How to Combat the Dirty Voter Rolls, Based on Fraudulent Certification of "Accurate/Secure" Rolls

Background and Federal Funding

The 2002 Help America Vote Act (HAVA), enacted in Title 52 U.S.C., requires (§ 21083) a "single, uniform, official, centralized, interactive computerized statewide voter registration list defined, maintained, and administered at the State level…"

The same Title 52 requires ((§ 21083(3)) "the appropriate State or local official" to "provide adequate technological security measures to prevent the unauthorized access to" the statewide voter registration lists, and ((§ 21083(4)) "the State election system shall include provisions to ensure that voter registration records in the State are accurate and are updated regularly…"

Federal funding authorized under HAVA to help states meet HAVA standards included assistance for those statewide voter registration lists, and requires (§ 20901) the states receiving the funds to certify the funds were used for those statutory purposes, and consistent with the HAVA statutory requirements (including "security" and "accuracy").

The Disconnect

Title 52 provides no standards for the security or accuracy of the statewide voter registration systems or rolls, nor any enforcement mechanism whatsoever, much less independent audits of the security or accuracy of the systems.

Elections results which wildly contradict polling, statistical and data analysis of voter rolls by multiple parties, evidence and discovery in lawsuits (e.g. Judicial Watch), and citizen-led canvassing all confirm that our statewide, state-controlled voter rolls and voter histories are inaccurate.

In multiple states, security vulnerabilities and breaches of voter registration systems have been reported and multiple non-governmental entities have been given access to read and modify government-controlled voter information in centralized statewide rolls, with no independent audit, civil or criminal investigation, or transparency for citizens to understand whether and to what extent the integrity of the voter rolls and thus elections have been affected.

States have received hundreds of millions of dollars from the Federal government through these grants, on the basis of false (due to the inaccuracy and insecurity of the voter rolls) certifications made by state officials to the Federal government. E.g., California alone has received over $296M under this program, and every 2020 battleground state except Texas and North Carolina have received the funds.

Those evidently false certifications by state officials fall under 31 U.S.C. § 3732(a) (False Claims Act) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (Federal Question), inviting a qui tam complaint on behalf of the Federal government against those states, both to seek remedy in the form of independent security and accuracy audits (they'll fail) of the statewide voter registration systems and rolls, and ongoing oversight, to safeguard Americans'

electoral franchise and public funds, and to clawback those funds to the public treasury which were distributed on the basis of the false claims. Over $800M in election security grants in 2018 and 2020 were also dependent upon state certifications under 52 U.S.C. 20901. The relators of the False Claims Act qui tam actions may receive up to 30% of the government's award, if successful, so the effort has the benefit of potentially paying for itself several times over.

Other Key Priorities

Our current U.S. elections regime is increasingly untrusted by citizens, despite massive, longstanding, deliberate campaigns by elements of our government (DHS/CISA, EAC, DoJ, etc) and a variety of institutions (e.g. National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS), National Association of State Election Directors (NASED), CTCL, CEIR, the majority of our mainstream media, etc.) to propagandize citizens and public officials, and to suppress questions (e.g. Dominion lawsuits v. Fox News, Lindell, etc), evidence (e.g. Konnech v. True the Vote), and speakers who ask those questions and seek or bring forth that evidence. The J6 "insurrection" narrative, FBI-controlled provocateurs, and DOJ political prosecutions are the epitome of that suppression effort. Our elections regime is untrusted because it is highly untrustworthy.

The System We Have.

These are the elements which make our elections regime opaque and untrustworthy, and they are present in various combinations nationwide. They are the systematic architecture and infrastructure which make everything Navarro described in his report (and Spoonamore in 2004, and the Collier brothers in Votescam in 1992) possible, at scale.

1. **Fake Voters.**
    a. Our voter rolls are rife with fraudulent, duplicate, and deceased voter names. Campaigns by the self-described "cabal" institutions over the past 20+ years to enact statutes and procedures enabling automatic and "motor-voter" registration, to sue government-controlled/government-to-government voter roll reconciliation (e.g. Kansas Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck Program) partnerships out of existence, to replace them with a cabal-controlled "clearinghouse" (Electronic Registration Information Center)) focused on expanding voter rolls (which enables mail-in/absentee ballot fraud), rather than on making rolls accurate, and to intimidate and suppress citizen-led canvassing efforts (e.g. DoJ letters to AZ Senate, NAACP/LWV lawsuits vs. citizen canvassing efforts), and to facilitate leftist non-governmental institution "voter registration" capabilities and access, have resulted in grossly-inflated voter rolls.
    b. Even our many honest election officials rarely have insight, and never have control, of the changes to their voter rolls, because of the centralized, statewide, insecure nature of the voter roll systems, and the larger the county, the greater the uncontrolled roll inflation, and the greater the electoral impact.
    c. Maintenance of those voter rolls on unsecure statewide centralized systems, often superficially "in-house"-developed by state governments, but in practice developed and controlled by a few companies unknown to the public and frequently hidden behind the

façade of state-ownership (e.g. BPro and Votem), is opaque to the public and typically to public officials, as well.

d. The nature of the centralized, computer-based rolls enables manipulation to, e.g. add, remove, change addresses, change party affiliations, shift between counties, and modify, erase, or fabricate voting histories without detection, negating all attempts to "clean" the rolls, and providing no audit trail for citizens or other independent auditors. Nothing currently exists to prevent multiple instances of the same person in different counties and states. Voter rolls somehow become "dirty" and bloated *before* each General Election and "cleaned" *after* each election, with the same cycle returning every two years, making it only appear as though an effort is being made.
e. These systems are seldom audited by independent, competent cyber or data professionals, and the few audits performed are seldom reported to the public; despite discovered breaches (e.g. 2020) and vulnerabilities, the states never verify that their data is uncorrupted, and they cannot do so.
f. There are no Federal or state standards, certifications, testing, auditing of these voter roll systems, despite their criticality to our elections.
g. Disproportionately, these fraudulent voter names are registered as "unaffiliated" or "independent" voters, so they do not show up on major party affiliation lists and are not canvassed by the parties.
h. Voter registration databases and voter history files are often separated and both considered "living documents" making it nearly impossible to have a static list of who's registered to vote at a specific time for a specific election.
i. The systematic insinuation of "voter identification" standards which allow cancelled checks, utility bills, and other unverified and unverifiable documents as "proof" of identity, citizenship, and residency is a critical enabling variable supporting the fraudulent inflation of voter rolls. Election officials are compelled by state statutes to accept these forms of "ID" which they cannot verify, and which would be illegal to allow to, e.g. purchase cigarettes or alcohol, or to board a commercial airline flight. These "ID" standards have been implemented in response to the false claims that voter ID are discriminatory in nature and purpose.

2. **Fake Ballots.**
   a. The directed evolution of our "election day" into an "election month+" supports and enables massive introduction of fake ballots, because it gives malicious actors time to model and predict voter behavior and likely future ballot/vote totals, based not only on voting history (from state data, e.g. that distributed to leftist organizations by ERIC), but on the Informed View/Mail Track and Report (IV/MTR) data from USPS showing all in-transit election-related mail, and on pre-tabulation data from automated signature verification (ASV) machines in large counties, which have scanned incoming mail-in/absentee/early voting ballot envelopes, which identify voters, precincts, and affiliations.
   b. A single high-speed industrial printing press can print 20,000 or more PRE-MARKED (voted) ballots per hour, so the distance between knowing how many ballots are needed for a desired outcome and producing and introducing those ballots is minute.

c. The massive increase in mail-out ballots, along with inaccurate/inflated voter rolls, lack of independent auditing of USPS data, and failure of government to canvass to verify their inaccurate voter rolls, provides a flood of ballots which avail themselves to misuse and which lack and frustrate chain of custody.
d. Even if multiple ballot anti-counterfeiting measures were implemented in all states and jurisdictions, the massive number of legitimate ballots mailed out to fraudulent voter names/locations and "in the wild" would make maintaining custody over (and count of) unvoted ballots impossible.
e. These factors also enable the printing of ballots after the fact to match vote results fabricated electronically in/on computerized voting systems (which digital voting machine results records may, in turn, have been fabricated to match election results reported by foreign-owned and -controlled election night reporting systems like Scytl's Clarity Election Night Reporting); adequate auditing might detect this, but it is not possible due to the non-creation/destruction of required voting system log files. Post-results ballot printing FROM fabricated/altered digital ballot images or cast vote records, to match those fabricated digital records is a likely explanation for the otherwise inexplicable presence of so many different paper types in the ballots finally received for the Maricopa County audit in 2021 (there should only have been two paper types: Runbeck pre-printed ballot paper and ballot-on-demand printer paper).
f. Infrared ballot paper authentication systems were turned off in both Georgia and Maricopa County for the 2020 General Election despite both purchasing the IR VoteSecure ballot stock at a premium. Georgia's remain disabled.
g. There is effectively no chain-of-custody for drop-box and mail-in ballots. Purported safeguards for chain-of-custody include dropbox video surveillance and verification of voter affidavit signatures, however:
    i. Not all jurisdictions employ video surveillance of dropboxes.
    ii. Few jurisdictions employ video surveillance adequate to identify either criminal acts (e.g. depositing ballots in excess of legal limits) or criminals (insufficient to support facial identification or license plate identification).
    iii. Video surveillance installations frequently lack security themselves, so that someone could easily disconnect or disrupt video surveillance long enough to empty or fill a dropbox, without detection.
    iv. No jurisdiction is consistently reviewing even a small proportion of available dropbox video, let alone all dropbox video, so legal and surveillance violations are never detected, and have no effect on acceptance of dropbox ballots.
    v. Dropbox pickups do not count the number of ballots removed from dropboxes, when emptied, and in some cases the ballots are weighed, rather than counted, at delivery to the appropriate jurisdiction (such that different ballot paper weights or enclosures might significantly affect ballot count estimates).
    vi. Though many jurisdictions use "bipartisan" teams of two or more election workers to pick-up dropbox ballots, there is little verification possible or required of the alleged affiliations of the team members, nor requirement that they be opposed to one another. I.e., a "bi-partisan" team could be one "Working Families Party" and one "Progressive Democratic Party" member.

vii. The dropbox locks and anti-tamper/tamper detection indicator devices used to secure dropboxes and ballot transport containers are all easily and quickly defeatable, without detection, so that neither election officials nor citizens have the ability to ensure ballots have not been fraudulently introduced or removed.

viii. Dropbox pickup logs are frequently non-existent or incomplete, hampering any attempt to investigate and confirm or refute chain of custody for purported dropbox ballots.

ix. USPS IV/MTR data is available, including both metadata of outbound and inbound ballot intelligent mail barcodes and images of ballot envelopes, however:

1. Ballots sent via USPS are handled by single individuals (both USPS employees and contractors) with no record of the individual, no requirement or implementation of two-person or "bipartisan" handling.
2. IV/MTR images of ballot envelopes often include affidavit signatures, which then place the very device (signature) used to verify chain-of-custody into an uncontrolled, unmonitored, unmonitorable (for citizens) environment, where it may be disseminated to unauthorized parties who can use it to "authenticate" absentee ballots in the same or subsequent elections.

x. Voter affidavit signatures are verified by either Automated Signature Verification (ASV) machines or election judges. The ASV machines are entirely unregulated, without supply-chain security, testing or certification standards, testing or certification, security or auditing requirements. They are computer-controlled, require access to voter registration systems and signature databases, and may be altered or modified in real-time through settings, and through connections to external networks, with no notification to or detection by election officials.

xi. Questioned document examiners (QDE), used as experts to verify handwriting and signatures in legal settings, are typically certified professionals with a minimum of an undergraduate degree in physical sciences, six months or more of study and tutelage under experienced professionals in the field, equipped with instruments like electrostatic discharge and light tables, allowing examination of handwriting and signatures under high-magnification, with wavelength-discrete lighting sources. In contrast, election judges typically have little training (two hours or less), no instruments other than the naked eye, and neither the time nor procedures to inspect ballots and ballot signatures to ensure, e.g., that the ballot markings and signatures are made by human hand, and not inkjet-printed.

3. **Fake Counts.**

a. Extraordinarily-complex black-box voting systems, including tabulation systems, are frequently provided by foreign (e.g. Dominion Voting Systems, with a veneer of U.S. incorporation but with all patents & headquarters in Canada) or foreign-controlled (e.g. Unisyn, owned by Malaysian-headquartered, Hong Kong-registered, PRC-affiliated Berjaya, through International Lottery & Totalizator Systems) (or those with obscure ownership, e.g. ES&S) companies.

b. These systems are comprised entirely or partially of components and systems manufactured and assembled overseas, primarily in the People's Republic of China, with no supply-chain security whatsoever (exposing the systems to compromise and direct control by numerous actors, including the PRC itself)
c. These systems have been discovered repeatedly to have undisclosed wireless networking capabilities, and have been "tested" incompetently and/or fraudulently by a small number of fraudulently-accredited voting system testing labs, certified for use by technologically-illiterate (at best) state officials, and controlled by the voting system vendors themselves, with false pretense of local election official control and procedures so the local officials can reassure themselves and the public of what is not true.
d. Hand-counts of paper ballots with wildly different results than the machine counts, in numerous locations and elections (e.g. DeKalb County, GA in '22, Williamson County, TN in '21), and numerous security assessments by independent cyber experts (e.g. Antrim (ASOG), Mesa (Gould/O'Donnell/Daugherity), Georgia (Halderman)), despite the alleged safeguards of certification, testing, "auditing" (including risk-limiting audits), and oversight, demonstrate beyond doubt that the systems are neither secure nor trustworthy, and that hand-counting of paper ballots is the only way for citizens to witness the tabulation of votes and thereby trust the tabulation of results.
e. Sample auditing, including risk-limiting audits (RLA), are a smoke detector with the battery removed; they provide false assurance and delay or impede real, effective auditing. Sample auditing is reasonable, in limited circumstances, as part of a larger quality control program; it represents the equivalent of an "internal control" for management purposes and objectives. Sample auditing is not now and never has been sufficient or suitable to detect fraud, nor in lieu of full, independent auditing, once any indication of internal control failure is detected. A prime example is Maricopa County's statutorily required hand-count sampling audit, which was completed *before* the ballots were counted for the election being audited (analgous to doing your income tax filing in October of the same year.)

Future Nonsense

Each of these continuations of centralized, technocratic, or unauditable mechanisms have been proposed, piloted or implemented in limited scope, thus far. They must be curtailed, eliminated, and prevented from expansion or adoption, for the reasons described.

Mobile/remote voting. Trades convenience for integrity. Even if all communications between personal computing devices (smartphones, tablets, laptops, desktops) and central servers could be secured, which they cannot, smartphone hardware and software are literally not controlled by their owners/users; government entities, carriers, operating system providers, and software/application and service providers can and do make changes to smartphones which cannot be detected or prevented by the owners/users (e.g. call blocking turned off after 911 call, Amber Alerts, COVID proximity/exposure messages, etc). The same is true for all personal/consumer computing devices. They cannot be secured, and if they cannot be secured and voting from them cannot be audited without violating individuals' privacy, then we cannot trust any election result purported from/involving mobile/remote voting. Furthermore, as with the

current regime, the fatal flaw in mobile/remote voting is that it requires blind public trust in "experts," as the general public lacks the technical expertise to evaluate the security and integrity of involved devices/mechanisms.

Blockchain voting. Same drawbacks as mobile/remote voting. Even if blockchain voting could be demonstrated and maintained "secure," which remains to be seen, it would put elections in the hands of technical "experts" to conduct and verify, depriving the public, which lacks sufficient expertise, of transparency and the ability to audit the election themselves.

Ranked-Choice Voting. Alternative to "plurality" election (wherein whomever receives the most votes, or a majority (50%+1), wins. Purported to produce legislative bodies that "reflect the diversity of their constituency." In practice: at best, can lead to election of officials who were NOBODY's first choice, can result in a "false majority" or various forms of "exhausted" ballots (where all a voter's choices are eliminated in successive rounds of RCV counting, so the final rounds don't count their votes, at all, and in all cases makes election results extraordinarily difficult to audit, due to complexity (as miscounts in Alameda County, CA, NYC, etc.) demonstrate.

The System We Need

1. **Clean-slate locally-controlled voter rolls.** Clean slate requires every name to be established by in-person registration with government-issued photo ID verifying citizenship and residency. Locally-controlled means the rolls are controlled by parish, borough, county, township, etc., with NO network/external access. The local election officials can upload/send read-only copies of their rolls on a frequent (e.g. daily) basis to state officials, who can compile those local rolls into a current state database and then use that database to prevent duplicate/fraudulent voter registrations within and across states, with no involvement from non-government entities. A helpful corollary would be establishing a national voter ID number system, so that citizens have a single, permanent, portable voter ID (like SSAN, but used only for voting) issued in the state in which they first register to vote, which follows them to all locations – this would facilitate elections officials verifying that no voter has voted more than once in an election.
2. **In-person, election DAY voting at precinct of residency, with the same government-issued photo ID used to register, on numbered paper ballots** (so election officials can immediately detect duplicate or fake ballots). This will interfere with both modeling/predicting current and future vote counts, and the opportunity to create/insert ballots to counter legitimate votes. The relatively small numbers of verified disability voters may be assisted by the person of their choice (except employer or union agent), in accordance with Federal law, or may register for in-person assistance by teams of sworn election officials. A helpful corollary implied by in-person, election day voting is the disaggregation of our elections from the current consolidated forms which have dozens (or hundreds) of choices on one multi-page ballot into separate, discrete local, statewide, and Federal elections, or separate ballot cards (the South Korean method) so that ballots for a given election are limited to a single side of a single page.
3. **Precinct hand-count of paper ballots under live-streamed, archived video, AFTER all the ballots which will be counted have been accepted by sworn officials.** At the precinct level, there will be no more than ~4,000 ballots, and typically less than ~1,000, to count in any given election. This can be completed in small spaces (e.g. elementary schools), by small teams of sworn citizens (e.g.

volunteers or the public school teachers already being paid by citizens), in a few hours. Conducting the hand-counts under streaming, archived video allows any citizen to a) watch the tallying in real-time, b) verify their own vote was accurately counted, if they have a discrete ballot number to watch for, c) verify that ballot and vote counts match in any precinct, and the archived video provides, in addition to the paper ballots themselves, an auditable record available to all citizens. With this method, there is no technology, no need for or reliance on "experts," and no opportunity for fake counts.

Until We Have the System We Need

What must be done, in the short- and long-term, to replace untrustworthy elements of our elections with transparent, trustworthy, citizen-controlled processes, and to mitigate the untrustworthy elements until they are replaced; in all cases, where resource constraints prevent broad/universal implementation, resources should be focused on those counties with greatest electoral impact[1]:

1. Show us the books.

a. **Digital Canvassing.** Conduct "digital canvassing" of voter rolls (pre-election) and voter history (post-election), correlating "proof of life" (NCOA, credit reporting, etc) data with voter roll names/addresses, flagging voter roll names with no corroborating data or which are refuted (e.g. address does not exist, no residence, name/individual deceased, proof of move/residence elsewhere, etc).
b. **Physical Canvassing.** Conduct full or statistically-designed/validated sampling door-to-door canvassing of precincts and counties/county equivalents voter rolls (pre-election) and voter history (post-election) to determine accuracy/inaccuracy of state rolls and voting history.
c. **Audit Open Records.** Via open records processes, request audit and cybersecurity records, including identified vulnerabilities, compromises, impact assessments, access agreements (between state and third-parties) to read or modify data in voter registration systems. Request ballot dropbox video. Request IV/MTR data to correlate with election official claims re: ballots sent out and received. Request records of all proxies granted access/receipt of IV/MTR data.
d. **Legislative inquiries.** Propose/enable legislative inquiries re: voter rolls and voter registration system for the same records requested in "c" above.
e. **Enact Voter Roll Auditing.** Propose statutory requirements for annual, pre-election full, independent auditing of voter registration systems themselves, including signature repositories,

[1] I.e., although there are 50 states and 3,143 counties/equivalents in the U.S., the largest population counties have disproportionate electoral impact in all state-level and Federal elections. E.g., Maricopa dominates AZ, with 60% of the state's population, and is the 4th largest U.S. county, by population. Any county which represents more than 50% of its state population is determinative in that state, by itself (e.g., Clark, NV; Honolulu, HI; Maricopa, New Castle, DE; Providence, RI) and in many more states, a small percentage of counties, together, are determinative (e.g. Cook/DuPage/Lake together are over half the population of IL, which has 102 counties; Philadelphia, Allegheny, Montgomery, Bucks, Delaware, Lancaster, Chester, York, and Berks counties in PA). The largest 50 U.S. counties (less than 1.6% of counties) are nearly 1/3 of the U.S. population. Some states and counties are more equal than others, electorally; focus there. Consider also anomalous voter roll and population growth/variance.

f. **Enact Voting System Audits.** Propose statutory requirements for annual, pre-election full, independent auditing of voting system configuration, certifications, and security assessments (e.g. to determine whether required security updates have been applied to prevent vulnerabilities, and whether required log files have been preserved to enable audit, in accordance with Federal/state statutes).

g. **Polling Place Reconciliation.** Require each polling location to reconcile the number of paper ballots, the number of ballots cast as identified on the tabulator poll closing tapes, and the list of voters (each voter specifically identified on a hard-copy list) daily (during in-person early voting) and on Election Day. Failure to reconcile within a reasonable margin of error would automatically yield a hand-count audit of the corresponding polling location. Records of all three metrics should be made public/posted on county's website immediately upon completion.

2. Require Accountability & Transparency.

a. **Enact Prohibitions on Foreign Voting Systems.** Propose statutory prohibitions on foreign-manufactured voting systems and voting system components, requiring voting system hardware and software be manufactured and assembled in the U.S. of U.S.-made components from trusted, certified suppliers, tested and certified in accordance with the Department of Defense standards in DoDI 5200.44, which protect mission critical functions (reflecting DHS' 2017 designation of election systems as "critical infrastructure").

b. **Enact Prohibitions on Non-Governmental Control and Conduct of Elections.** Prevent private/commercial/contracted operation of any aspect of elections, which are essential government functions that demand accountability and transparency, including voter registration system operation and maintenance, voting system operation and maintenance, and any aspect of handling cast votes or election reporting, including election night reporting.

c. **Independent Testing.** Authorize independent testing and auditing of voting systems by qualified businesses as opposed to the two Voting System Testing Labs who have an inherit conflict of interest with the voting system manufacturers.

d. **Investigate.** Follow-up on all anomalies/suspected fraud with in-person investigation to confirm person/residence/address/voter affiliation/voter history (not "whom" anyone voted for, only whether they voted in an election, and by what means (in-person, dropbox, mail, etc), and on what date. Provide a means by which citizens can file a complaint with the government agencies who regulate the voting systems (e.g., the EAC. Such action is currently reserved for election officials only.).

3. **Secure your vote.**

a. Encourage voters to vote in person, on election day, to retain their absentee/by-mail ballots where those have been mailed to them without their request, and to immediately report to legal teams and law enforcement when an absentee ballot in their name has been requested, distributed, or cast without their consent or involvement.

b. Organize ballot dropbox observation during use for elections.

4. **Elections By The People**.

a. Encourage voters to vote with their neighbors and family members, on election day.
b. Propose legislation to make election day a holiday or provide paid time off in every state.
c. Encourage voters to volunteer as election workers, including training to hand-count for both tabulation and election auditing.

5. **Legal.** To date, election integrity legal efforts have largely been a citizens' resistance movement, either self-funded or funded by small numbers of donors, with attorneys working pro bono or at reduced rates, under frequent attack from leftist organizations. Many organizations and institutions which claim and fundraise off the claim of their election integrity work have not been contributing to those legal efforts, or have contributed only superficially. Others have sued and settled but to little effect because their requested remedies (e.g. "clean up voter rolls") are ill-informed and inadequate. A coherent, resourced legal campaign is required to:
    a. Immediately engage in procedural and civil rights complaints in response to Constitutional and statutory violations, including slow-rolling and denial of open records requests.
    b. Sue & Refer for Criminal Investigation. Translate all discovered anomalies/errors/legal violations into affidavit-affirmed referrals for investigation to: election officials, district attorneys/attorney generals, legislators.
    c. Petition courts for appointment of special counsel and investigators, and to sue state officials if DAs/AGs will not fullfill their statutory responsibilities (e.g. qui tam v. secstates re: false claims for HAVA/CARES funds).
    d. File complaints against public officials for anti-SLAPP actions (including coordination with non-governmental entities such as CIS) to suppress or silence citizen speech, and associated civil rights violations.
    e. Defend public officials and citizens pursuing election integrity and acting within the law.
    f. Challenge all election conduct and results involving violation of Constitutional and statutory requirements, particularly where those violations negate safeguards (e.g. destruction of digital log files on voting systems, improper certification and use of voting systems, etc).

Note: the following are some actions/measures which are no doubt well-intentioned, but which will be ineffective for any purpose but diverting resources:

- Ballot-harvesting: no amount of ballot harvesting can overcome fraudulent, pre-marked ballots printed at 20,000 ballots per hour, per industrial press. And it will serve to indorse the practice when what we need is to legally prohibit it.
- Observers "watching" election conduct on voting machines: you can be sitting in front of a computer, watching it without interruption, and still have no idea what's happening inside the computer, or who is causing it to happen. You cannot "see" unauthorized external connections or functions. You cannot "see" anything but what the computer shows you, and even election officials do not have control over their systems.
- Post-election challenges: as we have seen over the last few election cycles, by the time citizens have access to data and artifacts, fraudulent election results are fait accompli and the burden and obstacles to remedy issues are insurmountable. The counting is drawn out, the "audits" are exercised before the counting is finished, and the elections are certified regardless of problems. Perhaps we need some type of immunity from intimidation/lawsuits for election boards and board

members who refuse to certify or wish to perform their due diligence before certification. Such protection would permit these individuals to order or perform audits and/or require all receipts before certification. To the extent possible, we must structure elections for transparency.

About Cause of America

The role of Cause of America is to enable, facilitate, and support citizen grassroots action to restore trust in local elections. Our work is about building a network of individuals, organizations, and partners who can learn from each other and work together to solve the most pressing issue facing our nation: free and fair elections.

The Cause of America mission is to find the truth, share the truth, restore election integrity, and connect election integrity individuals and groups locally and across the nation.

To learn more and get involved, visit https://causeofamerica.org/.