

36 CHAMBERS OF ELECTION INTEGRITY

- 1: Elections aren't safe just because someone says "they are safe" if they haven't looked at any data, equipment, or logs.
- 2: You cannot trust the Intel Community to tell you an election was safe.
- 3: In a world of electronic voting and tabulation, you cannot use decades old "recount" procedures to ensure an election was safe.
- 4: You cannot, as a jurisdiction, say you are done counting, then a few hours later upload hundreds of thousands of votes primarily all for a single candidate and act like it's "normal".
- 5: In a world of electronic voting and tabulation, the only way to audit an election is with IT personnel and digital forensic investigators. Not "election software certification companies" or election departments. If you can't afford that, don't use them.
- 6: You cannot declare an election with data irregularities as "safe" or "free of hacking" when you know that national elections are a patchwork of software, jurisdictions, and rules. There is simply no way for a person to make that judgement, sitting in Washington DC, as if they can magically assess all electoral functions from a laptop. It's impossible. It screams bias and chicanery.

7: You cannot say an election was "safe" based on the opinion of groups, thinktanks, and intel community personnel who are hostile to one of the candidates.

8: Jurisdictions cannot fight lawsuits where people are simply trying to verify results via digital forensic audit. It gives the appearance of guilt.

9: Judges cannot dismiss election lawsuits based on a lack of standing, when voters are the principal people harmed by a fraudulent election.

10: If you are going to use electronic voting systems, you must provide multi-million dollar physical security, completely transparent and audit-able systems, and offer no resistance to third party examination of those systems. This must be available in all jurisdictions. Not select counties. Not using "risk limiting audits". Not claiming "paper ballot recounts" are sufficient.

11: In the age of ballot printing on demand, automated test decks, COTS computers, common file types, etc. there can be no simple audit. Every election is essentially a digital crime scene. If you can't afford that, then you cannot afford to hold an electronic election.

12: Election integrity experts, and lawmakers prior to 2020 claimed an election could be hacked, manipulated or stolen in a way that would leave no trace. That is unacceptable. If true, we cannot have electronic voting systems for elections.

13: If electronic voting systems can be tampered with and leave no trace, how can any official claim an election is the "safest ever" without a full forensic examination of EVERY jurisdiction in the United States by digital forensic teams (particularly if there were irregularities in the election)?

14: If electronic voting systems have manuals that say they have vulnerabilities, they cannot be used in a national election.

15: If electronic voting systems have manuals that say all security is dependent on jurisdictional physical security, and that jurisdiction cannot provide robust security, they cannot use electronic voting systems. Period.

16: Electronic voting system companies cannot be owned by private equity firms that have little to no reporting requirements on ownership.

17: Electronic voting system companies need to be HIGHLY regulated to avoid even the appearance of bias by owners or executives.

18: Electronic voting system companies cannot not have a single dollar of foreign money anywhere in the ownership, in any way, in any part of the company or any shell companies or subsidiaries, in order to not have any ethical issues.

19: The people should have the right to call for audits and not be denied by any election board, court, or legal restraint.

20: The reporting of ANY election related story, information, or advertising cannot be censored by any social media company leading up to election day. Free press MUST be respected on all platforms that claim to be places of social interaction.

21: Government agencies cannot coordinate with social media companies on the censoring of information leading up to election day, regardless of reason.

22: Censoring information during an election is unAmerican and undemocratic. Period. Whether that be to help or harm a candidate.

23: For a government agency to censor information, they must meet the same legal and national security thresholds they would need for any other action. Which are warrants, and proof of foreign interference.

24: In 2020, the censoring of the Hunter Biden laptop story was an in-kind campaign contribution to the Joe Biden campaign in the amount of millions of dollars.

25: The coordination of censorship between government entities like CISA and social media companies are a violation of every citizens civil rights.

26: Mis/Dis/Mal information is by definition a "foreign" act. American citizens can tell the truth, lie, fabricate, or amplify anything they want within the law. That is called "Freedom of Speech".

27: On January 6th, there was no insurrection. No one was trying to overthrow the government to keep Donald Trump in power. It was a response to the censorship of the state, the violation of the people to petition their government, and the denial of grievances to be heard by the Judiciary. The REASON was not providing a safe and transparent election system or holding anyone accountable.

28: When you remove the 1st Amendment, which is a safety valve to prevent violence, you end up volatile situations.

29: The repeated denials of audits, lawsuits, etc. led to an oft quoted line by Martin Luther King Jr., "Riots are the language of the unheard".

30: In 2020, non-violent civil disobedience led to wide spread violations of civil rights of the citizens, all because no one wanted to examine electronic election results.

31: From BLM to J6, you cannot only agree with speech that you find palatable, "true", or "moral". The 1A is an all encompassing pact.

32: The labeling of everything as "Russian disinformation", "treason", etc. is despicable. It's unsustainable and unAmerican. There is zero margin of error to label something as disinformation and then later admit you were wrong. The consequences are too catastrophic.

33: From the "Steele Dossier" to the "Hunter Biden Laptop", the US Intelligence agencies need to stay out of information related to elections unless a remarkable threshold has been met.

34: The 1A is in place because no American will ever submit to people who make decisions about what is to be shared and what is to be censored. No one can label information real or non real in a way that affects civil rights. Period.

35: You can make the argument that even if the voting totals were correct, the election was still stolen by social media, mainstream media, and the intel community, via illegal election manipulation. That must end.

36: Electronic voting systems touted in pamphlets and sales pitches a host of transparency features and comprehensive audit logs. Why was reviewing these like pulling teeth, and suddenly subject to lawsuits to conceal them? They were literally sold as solutions to disputed elections.

