commission unanimously voted on a rule change¹¹ for so-called “ballot curing” contrary to state law (specifically Wisconsin Statutes 6.84 and 6.86).¹² With this illegal rule change, the Wisconsin Election Commission instructed that mail-in ballots with missing addresses should be cured, that is, fixed.¹³ However, Wisconsin Election Law states: “If a certificate is missing the address of a witness, the ballot may not be counted.”¹⁴

This may well be a case where the Republican Party was sleeping on the job. This change went unchallenged for eleven statewide elections until the Trump campaign took action following the November 3 election where mail in ballots played a crucial role.¹⁵ The lack of a more timely challenge notwithstanding, the action taken by the Wisconsin Election Commission was clearly illegal.

Guidance Issued by Secretaries of State

As an additional gambit, Secretaries of State and other government officials in four of the six battleground states – Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin – have pushed the envelope of their authorities and beat the rules to unilaterally bypass state legislatures and other election officials to issue so-called “guidance.” Their goals are to effectively expand the universe of absentee and mail-in ballots while reducing scrutiny of such ballots. Moreover, they did so often in clear contradiction of State Election Codes.

The poster children for this problem – and two shining examples of the corrosive effects of the oligarch George Soros on the integrity of American elections – are Michigan’s Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson and Pennsylvania’s Democrat Secretary of State Kathy Boockvar. Both of these liberal extremist puppets were elected with the help of the so-called “Secretary of State Project,” a political action committee funded by George Soros and members of the Democracy Alliance.¹⁶

The goal of the Secretary of State project was to build a “Democrat Firewall” in key battleground states by placing progressive extremists in positions of authority where they would be willing to bend, and, at times, break the law.¹⁷ This is exactly what has happened in the 2020 Presidential Election.

Consider, for example, Boockvar’s arguably unlawful guidance on September 15, 2020.¹⁸ She directed local election officials not to perform on-the-spot signature analysis for absentee and mail-in ballots. In effect, mail-in ballots could not be rejected even if election officials deemed there was an improper signature match. When it comes to outrageousness, this is about as outrageous as it gets in terms of DECREASING the scrutiny of mail-in and absentee ballots.

More broadly, Boockvar appeared to exhibit a total disregard for the sanctity of our legal system when she submitted clearly unlawful guidance a few days before the November 3 election that allowed voters missing proof of identification to have their mail-in ballots cured until November 12 – nine days after the election. This did indeed break the law; and the Pennsylvania Supreme Court agreed, finding that Boockvar lacked the statutory authority to take that step.¹⁹ Yet it was a clear and blatant attempt by a Soros puppet to rig the election.

George Soros certainly got his money’s worth as Boockvar also sought to extend deadlines for mail-in ballots,²⁰ citing concerns over delivery times involving the United States Postal Service.²¹ Republicans opposed the action.²² Said Pennsylvania Senate Majority Leader Jake Corman (Republican): “The issue is [that]...Secretary [Boockvar is] trying to influence this process by

sending out guidance at the 11th hour.” He also expressed that the (Pennsylvania) State Department had been “weaponized” and influenced by partisan attempts to sway the vote.²³

Not to be outdone, in September 2020, another Soros puppet –Michigan Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson–encouraged voters, along with Democrat Governor Gretchen Whitmer, to vote by absentee ballot and drop off ballots in drop boxes in order to “decrease the spread of COVID-19.”²⁴ She also urged voters “not to wait too long” to send in their ballots and to take the ballots directly to their clerks’ offices for submission.²⁵

Court Rulings

The American nation has been witness to the spectacle of our judicial branch likewise being used as a useful idiot for the Democrat Party’s Grand Strategy to steal the presidential election. The problem here is that of judicial activism: far too often activist judges have let partisanship and their own ideology get in the way of a sober and clinical interpretation of the law. In this vein, Table Two below provides an overview of a number of court rulings that effectively advance the Democrat Party’s Grand strategy.

Table Two

Court Rulings to Change 2020 General Election Laws			
State	Case	Ruling Date	Result
Arizona	<i>Arizona Democrat Party v. Katie Hobbs</i>	9/10/2020	Ballot curing extension <u>5 days</u> after Election Day
Arizona	<i>Mi Familia e Vota v. Katie Hobbs</i>	10/5/2020	<u>2 week</u> voter registration deadline extension
Georgia	<i>Georgia Coalition for the People's Agenda v. Brian Kemp</i>	11/2/2018	Green card holders without proof of U.S. citizenship permitted to vote
Michigan	<i>Robert Davis v. Jocelyn Benson</i>	8/26/2020	Universal absentee ballot applications
Nevada	<i>Paher v. Cegavske</i>	4/27/2020	Universal mail-in voting
Pennsylvania	<i>Pennsylvania Democratic Party v. Kathy Boockvar</i>	9/17/2020	Absentee ballot submission extension <u>3 days</u> after Election Day
Wisconsin	<i>Sari Ratner Judge et al v. Board of Canvassers for the City of Madison</i>	10/23/2020	Legalize ballot harvesting events (e.g. "Democracy in the Park")

Consider, for example, the ruling of September 10, 2020 by Obama-appointed Judge Douglas Reyes of the U.S. District Court of Arizona. He ordered an extension period for absentee ballots for the 2020 General Election and thereby allowed missing signatures to be added to vote-by-mail ballots. In this dramatic expansion of the rules for curing ballots, election officials were allowed to give voters until 5:00 PM on the fifth business day after the election to sign their vote-by-mail ballot envelopes if they failed to sign at the time they submitted the ballots.²⁶

Similarly, on August 26, 2020, Michigan Court of Claims Judge Cynthia Stevens, appointed by then-Governor and Democrat Jennifer Granholm, ruled that Michigan Secretary of State and Soros puppet Jocelyn Benson had the authority to mail all Michigan registered voters (7.7 million total) absentee ballot applications for the November 3rd election.²⁷ This, likewise, was a dramatic expansion of universal mailing.

Court Interventions

Democrat-backed and funded third-party groups during the 2020 Election would also intervene in court cases or submit petitions in order to coerce state government officials and judges into pushing Radical Left election law changes.

For example, the oligarch George Soros spent over \$28 million on influence operations during the 2020 Election.²⁸ He funded groups like the Brennan Center for Justice which intervened on behalf of powerful Democrats like his puppet, Michigan Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson.

During the *Davis v. Benson* case, three plaintiffs sued Secretary Benson²⁹ for her decision to mail absentee ballot applications to all Michigan voters ahead of the 2020 Presidential Election.³⁰ On August 25, 2020, the Michigan Court of Claims ruled in favor of Benson, granting her the authority to send ballot applications to all Michigan voters.³¹ Again, it is useful to note here that this was a dramatic expansion of universal voting through absentee and mail-in ballots, with such universal voting as one of the worst conduits for illegal votes.

Not to be outdone, the leftist organization *Democracy Docket*, founded by Marc Elias, former General Counsel to the 2016 Hillary Clinton campaign, intervened in court cases to push election law changes consistent with the Democrat Party's Grand Strategy across all six states.³² A case in point: Elias and Democracy Docket supplied lawyers as "Intervener Defendants" and filed a motion to intervene in the *Election Integrity Project of Nevada v. Nevada* case.³³

It is well worth noting here that Elias is also credited with hiring the dirty tricks group Fusion GPS to "compile the 'Russia dossier' to dig up dirt on Donald Trump in the 2016 race."³⁴

It is as remarkable as it is abhorrent that the Trump Administration's Department of Justice did not conduct a full investigation and issue indictments in a Russia Hoax that ended in a complete exoneration of President Trump. Effectively, the Elias-led effort has institutionalized the idea that it is perfectly acceptable to run propaganda campaigns for the purpose of toppling duly elected government officials, including the President himself.

Petitions for Public Referenda

As Table Three illustrates, the Democrat Party also used public referenda to change election laws in both Michigan and Nevada. The purpose of these referenda was to dramatically expand absentee and mail-in voting – just as the Democrat Party Grant Strategy dictates. These referenda are financed in part by the Wall Street oligarch George Soros; and it is worth noting here that Soros,

the consummate globalist, made billions by “breaking the Bank of England” while inflicting great harm on the British working class.³⁵ It is equally worth noting that the Globalist Soros has a strong antipathy towards the Economic Nationalism of Donald J. Trump.

Table Three

Law Changes through Public Referenda			
State	Referenda	Date	Provisions
Michigan	Voting Policies in State Constitution Initiative (Proposal 3)	11/3/2018	Straight-ticket voting, automatic voter registration, same-day voter registration, "no-excuse" absentee voting, pre-processing of ballots, military and overseas voters to receipt absentee ballots 45 days prior to Election Day, extended mail-in voter registration until 15 days prior to an election, state-wide audits of election results
Nevada	Automatic Voter Registration (via DMV Initiative)	11/6/2018	Automatic voter registration for all Nevada citizens when receiving select services from the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles

Proposal 3 in Michigan was one of the most radical and sweeping changes to election law ever witnessed in America. Changes consistent with the Democrat Party’s Grand “Stuff the Ballot Box” Strategy included: straight-ticket voting, automatic voter registration, same-day voter registration, no-excuse absentee voting during the 40 days before an election, extended mail-in voter registration until fifteen days prior to an election, and the auditing of election results.³⁶

Proposal 3 was backed by Soros-financed far Left groups like *Promote the Vote*. *Promote the Vote* spent \$2.5 million collecting signatures for the Proposal 3 petition and for consulting and marketing.³⁷ The referendum wound up passing with sixty-six percent of the vote in the 2018 Midterm Election. Democrat Governor Gretchen Whitmer and Soros puppet Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson both heavily promoted this radical weakening of election laws in the mainstream media.³⁸

In fact, Proposal 3 was an encore to a similarly successful Soros-backed public referendum in Nevada. Shortly after the 2016 election, leftist organizations such as iVote and the ACLU of Nevada, both with ties to Soros,³⁹ spent tens of millions of dollars in Nevada collecting 55,000 signatures to submit a petition for “automatic voter registration” law changes in Nevada.⁴⁰

The proposed legislation eventually passed by public referendum in 2018. It mandated that individuals would be automatically registered to vote when receiving select services from the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), such as obtaining a renewal or change of address for a license or identification card. In order to not be registered to vote, individuals would have to decline the registration by submitting a request in writing—an obvious strong incentive to be registered.⁴¹

Public-Private Partnerships (*Zuckerberg-Soros Effect*)

Both the Wall Street oligarch George Soros and the Silicon Valley oligarch and Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg used their deep pockets to finance public-private partnerships that would help advance the Democrat Party's grand strategy.

Zuckerberg money – nearly half a billion dollars – helped engineer what was effectively a hostile Democrat Party “public-private partnership” takeover of what should otherwise be a nonpartisan election process in key Democrat strongholds such as Wayne County, Michigan and Dane County, Wisconsin, and Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania.

It is worth noting that there is only one degree of separation between Soros and Zuckerberg. Zuckerberg's Center for Tech and Civic Life (CTCL) was founded in 2012 and is staffed by people that worked at the New Organizing Institute, a now defunct organization that was funded in part by George Soros' Open Society Foundation.⁴² During the 2020 Election, it would be Zuckerberg's CTCL that would spend hundreds of millions of dollars to fund cities, towns, and counties for “election administration.”⁴³

For example, Wisconsin used a \$6.3 million CTCL grant from Mark Zuckerberg to support the installation of drop-boxes and illegal ballot harvesting events like “Democracy in the Park.” These funds were also used to help with various other election administration activities in several Democrat strongholds including Milwaukee, Madison, Green Bay, Racine, and Kenosha.⁴⁴

Similarly, Pennsylvania received over \$12 million from CTCL. Fully \$10 million of those funds poured into the Democrat-dominated Philadelphia to help boost turnout and count ballots. The strings attached to these funds required the city to open no fewer than 800 new polling places, thereby dramatically changing how Philadelphia managed its General Election processes.⁴⁵ In a clear violation of its tax-exempt status, CTCL has posted anti-Republican and anti-Trump statements on social media.”⁴⁶

Despite its claims of non-partisanship, CTCL's officials have a documented history of involvement in left-wing political movements. A complaint filed on August 28, 2020 with the Wisconsin Elections Commission (WEC) showed that the organization is comprised of Barack Obama's allies who were highly skilled in recruiting Democrat voters to the polls.⁴⁷

It is also worth noting here that while this report does not examine any possible interventions by the Chinese Communist Party into our election, Mark Zuckerberg has long sought to enter the Chinese market. He speaks fluent Chinese,⁴⁸ and his company, Facebook, has – despicably – hired

Chinese Communist Party members⁴⁹ to increase Facebook's ability to censor Trump supporters and the conservative movement.

Zuckerberg also has expressed sympathies for Chinese Communist Party ideology. In 2014, Zuckerberg met with Chinese internet Czar Lu Wei in Silicon Valley, and was caught on Chinese state-run media promoting Chairman Xi's book entitled "The Governance of China."⁵⁰ In fact, Zuckerberg also distributed this propaganda trash to his colleagues, because he desired for them to understand Communist Party ideology such as "socialism with Chinese characteristics."⁵¹ In 2016, Zuckerberg also met with China's propaganda chief, Liu Yunshan, and praised the Communist Party for its "development of the internet."⁵²

As for George Soros and his web of progressive organizations, the Soros effort to influence the 2020 election ironically would be assisted by a key department in the Trump Administration, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In November 2019, DHS announced it would partner with Soros-funded VotingWorks – a left-of-center non-profit provider of voting machines and open-source election verification software – to salt key battleground states with voting machines.

Alleged Russia Hoax participant Marc Elias used tactics similar to Soros and Zuckerberg that likewise helped advance the Democrat Party's Grand Strategy. For example, Elias assisted Stacey Abrams' nonprofit, the New Georgia Project, in filing a complaint on May 8, 2020, which called for radical Election Law changes. These changes included absentee ballot receipt deadline extensions and increased ballot curing.⁵³

Elias' plan would reap major fruit in Gwinnett, Georgia, as Republicans lost major races for District Attorney, Sheriff, and County Commission Chair. The Democrat Party also flipped the 7th Congressional District seat to the blue side.⁵⁴

Propaganda "Public Awareness" Campaign

Many of the gambits advanced by the Democrat Party, their operatives, and their useful idiots were done under cover of "public awareness" campaigns that often amounted to little more than propaganda. Such campaigns were designed to target voters through published statements, reports, and media stories. The goal was to influence – and soften – public attitudes towards the liberalization of absentee and mail-in voting.

For example, in leaked documents from Soros' Open Society Foundation, the Soros-funded Brennan Center was listed as the recipient of funds earmarked for the express purpose of "litigation to expand access to registration and improve ease of voting."⁵⁵ As was common practice with the Democrats, the Brennan Center would use the shield of the CCP virus pandemic to advance its goals.

For example, in March of 2020, the Brennan Center issued a memo to influence mail-in ballot election law changes as a result of the CCP Virus pandemic. The memo stated: "All voters should be offered the option to cast their ballot by mail (with multiple submission options, as provided below), so as to enable voters to avoid lines at the polls and exposure to COVID-19."⁵⁶

Soros-funded Brennan Center memo also made five key recommendations aimed at expanding absentee and mail-in voting. These included: (1) polling place modification and preparation; (2) expanded early voting; (3) a universal vote-by-mail option; and (4) voter registration modification and preparation, including expanded online registration.⁵⁷

Democrat Methods to Dramatically INCREASE Absentee and Mail-In Ballot Voting

Let’s turn next to an examination of the various methods the Democrats used to dramatically INCREASE absentee and mail-in ballot voting in the battleground states. As previously introduced, Figure Six below illustrates the seven principal methods. These methods were identified from an analysis of the various modifications made to state election laws and rules and procedures in advance of the 2020 presidential election.

Note that a checkmark in a given cell in the matrix indicates that particular mechanism was present in a particular state. For example, universal mailing of absentee and/or mail-in ballots was observed in both Nevada and Wisconsin. Similarly, there is an increase in voting through the use of drop boxes in Georgia, Michigan, and Pennsylvania.

Of the six battleground states, Georgia and Wisconsin were subject to six of the seven methods of boosting absentee and mail-in ballot voting while at the other end of the scale Arizona was subject to three.

Figure Six

Dramatically INCREASE Absentee and Mail-In Ballots						
	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Relax Mail-In & Absentee Ballot Rules	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Universal Mailing of Absentee & Mail-in Ballots				✓		✓
Universal Mailing of Absentee / Mail-in Ballot Applications		✓	✓			✓
Increase Voting by Drop Boxes		✓	✓		✓	
Illegal Use of Ballot Drop Boxes		✓	✓			✓
Ballot Harvesting	✓	✓		✓		✓
Use of Potentially Corrupt Voting Machines	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Relaxed Mail - in / Absentee Ballot Requirements

The relaxation of absentee and mail-in ballot requirements was accomplished in a variety of ways. For example, on March 27, the Dane and Milwaukee County Clerks in Wisconsin issued guidance to voters that the pandemic was grounds for *anyone* to be considered an “indefinitely confined” voter.⁵⁸ In effect, this gutted the ID verification process for anyone who chose to identify as indefinitely confined because it allowed these voters to cast their ballots without presenting proper ID as a condition for an absentee ballot.⁵⁹

As a result of this change, the number of indefinitely confined voters surged in Dane and Milwaukee counties – two Democrat strongholds – from 72,000 in 2019 to over 240,000 by November 3, 2020.⁶⁰ Within the context of Democrat Party’s Grand Strategy, this was a twofer. The guidance simultaneously expanded the universe of absentee and mail-in ballot voters while lowering the level of scrutiny of these ballots.

Similarly, in Pennsylvania, a lawsuit was filed by the Democrat Party on July 10, 2020, citing Act 77’s provisions to expand absentee voting for all Pennsylvania registered voters.⁶¹ On September 17, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Democrat Party, allowing a three-day receipt deadline for absentee ballots postmarked by 8 PM on Election Day (November 3). In other words, ballots with a “pre-election” postmark were counted as long as they were received by 5 PM on November 6th, three days after polls closed. 10,000 absentee ballots in Pennsylvania were received after 8:00 PM on November 3.⁶²

Legalizing Universal Mailing of Mail-in/Absentee Ballots

Several states across the U.S. conduct all mail-in voting. These include Colorado, Hawaii, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. In other words, these states send mail-in ballots automatically without the voter’s consent. However, universal mail-in ballots are historically subjected to higher rates of fraud due to lack of I.D. verification, individuals submitting ballots multiple times without being detected, and voting under the identity of another individual; and each of these examples are apparent during the 2020 Presidential Election.

As part of its Grand Strategy, the Democrat Party and its operatives were successful in pushing for universal mail-in voting in Nevada and Wisconsin. In both of these states, election laws were altered so that mail-in ballots could be sent automatically to every individual on the voter rolls.

For example, on August 3, 2020, Democrat Governor Steve Sisolak (D) in Nevada signed AB-4 legislation into law. It directed election officials to distribute mail-in ballots automatically to all active registered voters for the November 3, 2020, General Election. This bill also gave Sisolak the authority to bypass Republican Secretary of State Barbara Cegavske and command her to adjust election procedures during a declared State of Emergency.

Note that the CCP virus pandemic again was used to justify this power grab. This alleged “reform” has led to substantial fraud; for example, roughly 15,000 mail-in or absentee ballots were counted in Nevada from voters who had voted in other states.⁶³

Legalizing Universal Mailing of Applications for Mail-in/Absentee Ballots

Closely related to the method of sending mail-in ballots to all registered voters is the technique of sending absentee ballot applications to all registered voters. This was done in Georgia, Michigan and Wisconsin.

For example, as previously noted, on August 26, 2020, the Michigan Court of Claims ruled that Michigan Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson had the authority to mail all Michigan registered voters (7.7 million total) absentee ballot applications for the November 3rd election.⁶⁴

Similarly, on June 17, 2020, the Wisconsin Election Commission voted unanimously to send absentee and mail-in ballot applications automatically to 2.7 million registered voters for the November 3, 2020, general election, who had not originally requested mail-in ballots.⁶⁵

Increase Voting by Drop Box

As discussed in Volume 1 of the Navarro Report, the use of ballot drop boxes raises huge chain of custody issues. As a further complicating issue, ballot harvesting, which is illegal in ten states, becomes much easier with the use of drop boxes.

Perhaps for this reason, prior to the 2020 election season, only thirteen states used ballot drop boxes. In this year's November General Election, however, that number skyrocketed to thirty-eight states and Washington, D.C.⁶⁶

Consider, for example Georgia. Ahead of the 2020 Presidential Primary Election held on June 9, the State Election Board required that "County registrars are authorized to establish one or more drop box locations as a means for absentee by mail electors to deliver their ballots to the county registrars."⁶⁷ Drop Boxes were then installed in nineteen of Georgia's 159 counties.⁶⁸

Similarly, in Michigan, there appears to have been a conscious effort to stuff the ballot box by stuffing Democrat strongholds with drop boxes. Thirteen new drop boxes were established in Lansing,⁶⁹ five in Ann Arbor,⁷⁰ and nearly forty in Detroit,⁷¹ As of the November 3 Election, Michigan had a total of 700 drop-boxes statewide.⁷²

Both Governor Whitmer and Soros puppet Secretary of State Benson issued statements in September 2020 to encourage voters to vote by absentee ballot and submit ballots via drop box in order to "decrease the spread of COVID-19."⁷³ Here again, we see the Democrats hid behind the shield of the CCP virus to advance their Grand Strategy.

Illegal Use of Drop Boxes

In at least some cases, the expanded use of drop boxes was a clear violation of state law.

Consider, for example, Wisconsin. Drop boxes are clearly illegal according to state election law.⁷⁴ Yet, the Wisconsin Election Committee nonetheless illegally issued guidance on August 19, 2020, to election officials in all municipalities throughout the state. It designated "drop boxes or mail slots set up for taxes, mail and public utilities as secure ballot drop locations" and suggested

“partnering with businesses...such as grocery stores and banks” as places voters could cast their ballots.⁷⁵

For example, in Pennsylvania, ahead of the 2020 Presidential Primary, ballot drop boxes were established in violation of state law under Secretary of State Boockvar’s knowledge and consent.

Similar problems arose in Pennsylvania. On June 29, 2020, the Trump Campaign filed a complaint to Secretary of State Boockvar and sixty-seven county officials in Pennsylvania, stating that the Secretary of State established drop boxes illegally by failing to provide adequate security, oversight, and supervision over the drop boxes. These conditions would thereby foster an environment that would encourage the legal ballot harvesting and/or tampering.⁷⁶

As indicated in Volume 1 of the Navarro Report, numerous abuses were indeed observed. For example, ballots were illegally dumped into drop boxes at the Nazareth, Pennsylvania, ballot drop box center, in violation of state law.⁷⁷ Another witness in Pennsylvania with video and photo evidence caught a man coming out of an unmarked Jeep extracting ballots from an unsupervised ballot drop box to be brought into a ballot counting center.⁷⁸

It’s not just that these drop boxes were illegally deployed. They were disproportionately deployed in urban areas with higher Democrat registration, favoring Joe Biden.⁷⁹

Ballot Harvesting

“Ballot harvesting” is the practice of allowing individuals to collect ballots from voters and deliver these bundles of votes to polling stations or drop boxes. Given the obvious chain of custody issues associated ballot harvesting – and the equally obvious opportunities to engage in fake ballot manufacturing – it is no surprise that many states forbid the practice.

These dangers to our democracy notwithstanding, the Democrat Party successfully pushed for the passage of legislation to legalize ballot harvesting in the battleground states of Georgia, Nevada, and Wisconsin.⁸⁰

On August 3, 2020, Nevada Democrat Governor Steve Sisolak called a special session with the State Legislature and signed Assembly Bill 4.⁸¹ It legalized the practice of ballot harvesting.

Bill 4 passed on a party-line vote through both the state Senate and Assembly, with Democrats in favor⁸² and all Republicans opposed.⁸³ Implementation of this bill took place over the strong objections of Nevada Republican Secretary of State Barbara Cegavske who warned that expanded ballot harvesting could fraudulently tip the scales in elections.⁸⁴

In both Georgia and Wisconsin, where ballot harvesting is illegal,⁸⁵ Democrat operatives nonetheless pushed the envelope of the law to run ballot harvesting operations. For example, several Democrat non-profits took advantage of the Georgia ballot-curing extension deadline and

conducted an absentee ballot-harvesting operation. This operation alone is suspected to have added enough Democrat votes to tip the scales in favor of Joe Biden.⁸⁶

To engage in this end run around the law, these organizations called themselves “Ballot Rescue Teams.” They deployed Democrat volunteer activist operatives to call voters and knock on voters’ doors as part of this operation.⁸⁷

As for Wisconsin, city officials in the Democrat stronghold of Madison assisted in the creation of more than 200 “Democracy in the Park” illegal polling places. These *faux* polling places were promoted and supported by the Biden campaign. They provided witnesses for absentee ballots and acted in every way like legal polling places—but weren’t. Moreover, they received ballots outside of the limited fourteen-day period preceding an election that is authorized by statute for in-person or absentee balloting. These were all clear violations of state law that had the effect of propagating ballot harvesting.

Installation of Potentially Corrupt Voting Machines

Much has been written about how vulnerabilities in voting machine systems may be exploited by cyber hackers and other bad actors to alter the count of actual ballots. A poster child for this problem is the dramatic malfunction that was observed with Dominion Voting Systems in Antrim, Michigan to the detriment of the count for President Trump.⁸⁸

In July of 2019, the nonprofit group Fair Fight Action issued a report claiming that another system—Election Securities and Software (ES&S)—has demonstrated “systematic disregard for basic security best practices and a complete lack of competence in the manufacturing of reliable voting machines.” The report also cited “large-scale negligence [that] exposed personal data of millions of voters, left tens of thousands of names off rolls and led to massive delays in vote counts across the country.” Moreover numerous US Senators “have expressed national security concerns after ES&S lied to federal lawmakers, refused to reveal which states were sent critically flawed machines, and vigorously fought attempts to reveal reliability information.”⁸⁹

Despite such concerns and warnings, Dominion and ES&S were implemented in all six battleground states between 2017 and 2020. For example, in March of 2020, Georgia rushed to install 30,000 new electronic voting machines from Dominion. State evaluators warned that these machines were subject to vulnerabilities.⁹⁰ Nonetheless, they were installed in all of Georgia’s 159 counties.⁹¹

In 2019, Pennsylvania installed Dominion in fourteen of Pennsylvania’s sixty-seven counties, resulting from guidance issued by the Soros puppet Secretary of State Boockvar.⁹² In 2020, 33 counties in Pennsylvania also installed the ES&S system. These counties included the Democrat strongholds of Philadelphia and Montgomery.⁹³ (Dane and Milwaukee in Wisconsin also use ES&S which were also found to be susceptible to vulnerabilities).⁹⁴

In March of 2017, the Michigan state government and twenty-two localities likewise awarded Dominion a \$31.5 million contract to provide voting machinery statewide. The top-spending local governments included the cities of Detroit (\$457,880), Dearborn (\$22,975), and Livonia (\$65,310) in Democrat-dominated Wayne County.⁹⁵

Dramatically DECREASE Democrat Ballots Rejected Across Six Battleground States

Even as the Democrat Party sought to dramatically INCREASE the amount of absentee and mail-in ballots, they also sought to dramatically DECREASE the level of scrutiny of such ballots. The practical effect of a reduced level of scrutiny – fewer “election cops” on the beat – was to significantly increase the level of illegal ballots able to FLOOD into the six battleground states.

Figure Seven illustrates how the five major gambits used to reduce scrutiny of absentee and mail-in ballots were distributed across the six battleground states. You can see from the figure that the State of Georgia effectively ran the table on behalf of the Democrats – no small irony given the fact that Georgia has both as useful idiots, both a Republican governor and a Republican Secretary of State.

In studying this figure, it is important to note that all methods of reducing ballot scrutiny are not created equal. One of the most critical elements of a free and fair election is the transparency one gains through comprehensive poll watching and observing. While both Pennsylvania and Michigan are characterized by only this method of reduced scrutiny, this method alone affected hundreds of thousands of potentially illegal votes in both states.

Figure Seven

Dramatically DECREASE Absentee and Mail-in Ballot Verification						
	ARIZONA	GEORGIA	MICHIGAN	NEVADA	PENNSYLVANIA	WISCONSIN
Relax ID Verification	✓	✓		✓		✓
Reduce Signature Matching Requirements	✓	✓		✓		
Illegally Counting Naked Ballots		✓				
Increased Ballot Curing	✓	✓		✓		✓
Reduced Poll Watching/Observing		✓	✓		✓	

Relaxed ID Verification Requirements

The Democratic push for lower voter identification requirements most notably occurred in Arizona, Georgia, Nevada, and Wisconsin.

For example, behind the shield of the CCP virus, Democrat stronghold counties in Arizona like Maricopa and Pima allowed and encouraged residents of long-term care facilities to vote by video chat.⁹⁶ There is no way to verify voter identification by video call, and there is no oversight over special election boards to know, in fact, if ballots are being recorded accurately.⁹⁷

Similarly, as noted earlier, Wisconsin's Democrat-dominated Dane and Milwaukee counties allowed anyone to register as "indefinitely confined."⁹⁸ These Wisconsin votes were thereby tabulated without verifying photo ID.⁹⁹

Relaxed Signature-Match Requirements

A major way mail-in and absentee ballots can be verified is through a process called signature matching. All states require voters to provide signatures on their absentee and mail-in ballot return documents in order to verify identification.¹⁰⁰

Note that thirty-two states in the U.S. require election workers to match voter signature with a signature on record for the voter on their registration form.¹⁰¹ In this case, Arizona, Georgia, and Nevada all relaxed signature match requirements, bringing into question hundreds of thousands potentially illegal ballots.

Perhaps most egregiously, on March 6th of 2020, Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger, with the approval of Governor Brian Kemp, signed off on a secret legal agreement with the Democratic Party of Georgia, the Democrat Senatorial Campaign Committee, and the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee to significantly alter absentee ballot procedures in Georgia.¹⁰² The Democrats' attorney for this secret deal was alleged Russia Hoax operative Marc Elias from Perkins Coie.¹⁰³

Originally, the signature-matching requirement in Georgia was such that the signature on the mail-in envelope had to match both the voter's signature stored in the State's E-Net system, as well as the absentee ballot application. The new guidance loosened these requirements; it only required that the signature on the absentee (mail-in) ballot envelope either must match the eNet signature, or the absentee ballot application, rather than both.¹⁰⁴ Further, the State required that if the election worker found a signature to not match, it couldn't be rejected unless a majority of the registrars, deputy registrars, or absentee ballot clerks reviewing the signature agreed.¹⁰⁵

This wholesale gutting of the state's signature-match requirement resulted in a drastic reduction in Georgia's absentee ballot rejection rate from 6.8% in 2016, to 0.34% during the 2020 Presidential Election. Effectively, almost none of Georgia's 1.3 million absentee ballots were rejected.¹⁰⁶ On top of this, Georgians were given the opportunity to "cure" or "fix" their ballot signatures on

ballots incorrectly filled out for three days after November 3 (Election Day).¹⁰⁷ If the flood of absentee ballots in the 2020 election had been rejected at the same rate as in the 2016 election, that would have been enough alone to flip the election to President Trump.

A similarly egregious problem reared its Grand Strategy head in Nevada. New legislation passed in August of 2020¹⁰⁸ allowed voters over sixty-five who have a disability or are unable to read or write to have someone assist them in physically marking signatures on their ballots.¹⁰⁹ These relaxed rules thereby have called into question at least some of the 400,000 ballots cast by Nevadans aged 65 and older. This “reform” also likely contributed to the statewide absentee ballot rejection rate dropping from 1.6% in 2016 to 0.58% in 2020.¹¹⁰

Illegal Counting of Naked Ballots

A quick review of the Figure Seven above indicates that the State of Georgia effectively cornered the market on the illegal counting of naked ballots. This was part of the bitter fruit of the aforementioned Georgia Consent Decree.

Increased Opportunities for Ballot Curing

As a fourth method to DECREASE the scrutiny of absentee and mail-in ballots, Democrats pushed for ballot curing leniency, which increased the ability or timeframe for curing problematic ballots. Ultimately, this effort allowed for illegally submitted mail-in or absentee ballots to be counted.

For example, on September 10, 2020, Obama-appointed Judge Douglas Rayes of the U.S. District Court for Arizona ordered election officials to give voters five business days after Election Day to sign their vote-by-mail ballot envelopes. Voters had until 5 PM on November 10 to sign the envelopes even if they failed to sign at the time they submitted the ballots.¹¹¹

In the wake of this order, Democrat volunteers raced around the state texting, calling, and knocking on people’s doors¹¹² to make sure thousands of ballots would be cured.¹¹³ Without the ruling, such votes would otherwise have been deemed illegal.

Perhaps most egregiously, the Wisconsin Election Commission unanimously offered guidance¹¹⁴ for vote curing, notably in contradiction of Wisconsin Statutes 6.84 and 6.86. For example, the Wisconsin Election Commission instructed curing mail-in ballots with missing addresses.¹¹⁵ This was despite Wisconsin Election Law plainly stating: “If a certificate is missing the address of a witness, the ballot may not be counted.”¹¹⁶ (Nevadans were also given a ballot-curing extension for up to a week after Election Day.)¹¹⁷

Reduced Poll Watching/Observing

Democrat Party officials and operatives repeatedly sought to reduce the meaningful access of Republican poll watchers and observers during the ballot counting process in half of the

battleground states. At the same time, these officials and operatives also sought to reduce the actual number of poll watchers and observers, often behind the shield of the CCP virus.

For example, Act 12 was passed by the Pennsylvania State Legislature on March 27, 2020. It mandated a reduction in the amount of poll workers.¹¹⁸ Also in Pennsylvania, certified Republican poll watchers were not allowed within six feet of ballot counters, and even kept at distances between 50 and 100 feet.¹¹⁹ Despite the disenfranchisement of observers and legal voters, counties like Philadelphia asserted that these restrictions had to go into effect due to pandemic social-distancing guidelines.¹²⁰ Such limitations would remain in place until a Pennsylvania Court Ruling went into effect on November 5, after hundreds of thousands of ballots had already been processed.¹²¹

Michigan, likewise, was a hotbed poll watcher and observer abuses designed to reduce the scrutiny of potentially illegal absentee and mail-in ballots. For example, Republican poll workers were kept more than six feet from ballot counters, sometimes, on entirely separate floors.¹²² Like in Pennsylvania, this flagrant denial of ballot observation was justified under CCP pandemic guidelines.

The practical effect of the Democrat Party's *Art of the Steal* was to substantially increase the number of potentially illegal ballots across all six battleground states. The equally practical result of the *Art of the Steal* was to effectively tip the balance of the election through the strategic gaming of the electoral process. While much of what the Democrats did was not *per se* illegal, what they did enabled illegal activity, namely, stuffing the ballot box with illegal mail-in and absentee ballots.

Concluding Observations

By implementing its Grand “Stuff the Ballot Box” Strategy, the Democrat Party and its political operatives have strategically gamed one of the most sacred elements of American democracy, our election system. This was brass knuckle politics at the highest level which has delivered a brutal punch to the nose of the American people and a vicious kick to the groin of American democracy.

That the Democrat Party and its operatives have, up to this point, gotten away with their Immaculate Deception and Art of the Steal represents a signal failure of the media, Republican state legislators, and other Republican government officials across the battleground states, the US Congress, and our judicial branch of government at both the state and federal levels.

Volumes 1 and 2 of the Navarro Report – *The Immaculate Deception* and *The Art of the Steal* – together make the strong case for a full investigation of the election irregularities and strategic gaming of our political process that in all likelihood have led to a stolen presidential election. Any such investigation must begin immediately as this nation simply cannot risk the inauguration of a president who will be perceived by a large segment of the American people as illegitimate.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Carter, Jimmy, et al, “Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” *Center for Democracy and Election Management*, American University, September, 2005.
<https://www.legislationline.org/download/id/1472/file/3b50795b2d0374cbef5c29766256.pdf>
- ² Dentzer, Bill, “Nevada Senate OKs mail-in election bill on party-line vote,” *Las Vegas Review Journal*, August 2, 2020. <https://www.reviewjournal.com/news/politics-and-government/nevada/nevada-senate-oks-mail-in-election-bill-on-party-line-vote-2086628/>
- ³ Pennsylvania General Assembly, *Act 77*, October 31, 2019.
<https://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/legis/li/uconsCheck.cfm?yr=2019&sessInd=0&act=77>
- ⁴ Pennsylvania General Assembly, *Act 77*, October 31, 2019.
<https://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/legis/li/uconsCheck.cfm?yr=2019&sessInd=0&act=77>
- ⁵ Brayton, Ed, “Secretary of State Candidates Focus on Voter Fraud, Soros,” *Clerk/Register of Deeds*.
<https://clerk.macombgov.org/Clerk-Newspaper-VoterFraud>
- ⁶ Michigan State Government, “Benson: All voters receiving applications to vote by mail,” May 19, 2020.
<https://www.michigan.gov/sos/0,4670,7-127-93094-529536--,00.html>
- ⁷ “Absentee voting program embraced by Georgia voters, then abandoned,” *AJC*, June 29, 2020.
<https://www.ajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/absentee-voting-program-embraced-georgia-voters-then-abandoned/hkNttNsgXlaYZXjUatnvjK/>
- ⁸ “Ballot drop boxes approved for Georgia voters during coronavirus,” *AJC*, April 19, 2020.
<https://www.ajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/ballot-drop-boxes-approved-for-georgia-voters-during-coronavirus/4Bir3Ymx1zL0ZOGsXMazEO/>
- ⁹ “Republican lawsuit would limit use of ballot drop boxes in Georgia,” *AJC*, December 9, 2020.
<https://www.ajc.com/politics/election/republican-lawsuit-would-limit-use-of-ballot-drop-boxes-in-georgia/7GBT2RX7N5DGXDDV6IONWEE5B4/>
- ¹⁰ “Ballot drop boxes approved for Georgia voters during coronavirus,” *AJC*, April 19, 2020.
<https://www.ajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/ballot-drop-boxes-approved-for-georgia-voters-during-coronavirus/4Bir3Ymx1zL0ZOGsXMazEO/>
- ¹¹ BeMiller, Haley, “Fact check: Wisconsin clerks followed guidance in place since 2016 about witnesses and absentee ballots,” *USA Today*, November 12, 2020.
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/factcheck/2020/11/11/fact-check-wisc-clerks-followed-2016-guidance-absentee-ballots/6253055002/>
- ¹² Wisconsin Elections Commission, “2020 Election for the President of the United States, Verified Petition for Recount,” November 18, 2020. https://www.democracymarket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/Recount-Petition_President_2020.pdf
- ¹³ https://www.democracymarket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/Recount-Petition_President_2020.pdf
- ¹⁴ BeMiller, Haley, “Fact check: Wisconsin clerks followed guidance in place since 2016 about witnesses and absentee ballots,” *USA Today*, November 12, 2020.
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/factcheck/2020/11/11/fact-check-wisc-clerks-followed-2016-guidance-absentee-ballots/6253055002/>
- ¹⁵ BeMiller, Haley, “Fact check: Wisconsin clerks followed guidance in place since 2016 about witnesses and absentee ballots,” *USA Today*, November 12, 2020.
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/factcheck/2020/11/11/fact-check-wisc-clerks-followed-2016-guidance-absentee-ballots/6253055002/>
- ¹⁶ Shipwrecked Crew, “In 2006 George Soros Funded a Project to Elect Progressive Liberals to Secretary of State Offices -- Now You Know Why,” *Red State*, November 6, 2020.
<https://redstate.com/shipwreckedcrew/2020/11/06/in-2006-george-soros-funded-a-project-to-elect-progressive-liberals-to-secretary-of-state-offices-now-you-know-why-n276082>
- ¹⁷ Zenilman, Avi, “Secretaries of State Give Dem Firewall,” November 2, 2008.
<https://www.politico.com/story/2008/11/secretaries-of-state-give-dem-firewall-015105>
- ¹⁸ Pennsylvania Department of State, “Guidance Concerning Examination Of Absentee And Mail-In Ballot Return Envelopes,” September 11, 2020.
<https://www.dos.pa.gov/VotingElections/OtherServicesEvents/Documents/Examination%20of%20Absentee%20and%20Mail-In%20Ballot%20Return%20Envelopes.pdf>

-
- ¹⁹ In the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, *Donald J. Trump for President v. Boockvar et al*, November 12, 2020. <https://static.foxbusiness.com/foxbusiness.com/content/uploads/2020/11/602-MD-2020-Order-Nov.-12.pdf>
See Also
Davidson, Jordan, “Pennsylvania Judge Sides With Trump Campaign, Throwing Out Ballots Missing ID Deadline,” *The Federalist*, November 12, 2020. <https://thefederalist.com/2020/11/12/pennsylvania-judge-sides-with-trump-campaign-throwing-out-ballots-missing-id-deadline/>
- ²⁰ Levy, Marc, “Pennsylvania asks court to extend mail-in voting deadlines,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, August 14, 2020. <https://www.post-gazette.com/news/state/2020/08/14/Pennsylvania-asks-court-extend-mail-in-voting-deadlines-2020-election/stories/202008140079>
- ²¹ Montellaro, Zach, “Pennsylvania Supreme Court extends state's mail ballot deadline,” *Politico*, September 17, 2020. <https://www.politico.com/news/2020/09/17/pennsylvania-mail-ballot-deadline-extended-417044>
- ²² Montellaro, Zach, “Pennsylvania Supreme Court extends state's mail ballot deadline,” *Politico*, September 17, 2020. <https://www.politico.com/news/2020/09/17/pennsylvania-mail-ballot-deadline-extended-417044>
- ²³ Rosenblatt, Lauren, “Senate Republican Leaders Ask for PA Secretary of State Boockvar to Step Down,” *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, November 4, 2020. <https://www.post-gazette.com/news/politics-state/2020/11/04/Senate-Republicans-jake-corman-joe-scarnati-Pa-Secretary-State-Kathy-Boockvar-pa-election/stories/202011040130>
- ²⁴ LeBlanc, Beth, “Whitmer, Benson urge Michigan residents to make a voting plan,” *The Detroit News*, September 16, 2020. <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/michigan/2020/09/16/whitmer-benson-urge-michigan-residents-make-voting-plan/5821769002/>
- ²⁵ LeBlanc, Beth, “Whitmer, Benson urge Michigan residents to make a voting plan,” *The Detroit News*, September 16, 2020. <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/michigan/2020/09/16/whitmer-benson-urge-michigan-residents-make-voting-plan/5821769002/>
- ²⁶ United States District Court for the District of Arizona, *Arizona Democratic Party v. Katie Hobbs*, Order, September 10, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/07/AZ-Order.pdf>
- ²⁷ Ahmad, Zahra, “Michigan court: SOS can mail absentee ballot requests to registered voters,” *MLive*, August 26, 2020. <https://www.mlive.com/public-interest/2020/08/michigan-court-sos-can-mail-absentee-ballot-requests-to-registered-voters.html>
- ²⁸ Severns, Maggie, “Soros pumps more than \$28 million into Democratic groups for 2020,” *Politico*, April 10, 2020. <https://www.politico.com/news/2020/04/10/soros-pumps-28-million-democratic-groups-2020-179367>
- ²⁹ *Brennan Center for Justice*, “Davis v. Benson,” September 16, 2020. <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/court-cases/davis-v-benson>
- ³⁰ *Davis v. Benson*, State of Michigan in the Court of Claims, “Amicus Brief,” June 16, 2020. <https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2020-06/Davis%20v%20Benson%20-%20Amicus%20Brief.pdf>
- ³¹ *Brennan Center for Justice*, “Davis v. Benson,” September 16, 2020. <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/court-cases/davis-v-benson>
- ³² “Democracy Docket: States by Impact,” https://www.democracymocket.com/case_type/impact/
- ³³ Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, *Election Integrity Project of Nevada v. Nevada*, October 7, 2020. <https://casetext.com/case/election-integrity-project-llc-v-eighth-judicial-dist-court>
- ³⁴ Pollak, Joel, “Marc Elias, Democrat Lawyer Who Pushed Vote-by-Mail in 2020, Also Behind ‘Russia Dossier’ in 2016,” *Breitbart*, <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2020/11/04/marc-elias-democrat-lawyer-who-pushed-vote-by-mail-in-2020-also-behind-russia-dossier-in-2016/>
- ³⁵ [George Soros, the man who 'broke the Bank of England', backing secret plot to thwart Brexit \(telegraph.co.uk\)](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/07/20/George-Soros-the-man-who-broke-the-Bank-of-England-backing-secret-plot-to-thwart-Brexit/)
- ³⁶ “Michigan Proposal 3, Voting Policies in State Constitution Initiative (2018),” *Ballotpedia*, November 3, 2018. [https://ballotpedia.org/Michigan_Proposal_3_Voting_Policies_in_State_Constitution_Initiative_\(2018\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Michigan_Proposal_3_Voting_Policies_in_State_Constitution_Initiative_(2018))
- ³⁷ Beggin, Riley, “Who’s funding Michigan’s voting rights ballot proposal?,” *Bridge Michigan*, October 11, 2018. <https://www.bridgemi.com/michigan-government/whos-funding-michigans-voting-rights-ballot-proposal>
- ³⁸ Mack, Julie, “Michigan approves Proposal 3’s election reforms,” *MLive*, November 7, 2018. https://www.mlive.com/news/2018/11/hold_michigan_proposal_3s_elec.html
- ³⁹ Brat, Dave, “Dave Brat's linkage of George Soros to Abigail Spanberger gets Pants on Fire,” November 2, 2018. <https://www.politifact.com/factchecks/2018/nov/02/dave-brat/dave-brats-linkage-george-soros-abigail-spanberger/>
- ⁴⁰ “Nevada Question 5, Automatic Voter Registration via DMV Initiative (2018),” *Ballotpedia*, November 6, 2018. [https://ballotpedia.org/Nevada_Question_5_Automatic_Voter_Registration_via_DMV_Initiative_\(2018\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Nevada_Question_5_Automatic_Voter_Registration_via_DMV_Initiative_(2018))
- ⁴¹ “Nevada Question 5, Automatic Voter Registration via DMV Initiative (2018),” *Ballotpedia*, November 6, 2018. [https://ballotpedia.org/Nevada_Question_5_Automatic_Voter_Registration_via_DMV_Initiative_\(2018\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Nevada_Question_5_Automatic_Voter_Registration_via_DMV_Initiative_(2018))

-
- ⁴² Malkin, Michelle, “Who’s Funding Shady Ballot Harvesting Schemes?,” *Rasmussen Reports*, September 30, 2020. https://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/political_commentary/commentary_by_michelle_malkin/who_s_funding_shady_ballot_harvesting_schemes
- ⁴³ Amistad Project, “Amistad Project: Time To Fully Unmask Mark Zuckerberg’s \$350 Million Funnelled For Election Administration And The Motivation Behind It,” *Cision PR Newswire*, October 28, 2020. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/amistad-project-time-to-fully-unmask-mark-zuckerbergs-350-million-funnelled-for-election-administration-and-the-motivation-behind-it-301161751.html>
- ⁴⁴ Vielmetti, Bruce, “Judge: No apparent law against cities using private grants to help stage elections during pandemic,” *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, October 14, 2020. <https://www.greenbaypressgazette.com/story/news/politics/2020/10/14/judge-oks-cities-use-private-grants-stage-elections/3654110001/>
- ⁴⁵ Amistad Project, “Amistad Project: Time To Fully Unmask Mark Zuckerberg’s \$350 Million Funnelled For Election Administration And The Motivation Behind It,” *Cision PR Newswire*, October 28, 2020. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/amistad-project-time-to-fully-unmask-mark-zuckerbergs-350-million-funnelled-for-election-administration-and-the-motivation-behind-it-301161751.html>
- ⁴⁶ W.J. Kennedy, “Zuckerberg’s massive donation to ‘non-partisan’ election group not so non-partisan, challenger argues,” *Legal Newswire*, December 21, 2020. <https://legalnewsline.com/stories/552145492-zuckerberg-s-massive-donation-to-non-partisan-election-group-not-so-non-partisan-challenger-argues>
- ⁴⁷ Wisconsin Election Commission, “Jay Stone’s Sworn WEC Complaint,” August 28, 2020. <https://s3.amazonaws.com/jnswire/jns-media/a2/60/11463618/jaystone.pdf>
- ⁴⁸ “Mark Zuckerberg speaks fluent Mandarin during Q&A in Beijing,” *KiniTv*, October 23, 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HTmHtOSqHTk>
- ⁴⁹ Svab, Petr, “Facebook Fact-Checker Funded by Chinese Money Through TikTok,” *The Epoch Times*, December 10, 2020. https://www.theepochtimes.com/facebook-fact-checker-funded-by-chinese-money-through-tiktok_3610009.html
- ⁵⁰ Taylor, Adam, “Why would Mark Zuckerberg want Facebook employees to read the Chinese president’s book?,” *The Washington Post*, December 8, 2014. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2014/12/08/why-does-mark-zuckerberg-want-facebook-employees-to-read-the-chinese-presidents-book/>
- ⁵¹ Taylor, Adam, “Why would Mark Zuckerberg want Facebook employees to read the Chinese president’s book?,” *The Washington Post*, December 8, 2014. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2014/12/08/why-does-mark-zuckerberg-want-facebook-employees-to-read-the-chinese-presidents-book/>
- ⁵² King, Hope, “Mark Zuckerberg met with China’s propaganda chief,” *CNN*, March 21, 2016. <https://money.cnn.com/2016/03/21/technology/zuckerberg-china/>
- ⁵³ ¹ United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia Atlanta Division, *The New Georgia Project et al vs. Brad Raffensperger*, May 8, 2020. <https://www.democracymocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/41/2020/05/2020-05-08-New-GA-Project-et-al.-v.-Raffensperger-Complaint.pdf>
- ⁵⁴ “A Second Agreement In Georgia Between Democrats and Gwinnett County Is Discovered,” *The Spectator*, November 20, 2020. <https://thespectator.info/2020/11/20/exclusive-a-second-agreement-in-georgia-between-democrats-and-gwinnett-county-is-discovered/>
- ⁵⁵ Klein, Aaron, “Leaked Memo: George Soros Foundation Seeking to Expand U.S. Online Voting,” *Briertbart News*, September 9, 2016. <https://www.briertbart.com/middle-east/2016/09/09/leaked-memo-george-soros-foundation-seeking-expand-u-s-online-voting/>
- ⁵⁶ *Brennan Center for Justice*, “How to Protect the 2020 Vote from the Coronavirus,” March 16, 2020. (PDF Document provided upon request).
- ⁵⁷ *Brennan Center for Justice*, “How to Protect the 2020 Vote from the Coronavirus,” March 16, 2020. (PDF Document provided upon request).
- ⁵⁸ State of Wisconsin Supreme Court, *Jefferson v. Dane County*, March 27, 2020. <https://www.wicourts.gov/sc/opinion/DisplayDocument.pdf?content=pdf&seqNo=315283>
- ⁵⁹ Wisconsin State Government, “My Vote,” <https://myvote.wi.gov/en-us/ProofofResidence>
- ⁶⁰ *MacIver News*, “A Quarter-Million Wisconsin Voters Claim To Be ‘Indefinitely Confined’ And Not Bound By Voter ID,” MacIver Institute, October 29, 2020. <https://www.maciverinstitute.com/2020/10/a-quarter-million-wisconsin-voters-claim-to-be-indefinitely-confined/>
- ⁶¹ In the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, *Pennsylvania Democratic Party et al. v. Kathy Boockvar*, July 10, 2020. <https://electioncases.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/PDP-v.-Boockvar-Commonwealth-Court-Petition.pdf>

-
- ⁶² Lai, Jonathan, “10,000 Pennsylvania votes are in limbo. They won’t change the outcome. They could still have a huge impact.,” *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, December 20, 2020. <https://www.inquirer.com/politics/election/pennsylvania-late-mail-ballots-supreme-court-20201220.html>
- ⁶³ Navarro, Peter, “The Immaculate Deception,” December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁶⁴ Ahmad, Zahra, “Michigan court: SOS can mail absentee ballot requests to registered voters,” *MLive*, August 26, 2020. <https://www.mlive.com/public-interest/2020/08/michigan-court-sos-can-mail-absentee-ballot-requests-to-registered-voters.html>
- ⁶⁵ Marley, Patrick, “Wisconsin Elections Commission approves sending 2.7 million absentee ballot request forms to voters ,” *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, June 7, 2020. <https://www.jsonline.com/story/news/politics/2020/06/17/wisconsin-elections-commission-finalize-mailing-absentee-ballot-request-forms/5329007002/>
- ⁶⁶ Rakich, Nathaniel, “More States Are Using Ballot Drop Boxes. Why Are They So Controversial?,” *FiveThirtyEight*, October 5, 2020. <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/more-states-are-using-ballot-drop-boxes-why-are-they-so-controversial/>
- ⁶⁷ Georgia State Election Board, “Absentee Voting,” <https://sos.ga.gov/admin/files/SEB%20Emergency%20Rule%20183-1-14-0.6-.14.pdf>
- ⁶⁸ Niese, Marc, “Where are absentee ballot drop boxes in metro Atlanta?,” *AJC*, October 7, 2020. <https://www.ajc.com/politics/where-are-absentee-ballot-drop-boxes-in-metro-atlanta/YWWVPFUDFZF5ZB6JLH5S33UIEU/>
- ⁶⁹ Campbell, Bob, “Absentee ballot drop boxes boom in Michigan, despite controversy elsewhere,” *Bridge Michigan*, October 5, 2020. <https://www.bridgemi.com/michigan-government/absentee-ballot-drop-boxes-boom-michigan-despite-controversy-elsewhere>
- ⁷⁰ Stanton, Ryan, “New ballot drop boxes installed at 5 outdoor locations around Ann Arbor,” *Bridge Michigan*, October 20, 2020. <https://www.mlive.com/news/ann-arbor/2020/10/new-ballot-drop-boxes-installed-at-5-outdoor-locations-around-ann-arbor.html>
- ⁷¹ Campbell, Bob, “Absentee ballot drop boxes boom in Michigan, despite controversy elsewhere,” *Bridge Michigan*, <https://www.bridgemi.com/michigan-government/absentee-ballot-drop-boxes-boom-michigan-despite-controversy-elsewhere>
- ⁷² “Michigan has more than 700 absentee ballot drop-off locations – find the one you should use,” *WXYZ*, August 17, 2020. <https://www.wxyz.com/news/election-2020/michigan-has-more-than-700-absentee-ballot-drop-off-locations-find-the-one-you-should-use>
- ⁷³ LeBlanc, Beth, “Whitmer, Benson urge Michigan residents to make a voting plan,” *The Detroit News*, September 16, 2020. <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/local/michigan/2020/09/16/whitmer-benson-urge-michigan-residents-make-voting-plan/5821769002/>
- ⁷⁴ Navarro, Peter, “The Immaculate Deception,” December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁷⁵ Wisconsin Elections Commission, “Absentee Ballot Drop Box Information,” August 19, 2020. <https://elections.wi.gov/sites/elections.wi.gov/files/2020-08/Drop%20Box%20Final.pdf>
- ⁷⁶ The United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, *Donald Trump for President et al v. Kathy Boockvar*, June 29, 2020. <https://www.courthousenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/trump-pa.pdf>
- ⁷⁷ Navarro, Peter, “The Immaculate Deception,” December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁷⁸ Navarro, Peter, “The Immaculate Deception,” December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁷⁹ Navarro, Peter, “The Immaculate Deception,” December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁸⁰ Re, Greg, “What is ballot harvesting?,” April 14, 2020. <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/what-is-ballot-harvesting>
- ⁸¹ *Assembly Bill 4*, August 3, 2020. <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/32nd2020Special/Bill/7150/Text>
Assembly Bill 4, August 3, 2020. <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/32nd2020Special/Bill/7150/Overview>
- ⁸² “AB 4 - Authorizes Mostly Mail-In Election for 2020 Presidential Election - Nevada Key Vote,” 3 August, 2020. <https://justfacts.votesmart.org/bill/28626/74234/authorizes-mostly-mail-in-election-for-2020-presidential-election>
- ⁸³ “AB 4 - Authorizes Mostly Mail-In Election for 2020 Presidential Election - Nevada Key Vote,” 3 August, 2020. <https://justfacts.votesmart.org/bill/28626/74234/authorizes-mostly-mail-in-election-for-2020-presidential-election>

-
- ⁸⁴ Snyder, Riley et al, “Secretary of State Seeks regulation on newly allowed ‘ballot harvesting’ practice, wants collectors to report to her office,” *The Nevada Independent*, August 17, 2020. <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/secretary-of-state-seeks-regulation-on-newly-allowed-ballot-harvesting-practice-wants-collectors-to-report-to-her-office>
- ⁸⁵ Georgia State Government, “National Election Security Lab Report On November Election Shows Sec Raffensperger’s Ballot Harvesting Ban Holds Strong,” https://sos.ga.gov/index.php/elections/national_election_security_lab_report_on_november_election_shows_sec_raffenspergers_ballot_harvesting_ban_holds_strong#:~:text=In%20April%202019%2C%20the%20Georgia,the%20legislation%20banned%20ballot%20harvesting
- See, also: Wisconsin Statute 6.84(2), Wisconsin Statute 6.87(4)(b)1, Wisconsin Statute 6.87(4)(b). <https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/6/iv/87/4/b/1>
- ⁸⁶ Hoft, Joe, “Numerous Democrat Led Non-Profits Are Connected to Likely Illegal Absentee Ballot Harvesting in Georgia After the Election,” *The Gateway Pundit*, November 9, 2020. <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2020/11/numerous-democrat-led-non-profits-connected-likely-illegal-absentee-ballot-harvesting-georgia-election/>
- ⁸⁷ Hoft, Joe, “Numerous Democrat Led Non-Profits Are Connected to Likely Illegal Absentee Ballot Harvesting in Georgia After the Election,” *The Gateway Pundit*, November 9, 2020. <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2020/11/numerous-democrat-led-non-profits-connected-likely-illegal-absentee-ballot-harvesting-georgia-election/>
- ⁸⁸ Ramsland Jr., Russell. “Antrim Michigan Forensics Report.” William Bailey v. Antrim County, Michigan, December 13, 2020. [https://depernolaw.com/uploads/2/7/0/2/27029178/antrim_michigan_forensics_report_\[121320\]_v2_\[redacted\].pdf](https://depernolaw.com/uploads/2/7/0/2/27029178/antrim_michigan_forensics_report_[121320]_v2_[redacted].pdf)
- ⁸⁹ Fair Fight Action, “Election Systems And Software (ES&S) Corruption Doc,” July 16, 2019. <https://fairfight.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Election-Systems-and-Software-ESS-Corruption-07162019.pdf>
- ⁹⁰ Niesse, Marc, “Georgia bets on new voting system amid high-stakes election,” *AJC*, November 1, 2019. <https://www.ajc.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/georgia-bets-new-voting-system-amid-high-stakes-election/XVR7Jw5i1J7MiZ11O8xUZK/>
- ⁹¹ Dominion Voting Systems, “Setting The Record Straight: Facts & Rumors,” January 1, 2021. <https://www.dominionvoting.com/election-2020-setting-the-record-straight-georgia/>
- ⁹² Dominion Voting Systems, “Setting The Record Straight: Facts & Rumors,” January 1, 2021. <https://www.dominionvoting.com/election-2020-setting-the-record-straight-pennsylvania/>
- ⁹³ Schweigert, Steve, “Here’s a list of voting machines used in every county across the state,” November 6, 2019. <https://www.fox43.com/article/news/heres-a-list-of-voting-machines-used-in-every-county-across-the-state/521-5797a12a-01ee-42aa-a08e-810a7205b52f>
- ⁹⁴ *Inside Alerts*, “Elections Watchdog Says Wisconsin Refused to Warn Clerks About Flawed Dominion ICE Voting Machines,” November 23, 2020. <https://www.insidesources.com/elections-watchdog-says-wisconsin-refused-to-warn-clerks-about-flawed-dominion-ice-voting-machines/>
- ⁹⁵ Department of Technology, Management, and Budget, Michigan State Government, Notice of Contract. https://www.michigan.gov/documents/sos/071B7700117_Dominion_555356_7.pdf
- ⁹⁶ Leingang, Rachel, “Ducey objects to plan to let some Arizonans in hospitals and nursing homes cast ballots via video call,” *AZ Central*, September 22, 2020. <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/09/22/arizona-voters-hospitals-and-nursing-homes-may-cast-ballot-via-video/5858551002/>
- ⁹⁷ Leingang, Rachel, “Ducey objects to plan to let some Arizonans in hospitals and nursing homes cast ballots via video call,” *AZ Central*, September 22, 2020. <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/09/22/arizona-voters-hospitals-and-nursing-homes-may-cast-ballot-via-video/5858551002/>
- ⁹⁸ Navarro, Peter, “The Immaculate Deception,” December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁹⁹ Dolby, Nuha, “Here are the 4 voting issues at the heart of Trump’s Wisconsin election lawsuit,” *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, December 2, 2020. <https://www.jsonline.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/12/01/trump-wisconsin-lawsuit-four-voting-issues-challenged-court/6465214002/>
- ¹⁰⁰ “How do election workers match signatures? (2020),” *Ballotpedia*, [https://ballotpedia.org/How_do_election_workers_match_signatures%3F_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/How_do_election_workers_match_signatures%3F_(2020))
- ¹⁰¹ “How do election workers match signatures? (2020),” *Ballotpedia*, [https://ballotpedia.org/How_do_election_workers_match_signatures%3F_\(2020\)](https://ballotpedia.org/How_do_election_workers_match_signatures%3F_(2020))

-
- ¹⁰² Democratic Party of Georgia, Inc. (“DPG”), the DSCC, and the DCCC, Compromise Settlement and Release, March 6, 2020. <https://www.democracymarket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/07/GA-Settlement-1.pdf>
- ¹⁰³ The Gateway Pundit, “Lin Wood Files Lawsuit Challenging Georgia’s Secretary Of State’s Dark Unconstitutional Agreement With Hillary Attorney Marc Elias,” November 14, 2020. <https://clarion.causeaction.com/2020/11/14/lin-wood-files-lawsuit-challenging-georgias-secretary-of-states-dark-unconstitutional-agreement-with-hillary-attorney-marc-elias/>
- ¹⁰⁴ Democratic Party of Georgia, Inc. (“DPG”), the DSCC, and the DCCC, Compromise Settlement and Release, March 6, 2020. <https://www.democracymarket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/07/GA-Settlement-1.pdf>
- ¹⁰⁵ Niese, Marc, “Trump supporter sues Georgia in attempt to stop election results,” *AJC*, November 13, 2020. <https://www.ajc.com/politics/trump-supporter-sues-georgia-in-attempt-to-stop-election-results/3A4WOXPD3JB3NMGREX5ZBUYDPY/>
- ¹⁰⁶ Navarro, Peter, “The Immaculate Deception,” December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ¹⁰⁷ “Cure period for absentee and mail-in ballots,” *Ballotpedia*, https://ballotpedia.org/Cure_period_for_absentee_and_mail-in_ballots
- ¹⁰⁸ *Assembly Bill 4*, August 3, 2020. <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/32nd2020Special/Bill/7150/Text>
- ¹⁰⁹ *Assembly Bill 4*, August 3, 2020. <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/32nd2020Special/Bill/7150/Overview>
- ¹¹⁰ Navarro, Peter, “The Immaculate Deception,” December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ¹¹¹ United States District Court for the District of Arizona, *Arizona Democratic Party v. Katie Hobbs*, Order, September 10, 2020. <https://www.democracymarket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/07/AZ-Order.pdf>
- ¹¹² Knowles, Hannah, “As Arizona count ticks on, Democratic volunteers race to make sure ballots are not rejected,” *Washington Post*, November 10, 2020. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/11/10/arizona-ballot-curing/>
- ¹¹³ Giles, Ben, “Arizona Voters Have Until 5 p.m. Tuesday To Cure Ballots,” *KJZZ*, November 9, 2020. <https://kjzz.org/content/1634458/arizona-voters-have-until-5-pm-tuesday-cure-ballots>
- ¹¹⁴ BeMiller, Haley, “Fact check: Wisconsin clerks followed guidance in place since 2016 about witnesses and absentee ballots,” *USA Today*, November 11, 2020. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/factcheck/2020/11/11/fact-check-wisc-clerks-followed-2016-guidance-absentee-ballots/6253055002/>
- ¹¹⁵ Wisconsin Elections Commission, “The 2020 Election for President of the United States, Petition for Hand Recount,” November 18, 2020. https://www.democracymarket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/Recount-Petition_President_2020.pdf
- ¹¹⁶ BeMiller, Haley, “Fact check: Wisconsin clerks followed guidance in place since 2016 about witnesses and absentee ballots,” *USA Today*, November 11, 2020. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/factcheck/2020/11/11/fact-check-wisc-clerks-followed-2016-guidance-absentee-ballots/6253055002/>
- ¹¹⁷ NRS 293.325, <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/nrs/nrs-293.html>
- ¹¹⁸ Pennsylvania General Assembly, *Act 12*, March 27, 2020. <https://www.legis.state.pa.us/cfdocs/legis/li/uconsCheck.cfm?yr=2020&sessInd=0&act=12>
- ¹¹⁹ Bernstein, Leandra, “Trump campaign claims Philadelphia defying court-ordered election observation,” *NBC Montana*, November 5, 2020. <https://nbcmontana.com/news/nation-world/trump-campaign-allowed-to-observe-ballot-counting-in-pennsylvania-legal-victory>
- ¹²⁰ Mosk, Matthew, et al, “Trump files election lawsuits in Michigan, Pennsylvania alleging lack of access for poll observers,” *ABC News*, November 5, 2020. <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-files-election-lawsuits-michigan-pennsylvania-alleging-lack/story?id=74032924>
- ¹²¹ CBS3 Staff, “Philadelphia Court Decision: Poll Watchers Now Allowed Within 6 Feet Of Ballot Counting At Pennsylvania Convention Center,” *CBS Philly*, November 5, 2020. <https://philadelphia.cbslocal.com/2020/11/05/philadelphia-court-decision-poll-watchers-now-allowed-within-6-feet-of-ballot-counting-at-pennsylvania-convention-center/>
- ¹²² United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, *Donald J. Trump for President v. Jocelyn Benson*, November 8, 2020. <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20404059/trump-campaign-election-lawsuit-michigan-federal.pdf>



**Yes, President Trump Won:
The Case, Evidence, & Statistical Receipts**

Volume Three of the Navarro Report

Introduction

Volume 1 of the Navarro Report, *The Immaculate Deception*, assessed the fairness and integrity of the 2020 Presidential Election by identifying and assessing six key dimensions of alleged election irregularities. These irregularities included: outright fraud, ballot mishandling, a wide range of process fouls, multiple violations of the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, voting machine irregularities, and statistical anomalies.

This assessment was conducted across six key battleground states – Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. It would be the outcomes in these six states that would ultimately be election-determinate – just as the strategy of the Democrat Party assumed.

Evidence used to conduct *The Immaculate Deception* assessment included more than 50 lawsuits and judicial rulings, thousands of affidavits and declarations, testimony in a variety of state venues, published analyses by think tanks and legal centers, videos and photos, public comments, and extensive press coverage. Three key findings of the report include: (1) Six types of election irregularities were present and pervasive in most or all of the battleground states; (2) Each battleground state differed in its own way with respect to the types of irregularities that were election-determinate; (3) There was no single “silver bullet” that allegedly won the election for Biden; instead it was “death by a thousand irregularities” in any given battleground state; and, most importantly with respect to the question as to whether the election may well have been stolen, (4) the narrow alleged Biden “victory” margins in each of the six battleground states were dwarfed by the number of potentially illegal ballots.

Volume 2 of the Navarro Report, *The Art of the Steal*, examined the institutional genesis of the six types of election irregularities. One key finding: The Democrat Party efforts to strategically game the election process across the six battleground states began years before, and in many cases, shortly after President Trump was elected in 2016. A second key finding: the Democrat's This gaming of the election process was implemented through a two-pronged Grand “Stuff the Ballot Box” Strategy designed to flood the six key battleground states with enough un-scrutinized and potentially illegal absentee and mail-in ballots to turn a decisive Trump victory into a narrow alleged Biden “win.”

Prong One of the Democrat strategy dramatically INCREASED the amount of absentee and mail-in ballots. Prong Two dramatically DECREASED the level of scrutiny of such ballots. This resulted in a FLOOD of potentially illegal ballots into the battleground states more than sufficient to tip the scales from a decisive legal win by President Trump to a narrow and potentially illegitimate alleged “victory” by Joe Biden.

Importantly, much of what the Democrat Party and its operatives did to effectively achieve what may well be an illegal result was pursued through a variety of legal means. Nonetheless, at times, Democrat government officials also bent, and at times, broke the laws or rules of their state.

Volume 3 of the Navarro Report is designed to serve as a capstone to what has been a comprehensive analysis of the question: Was the 2020 presidential election stolen from Donald J. Trump? In this report, we provide the most up-to-date statistical “receipts” with respect to the potential number of illegal votes in each battleground state.

The broader goal of this final installment of the Navarro Report is to provide investigators with a well-documented tally of potentially illegal votes on a state-by-state and category-by-category basis. This tally is presented in *Figure One* on the next page of this report. Note that each number in this figure has a corresponding endnote identifying the source of the number. Note further that we have taken a conservative approach to the count of potentially illegal ballots.

As with previous volumes of the Navarro Report, you can see clearly in *Figure One* that the number of potentially illegal votes dwarfs the very thin alleged Biden “victory” margins. In the face of this evidence, no reasonable person would conclude that the 2020 presidential election was, beyond any shadow of doubt, a fair election. Rather, anyone who reads this report should feel compelled to seek greater clarity about whether, in fact, this election may have been stolen from Donald J. Trump.

While it is now politically correct in progressive circles and the mainstream media to demand that all Americans submit and confess to the “truth” of what may well be the fiction of a free and fair election for the sake of “unity” and “harmony,” such a Kafkaesque demand in the face of the evidence in this report will likely have the opposite effect.

To wit: almost half the country now believes that there were significant irregularities in the 2020 presidential race; and the failure to fully investigate these irregularities will only increase the number of Americans who have such doubts. This will be particularly true if the suppression of what necessarily must be a search for truth is facilitated by the authoritarian – nay fascist – behavior of a small group of social media oligarchs who have taken it upon themselves to de-platform and censor tens of millions of pro-Trump Americans who now find themselves victims, rather than consumers, of platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube.

In considering these truths, let us never forget two things: (1) The Democrat Party and its operatives stole the 1960 Presidential Election – it happened then and it can happen again; and (2) it took decades for historians to finally acknowledge the 1960 version of the Immaculate Deception in the face of the same kind of virtue-signaling and cancel culture pressures we are witnessing today.

Despite a similar quest to silence Republican and conservative voices today, 74 million Americans who voted for President Donald J. Trump have the right to a full investigation and bipartisan search for truth. If, however, the Democrat Party, RINO elements of the Republican Party, the anti-Trump mainstream media, and the out-of-control censoring social media oligarchs do not cease and desist from their efforts to suppress the search for truth about the 2020 election, history will judge all of these people, corporations, and institutions in the harshest possible manner.

At this point, we have moved dangerously in what seems like a nanosecond from a full and vibrant American Democracy to a Communist Chinese-style, Cancel Culture, Police State guarded by a collusive social media oligopoly that is beyond out of control.

In the remainder of this report, we will simply present the statistical “receipts” on a state-by-state and subcategory-by-subcategory basis what may well be the worst theft in American political history. If the U.S. Congress and State Legislatures across the six battleground states ignore this evidence, they will do so not just at their own peril but also at the peril of America’s faith in our elections and the sanctity of our Republic.

Vote Irregularities and Illegals by Category and State

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

The Arizona Battleground

Figure Two tabulates by category a total of 254,722 potentially illegal votes. This number constitutes roughly 24 times the alleged Biden victory margin of 10,457 votes. By far the largest category is 150,000 mail-in ballots cast by voters registered after the registration deadline. Another 22,903 absentee ballots were on record as having been returned on or before the postmark date, which is highly unlikely.¹

Figure Two

Vote Irregularities and Illegals	
CATEGORY	ARIZONA
Absentee ballots cast from addresses other than where voters legally reside	19,997
Absentee ballots cast that were returned on or before the postmark date	22,903
Double voters: In-state	157
Ghost voters	5,790
Mail-in ballots cast by voters registered after the registration deadline	150,000
No address on file for voter	2,000
Non-citizen voters	36,473
Out-of-state voters who voted in-state	5,726
Over-votes	11,676
Possible Illegal Votes	254,722
Biden "Victory" Margin	10,457
Margin of Error > Margin of Victory	24x

In reviewing the statistics in *Figure Two*, it is worth noting that Arizona had statistically improbable high voter turnouts in Maricopa and Pima counties; widespread ballot mishandling; and 1.6 million mail-in ballots (which disproportionately leaned towards Biden)² which were subjected to much lower standards of certification and ID verification than in-person votes (which leaned toward Trump).³

The Copper State also accomplished the remarkable feat of exceeding 100% turnout of its registered voters. This is indeed a remarkable feat because Arizona does not allow same-day voter registration. The "over-votes" alone totaled 11,676, an amount more than the purported Biden "victory" margin of 10,457.⁴

From the figure, it should also be clear that Arizona boasts a litany of other election irregularities. For example, a total of 19,997 persons voted where they did not reside⁵ while 2,000 voters did not have an address at all.⁶ 5,790 voters moved out of state or registered to vote in another state,⁷ 5,726

out-of-state residents voted in Arizona,⁸ and 36,473 individuals voted without providing evidence of citizenship.⁹

The Georgia Battleground

Figure Three tabulates by category a total of 601,130 potentially illegal votes in Georgia. This is more than 50 times the alleged Biden victory margin of 11,779 votes.

Figure Three

Vote Irregularities and Illegalities	
CATEGORY	GEORGIA
Absentee ballots cast that were requested before & after statutory deadline	305,701
Dead voters	10,315
Double voters: In-state	395
Felon voters	2,560
Ghost voters	15,700
Juvenile voters (< 18 years old)	66,247
No address on file for voter	1,043
Non-registered voters (not on voter rolls)	2,423
Out-of-state voters who voted in-state	20,312
Voting machine irregularities (fake/manufactured ballots & spikes)	136,155
Voters who vote in the wrong county	40,279
Possible Illegal Votes	601,130
Biden "Victory" Margin	11,779
Margin of Error > Margin of Victory	51x

From the figure, we see that the largest category of potentially illegal votes is that of absentee ballots cast requested before or after the statutory deadline. In the state of Georgia, voters have 180 days prior to Election Day to request absentee ballots, according to state law.¹⁰ However, during the 2020 Presidential Election, Georgia officials counted over 305,700 ballots cast by individuals who had requested absentee ballots more than 180 days before the absentee ballot request deadline, in blatant violation of Georgia Election Code.¹¹

From the figure, we also see that 10,000 ballots of deceased individuals were counted.¹² 15,700 votes were counted from "ghost" voters, that is, voters who requested and submitted ballots under the names of voters who no longer reside at a particular address.¹³ Similarly perplexing is that over 1,000 voters without an address cast ballots.¹⁴

Voting machines –which Georgia election officials were in an inexplicable rush to install leading up to the 2020 election¹⁵ – likewise may account for a substantial number potentially illegal ballots.¹⁶ There were also over 40,000 cases of voters voting in counties in which they did not legally reside, as well as over 66,000¹⁷ voters who had successfully cast ballots even though they were under the legal voting age of 18.

The Michigan Battleground

Figure Four tabulates by category a total of 446,803 potentially illegal votes in Michigan. This is almost three times the alleged Biden victory margin of 154,818 votes.

Figure Four

Vote Irregularities and Illegalities	
CATEGORY	MICHIGAN
Absentee ballots requested under the name of a registered voter without consent	27,825
Dead voters	482
No address on file for voter	35,109
No corresponding voter registration numbers	174,384
Out-of-state voters who voted in-state	13,248
Voting machine irregularities (fake/manufactured ballots & spikes)	195,755
Possible Illegal Votes	446,803
Biden "Victory" Margin	154,818
Margin of Error > Margin of Victory	2.8x

The largest amount of ballots in question in Michigan stems from inexplicable vote tabulation surges along with alleged voting machine irregularities¹⁸ and ballots counted despite lacking voter-registration numbers.

There were also two major questionable "Biden vote spikes" in the early hours of November 4th. At 3:50 AM EST, Michigan added 54,497 additional ballots cast for Joe Biden and just 4,718 votes cast for President Trump.¹ At 6:31 AM EST, an update showed an additional 141,258 votes cast for Biden, while President Trump received just 5,968 additional ballots.¹⁹

Additionally, it is illegal in Michigan to count absentee ballots without having corresponding voter registration numbers for corresponding precincts, according to state law. Despite this, election officials allowed over 174,000 of these ballots to be counted anyway.²⁰

Michigan also processed ballots of over 35,000 voters without addresses on state records,²¹ at least over 480 confirmed dead voters,²² and over 13,200 voters registered to vote in other states—in blatant violation of state election law.²³ Lastly, over 27,800 ballots were requested under the name of a registered voter without their knowledge and/or consent.²⁴

The Nevada Battleground

Figure Five tabulates by category a total of 220,008 potentially illegal votes in Nevada. This is roughly six times the alleged Biden victory margin of 33,596 votes.

Figure Five

Vote Irregularities and Illegalities	
<i>CATEGORY</i>	NEVADA
Absentee ballots cast from addresses other than where voters legally reside	15,000
Dead voters	1,506
Double voters: In-state	42,284
No address on file for voter	8,000
Non-citizen voters	4,000
Out-of-state voters who voted in-state	19,218
Signature matching errors	130,000
Possible Illegal Votes	220,008
Biden “Victory” Margin	33,596
Margin of Error > Margin of Victory	6x

Nevada’s largest irregularities stemmed from the use of the Agilis signature-matching machines installed in Clark County to verify signatures on ballots. Using machines instead of people for signature match verification is in blatant violation of state law and calls into question the 130,000 ballots verified by these Agilis machines.²⁵

The Agilis machines were also alleged to have not been operated “in conformance with the manufacturer’s recommendations” on Election Day. First, the images on file used by the Agilis machine to compare to the signatures on the outside of the mail-in ballots were of lower image quality than “suggested by the manufacturer” for the machine to operate properly, and the machine was altered or adjusted by election officials to a setting “lower than the manufacturer’s recommendations,” making the machine unreliable.²⁶

Nevada also registered 42,284 double voters,²⁷ ascertained by reviewing the list of voters and comparing voters with the same name, address, and date of birth—a method shown in peer

reviewed papers to have over 99% accuracy.²⁸ That category alone exceeds the alleged Biden victory margin of 33,596 votes.

In addition, 19,218 out-of-state voters cast ballots in Nevada. This was ascertained by lining up voter lists from all counties against publicly available USPS records on permanent change of addresses with other states and correcting for military and student voters.²⁹

Finally, 1,506 votes were cast in the name of deceased persons—verified by comparing mail voters with social security death records.³⁰ Over 8,000 ballots were cast by persons without addresses—found by referencing voters with the Coding Accuracy Support System and finding undeliverable addresses.³¹ 4,000 non-U.S. citizens also appear to have voted—found by comparing non-citizen DMV records to the list of voters.³²

The Pennsylvania Battleground

Figure Six tabulates by category a total of almost a million potentially illegal votes in Pennsylvania. This is roughly twelve times the alleged Biden victory margin of 81,660 votes.

Figure Six

Vote Irregularities and Illegals	
<i>CATEGORY</i>	PENNSYLVANIA
Absentee ballots cast that arrived after Election Day	10,000
Absentee ballots cast from addresses other than where voters legally reside	14,328
Absentee ballots cast that were returned on or before the postmark date	58,221
Absentee ballots cast without a postmark	9,005
Dead voters	8,021
Double voters: In-state	742
Out-of-state voters who voted in-state	7,426
Over-votes	202,377
Poll watcher & poll observer abuses	680,774
Voters over 100 years old	1,573
Possible Illegal Votes	992,467
Biden “Victory” Margin	81,660
Margin of Error > Margin of Victory	12x

By far the largest category of potentially illegal ballots – over 680,000 – is associated with poll observer abuses.³³ Certified Republican poll observers were kept at distances the length of a football field.³⁴ They were prevented from accessing back rooms where tens of thousands of ballots were being processed, and they were rounded up into restricted areas when trying to fulfill their legal duty to observe the ballot counting process.³⁵ Without meaningful observation of the ballot counting process, it is impossible to verify the legality of absentee and mail-in ballots.

State Representative Frank Ryan, along with several other members of the State Legislature, found that over 202,000 more ballots were cast than actual registered voters in the state.³⁶ In addition, there were 58,221 absentee ballots counted that were returned on or before the postmarked date on the envelope.³⁷ 9,005 additional ballots were counted without a postmark on the envelope,³⁸ in clear violation of state election law.

There were also over 14,300 absentee ballots cast from addresses in which registered voters did not legally reside,³⁹ over 7,400 registered voters from other states⁴⁰ that successfully cast ballots in the state of Pennsylvania, over 8,000 likely dead voters⁴¹ according to an analysis of state records and publicly available obituaries, and over 1,500 suspect votes in the names of persons over 100 years old.⁴²

Pennsylvania was not exempt from the double-voter problem either, with 742 voters on record as having voted twice,⁴³ adding several hundred fraudulent ballots into the mix.

The Wisconsin Battleground

Figure Seven tabulates by category a total of over half a million potentially illegal votes in Wisconsin. This is more than 25 times the alleged Biden victory margin of 20,682 votes.

By far the largest category of potentially illegal votes is associated with alleged “bad-faith voters” who registered as “indefinitely confined” and thereby broke “Wisconsin election law to circumvent election integrity photo identification requirements.”⁴⁴ These persons voted without showing a voter identification photo and therefore underwent a far less rigorous I.D. check than would otherwise have been conducted. (Wisconsin voters who had registered under “indefinitely confined” status were also seen attending weddings, riding their bikes, going on vacation, and otherwise not confined.)⁴⁵

In the wake of the expanded definition of indefinitely confined voters – a definition ruled legally incorrect by the Wisconsin Supreme Court – the number of indefinitely confined voters surged from just under 70,000 voters in 2019 to over 200,000 in 2020.⁴⁶ Through this one problematic dimension, the integrity of 216,000 Wisconsin votes were compromised in the 2020 General Election.⁴⁷

In addition, as illustrated in *Figure Seven*, 17,271 ballots were cast at 200 illegal polling places through “Democracy in the Park” events,⁴⁸ in direct violation of Wisconsin state law. These polling locations provided witnesses for absentee ballots and acted in every way like legal polling places. Moreover, many received ballots outside of the limited 14-day period preceding an election that is authorized by statute for in-person or absentee balloting. These were clear violations of state law. City of Madison officials facilitated the event which was broadcasted by Biden radio advertisements.⁴⁹

Figure Seven

Vote Irregularities and Illegalities	
<i>CATEGORY</i>	WISCONSIN
Absentee ballots cast without statutorily required application	170,140
Double voters: In-state	234
Illegal ballot harvesting	17,271
Indefinitely confined voter abuses	216,000
Out-of-state voters who voted in-state	6,848
Voting machine irregularities (fake/manufactured ballots & spikes)	143,379
Possible Illegal Votes	553,872
Biden “Victory” Margin	20,682
Margin of Error > Margin of Victory	26x

Finally, as noted in the figure, there were 6,848 voters registered in other states who voted in the state of Wisconsin—ascertained by comparing all states’ voter databases with the National Change of Address (NCOA) database.⁵⁰ Also, 234 individuals were documented as having voted twice in Wisconsin.⁵¹ Moreover, a whopping 170,000 in-person absentee ballots were cast without the submission of a legally required absentee ballot application.⁵²

Concluding Remarks

Based on this third and final volume of *The Navarro Report*, and as *Figure Eight* demonstrates, it should be clear that there are far more questions raised about the potential illegality of the 2020 presidential election than have been answered. Clearly, the case, evidence, and statistical receipts presented in this report provide a strong case that the 2020 election may well have been stolen not just from President Trump but also from the 74 million Americans who went to the ballot box in good faith in support of President Trump.

Figure Eight

Thorough Investigation Is Essential	
Possible Illegal Votes	3,069,002
Biden "Victory" Margin	312,992
Margin of Error > Margin of Victory	10x

In light of this evidence, it is impossible for anyone to claim that President Trump was in any way wrong in stoutly raising the question of election fraud and irregularities in the weeks following the November 3 election and in calling for his supporters to PEACEFULLY protest. Indeed, for the president not to rise to defend the integrity of the ballot box would have been a betrayal of the 74 million Americans who voted for the president thinking they were participating in what may well not have been a free and fair election.

In light of this evidence, it is also irresponsible – in the extreme – for the Democrat Party and its leadership, or journalists in the mainstream media, or RINO Republicans to claim there is no evidence of election irregularities. That’s absurd on its face. As this report shows, there is an abundance of evidence – a virtual cornucopia of potentially poisonous election irregularities.

In light of this evidence, this must also be said: Those American citizens who are now questioning the potential illegality of votes cast in the 2020 election should NOT be subjected by cable news networks, social media platforms, or the print media to the kind of abhorrent behaviors that we are now observing – social and political behaviors that are far more worthy of Communist China authoritarianism than American democracy.

From public shaming to de-platforming, doxing, and public calls to punish and shun all those who have supported the president or worked in his administration, these types of behaviors are not the American way. Rather, this is Orwell, Kafka, and Xi Jinping all rolled up into the death of the First Amendment and the death knell of our democracy.

Based on the analysis and the granular, documented quantities of illegal votes in this report, the only thing that must happen now as we engage in a peaceful transition of power is a FULL investigation of this matter.

- The Department of Justice should immediately appoint a Special Counsel BEFORE the Biden administration begins.
- State legislators and Attorneys Generals in the battleground states, particularly Republican states, must launch similar investigations.

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

Endnotes

- ¹ Background For Congressional Leaders, *Voter Fraud Highlights for 2020 US Election*, Attorneys for President Donald J. Trump. <http://greatamericanrebirth.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Background-Briefing-on-2020-Fraud.pdf>
- ² For example, in Pennsylvania, 3 out of every 4 absentee/mail-in ballots went to Joe Biden. <https://www.inquirer.com/politics/election/mail-ballots-pennsylvania-election-trump-biden-20201119.html>
See, also: In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 84% of absentee/mail-in ballots went to Joe Biden. <https://www.tmj4.com/news/election-2020/no-joe-biden-did-not-get-100-percent-of-all-milwaukee-absentee-ballots>
- ³ Garrison, Joey, “Democrats led early voting after Trump’s attacks on mail-in ballots. Now Trump needs to dominate Election Day,” USA Today, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/11/01/trump-needs-election-day-vote-biden-democrats-dominate-early-voting/6085797002/>
- ⁴ Kelli Ward v. Constance Jackson et al, In the Superior Court of Arizona in and For the County of Maricopa, November 24, 2020. <https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/20417265/ward-v-jackson-complaint-and-petitionfor-discovery.pdf>
- ⁵ Stevenson et al v. Ducey et al, Superior Court of the State of Arizona and for the County of Maricopa, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/PetitionforElectionContest.pdf>
- ⁶ Background For Congressional Leaders, *Voter Fraud Highlights for 2020 US Election*, Attorneys for President Donald J. Trump. <http://greatamericanrebirth.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Background-Briefing-on-2020-Fraud.pdf>
- ⁷ Burk v. Ducey et al, Superior Court of the State of Arizona and for the County of Pinal, December 7, 2020. <https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Burk-v-Ducey-complaint.pdf>
- ⁸ Stevenson et al v. Ducey et al, Superior Court of the State of Arizona and for the County of Maricopa, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/PetitionforElectionContest.pdf>
- ⁹ Background For Congressional Leaders, *Voter Fraud Highlights for 2020 US Election*, December 21, 2020.
See, also: Arizona Rep Kelly Townsend, ALIPAC, November 13, 2020. <https://www.israpundit.org/arizona-rep-kelly-townsend-36473-az-voters-did-not-prove-citizenship/>
- ¹⁰ The Superior Court Of Fulton County State Of Georgia, Trump v. Raffensperger, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v.-Raffensperger.pdf>
- ¹¹ The Superior Court Of Fulton County State Of Georgia, Trump v. Raffensperger, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v.-Raffensperger.pdf>
- ¹² Background For Congressional Leaders, *Voter Fraud Highlights for 2020 US Election*, Attorneys for President Donald J. Trump. <http://greatamericanrebirth.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Background-Briefing-on-2020-Fraud.pdf>
- ¹³ The Superior Court Of Fulton County State Of Georgia, Trump v. Raffensperger, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v.-Raffensperger.pdf>
- ¹⁴ State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin, “Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint,” December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>
- ¹⁵ Niese, Marc, “Where are absentee ballot drop boxes in metro Atlanta?,” AJC, October 7, 2020. <https://www.ajc.com/politics/where-are-absentee-ballot-drop-boxes-in-metroatlanta/YWWVPFUDFZF5ZB6JLH5S33UIEU/>
- ¹⁶ Fair Fight Action, “Election Systems And Software (ES&S) Corruption Doc,” July 16, 2019. <https://fairfight.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Election-Systems-and-Software-ESS-Corruption-07162019.pdf>
- ¹⁷ The Superior Court Of Fulton County State Of Georgia, Trump v. Raffensperger, December 4, 2020. <https://www.democracydocket.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/Trump-v.-Raffensperger.pdf>
- ¹⁸ Antrim Michigan Forensics Report, December 13, 2020. Allied Security Operations Group. https://www.depernolaw.com/uploads/2/7/0/2/27029178/antrim_michigan_forensics_report_%5B121320%5D_v2_%5Bredacted%5D.pdf See, also: "Michigan Judge Allows Release of Dominion Voting System Audit Demonstrating Astounding 68% Error Rate in Vote Calculations, December" 14, 2020. https://www.9and10news.com/content/uploads/2020/12/Bill_Bailey_Antrim_County_Press_Release.pdf
- ¹⁹ Voter Integrity Project, “Anomalies in Vote Counts and Their Effects on Election 2020,” November 24, 2020. <https://votepatternanalysis.substack.com/p/voting-anomalies-2020>
- ²⁰ State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin, “Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint,” December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>
- ²¹ State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin, “Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint,” December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>
- ²² Michigan Voter Fraud, Deceased Voters, <https://checkyourvote.org/deceased-voters/michigan>
- ²³ State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin, “Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint,” December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>
- ²⁴ State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin, “Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint,” December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>

-
- ²⁵ In the First Judicial District Court Carson City, Nevada Jesse Law v. Judith Whitmer, November 17, 2020. <https://www.democracymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/nov-17-doc-2.pdf>
- ²⁶ In the First Judicial District Court Carson City, Nevada Jesse Law v. Judith Whitmer, November 17, 2020. <https://www.democracymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/11/nov-17-doc-2.pdf>
- ²⁷ Witness Statement of Jesse Binnall, Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, December 16, 2020. <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Testimony-Binnall-2020-12-16.pdf>
- ²⁸ Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Hersch, Eitan. "ADGN: An Algorithm for Record Linkage Using Address, Date of Birth, Gender, and Name," *Statistics and Public Policy*, November 30, 2017. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2330443X.2017.1389620>
- ²⁹ "Out of State Voters," Nevada Republican Party, November 15, 2020. <https://nevadagop.org/out-of-state-voters/>
- ³⁰ Witness Statement of Jesse Binnall, Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, December 16, 2020. <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Testimony-Binnall-2020-12-16.pdf>
- ³¹ Witness Statement of Jesse Binnall, Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, December 16, 2020. <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Testimony-Binnall-2020-12-16.pdf>
- ³² Witness Statement of Jesse Binnall, Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, December 16, 2020. <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Testimony-Binnall-2020-12-16.pdf>
- ³³ The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, "*Donald J. Trump for President et al v. Kathy Boockvar et al.*," 18 November 2020. <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057/gov.uscourts.pamd.127057.169.0.pdf>
- ³⁴ "Appeal of: City of Philadelphia Board of Elections," Superior Court of Pennsylvania, Eastern District, November 17, 2020. <http://www.pacourts.us/assets/opinions/Supreme/out/J-116-2020mo%20-%20104608159120049033.pdf>
- ³⁵ Navarro, Peter, "The Immaculate Deception," December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wpcontent/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ³⁶ PA Lawmakers: Numbers Don't Add Up, Certification of Presidential Results Premature and In Error, December 28, 2020. <http://www.repdiamond.com/News/18754/Latest-News/PA-Lawmakers-Numbers-Don%E2%80%99t-Add-Up.-Certification-of-Presidential-Results-Premature-and-In-Error>
- ³⁷ State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin, "Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint," December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>
- ³⁸ State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin, "Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint," December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>
- ³⁹ WVA v. Pence, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, December 22, 2020. <https://www.democracymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/DC-WVA-20201222-complaint.pdf>
- ⁴⁰ "Declaration of Professor of Mathematics, Dr. Steven J Miller, Ph.D.," https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22O155/163392/20201214094921641_Appendix%20section%209.pdf
- ⁴¹ Background For Congressional Leaders, *Voter Fraud Highlights for 2020 US Election*, Attorneys for President Donald J. Trump. <http://greatamericanrebirth.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Background-Briefing-on-2020-Fraud.pdf>
- ⁴² Background For Congressional Leaders, *Voter Fraud Highlights for 2020 US Election*, Attorneys for President Donald J. Trump. <http://greatamericanrebirth.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Background-Briefing-on-2020-Fraud.pdf>
- ⁴³ WVA v. Pence, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, December 22, 2020. <https://www.democracymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/DC-WVA-20201222-complaint.pdf>
- ⁴⁴ Navarro, Peter, "The Immaculate Deception," December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wpcontent/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁴⁵ Navarro, Peter, "The Immaculate Deception," December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wpcontent/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁴⁶ Navarro, Peter, "The Immaculate Deception," December 17, 2020. <https://populist.press/wpcontent/uploads/2020/12/The-Immaculate-Deception-12.15.20-1.pdf>
- ⁴⁷ State of Texas v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Georgia, State of Michigan, State of Wisconsin, "Motion for Leave to File Bill of Complaint," December 7, 2020. <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/images/admin/2020/Press/SCOTUSFiling.pdf>
- ⁴⁸ Donald J. Trump for President et al v. Evers et al, In the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, December 1, 2020. <https://www.wrn.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/2020AP1971-Pet-for-Orig-Action-12-1-20.pdf>
- ⁴⁹ Donald J. Trump for President et al v. Evers et al, In the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, December 1, 2020. <https://www.wrn.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/2020AP1971-Pet-for-Orig-Action-12-1-20.pdf>
- ⁵⁰ "Declaration of Professor of Mathematics, Dr. Steven J Miller, Ph.D.," https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22O155/163392/20201214094921641_Appendix%20section%209.pdf
- ⁵¹ WVA v. Pence, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, December 22, 2020. <https://www.democracymagazine.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2020/12/DC-WVA-20201222-complaint.pdf>
- ⁵² Donald J. Trump for President et al v. Evers et al, In the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, December 1, 2020. <https://www.wrn.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/2020AP1971-Pet-for-Orig-Action-12-1-20.pdf>

*Cover photo: © Reuters by Kevin Lamarque

End Notes (Main Cover Photo)

¹ Founding Fathers: George Washington, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, American Flag, “Michael Youssef on What Our Founding Fathers Envisioned for America: Faith and Liberty,” *BCNN*, Accessed on January 31, 2021. <https://bcnntwo.home.blog/2020/07/08/michael-youssef-on-what-our-founding-fathers-envisioned-for-america-faith-and-liberty/>

See Also

Alcorn Imagery, “Dropping mail-in ballot in ballot box,” Adobe Stock, Accessed on January 31, 2021.

See Also

Sheila F, “Alameda, CA - May 11, 2020: Young caucasian hand holding mail in ballot. Governor Gavin Newsom just announced California will be a vote by mail only state for the 2020 Presidential election,” Adobe Stoc, Accessed on January 31, 2021

See Also

Lisa F. Young, “Florida Election 2008,” Adobe Stock, Accessed on January 31, 2021.

See Also

Alcorn Imagery, “Official 2020 US Election absentee mail in ballot with a mask and a black pen focused on the presidential candidates with a shallow depth of field and copy space,” Adobe Stock, Accessed on January 31, 2021.