

Op-Ed

OP-ED

TWJ Exclusive: The Viral Memo Changing the Trump Legal Strategy



Jacquelyn Martin / AP Photo

Members of President Donald Trump's legal team, including former Mayor of New York Rudy Giuliani, Sidney Powell, and Jenna Ellis, speaking, attend a news conference at the Republican National Committee headquarters on Nov. 19, 2020, in Washington. (Jacquelyn Martin / AP Photo)

By **William J. Olson** and **Patrick M. McSweeney**
Published November 22, 2020 at 4:28pm

The Western Journal is presenting this memorandum, written by two prominent conservative legal scholars, essentially verbatim, with only enough editing to format it for the Op-Ed section of our website. Because of the importance of the subject matter and its potential to impact the results of the 2020 presidential election, we felt it was even more important than usual to allow these newsworthy authors their own voice, with as light a touch from our editorial staff as possible. — Ed. note

THE CONSTITUTIONAL

DUTY OF STATE LEGISLATURES IN A CONTESTED PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

William J. Olson, William J. Olson, P.C., Vienna, Virginia

Patrick M. McSweeney, McSweeney, Cynkar & Kachouroff, Powhatan, Virginia

The American People deserve lawful presidential elections: “No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live. Other rights, even the most basic, are illusory if the right to vote is undermined.” *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 10 (1964).

During the 2020 Presidential Election, many of the so-called swing states, including Arizona, saw unprecedented – and unlawful – erosions of procedural safeguards as well as administrative irregularities on Election Day. People deserve an honest accounting of who won. Many Americans voted via a process – absentee ballots, including mail in ballots – that the bipartisan Jimmy Carter-James Baker commission identified as “the largest source of potential voter fraud” in the wake of the contested 2000 election. [BUILDING CONFIDENCE IN U.S. ELECTIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON FEDERAL ELECTION REFORM](#), at 46 (Sept. 2005).

With respect to identifying and remediating fraudulent or mistaken results, it is now or never, whatever can be done must be done.

Examining the Assumptions of Andrew McCarthy

This analysis was inspired, indeed provoked, by an article written by Andrew

McCarthy appearing in the historically Never-Trump *National Review*. Andrew C. McCarthy, “[No, State Legislatures May Not Reverse the Result of the Election](#),” *National Review* (Nov. 21, 2020). Mr. McCarthy completely mischaracterizes the issue, establishing a straw man for him to set on fire.

He says: “The idea would be to appeal to Republican-controlled legislatures in states where presumptive president-elect Joe Biden won the popular vote — Pennsylvania, Michigan, Georgia, and Arizona — and persuade them to appoint slates of Republican electors who would cast each state’s Electoral College votes for Trump rather than Biden.” Well, if Biden actually was the presumptive president-elect, and if Biden had won the popular vote, Mr. McCarthy’s analysis would make sense. But he is assuming facts not in evidence.

Suppose that the Trump Campaign follows up on the “Opening Statement” that was outlined by Rudy Giuliani, Sidney Powell, and Jenna Ellis on November 19, with a case-in-chief which demonstrates the presence of rampant fraud — with votes being tabulated at overseas computers, with software designed to elect favored candidates, with stacks of ballots marked only for Biden and no down-ballot races, etc. What then is a state legislator to do, particularly if the hard evidence of pervasive electoral fraud comes in after the vote is “certified” in accordance with election laws that presuppose that only a brief time is required to detect and remove fraud, and the number of votes directly challenged is not outcome determinative?

Mr. McCarthy objects to the “president’s team ... taking its case public in order to pressure Republican state legislators.” Mr. McCarthy would prefer if President Trump conceded and simply rode off into the sunset. Would he do that if as a candidate he thought that he had lost in a dishonest vote? Taking the case to the public makes all the sense in the world — after all, the President is the one official who represents all the People. And, *a prima facie* case has been made that there was substantial computerized election fraud.

For every legal argument Mr. McCarthy makes, there is a stronger argument on the other side. He would ignore the language of Article I, Section 2 which vests in state legislatures the authority to determine the Manner of electing electors. Mr.

McCarthy would have even those state legislators who become fully persuaded that the count was fraudulent to sit back and see the person that their constituents actually elected be de-throned by CNN and National Review. Legislators who want to carefully examine the election process, and take action if significant election fraud is found, would be simply giving effect to the vote of the People, not denying it. They should not, as Mr. McCarthy would want them to do, avert their eyes to the Big Steal.

The U.S. Constitution vests the total authority to select electors in state legislators, not Governors, Secretaries of State, or pundits. Mr. McCarthy would believe that laws enacted by states can diminish that authority. But they cannot. And if the counting of the votes from the November 3 election demonstrates foreign meddling, then state legislatures absolutely will be required to carry out the mission assigned them by Alexander Hamilton in Federalist 68 by exercising their authority, as the Constitution states, to “appoint” electors. Inspired by Mr. McCarthy, and in a desire to defend the process established by the Framers, this paper was written.

A Prima Facie Case for Election Fraud Has been Made Out

Although the principals involved apply to all states, we focus one state — Arizona. As of November 21, 2020, the website of the Arizona Secretary of State shows the following razor thin difference in the reported vote for President and Vice President:

Biden	1,672,143	49.39 percent
Trump	1,661,686	49.08 percent
Difference	10,457	0.31 percent

This 10,000 vote spread is so small that it easily could be the result of the type of retail election irregularities that occur, such as persons voting twice, voting by dead persons, voting by illegal aliens, voting by persons not living in the state,

etc. But the reported margin could also be the result of a relatively new types of computer-based election fraud.

At a 96 minute [press conference](#) on November 19, 2020, Trump campaign counsel Rudy Giuliani, Sidney Powell, and Jenna Ellis presented what they described as their “Opening Statement,” in the Trump Campaign’s effort to demonstrate various types of election fraud. That Opening Statement outlined details of election fraud that has occurred in Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. Election fraud in New Mexico and Virginia was also briefly addressed. That press conference was covered by Fox and Newsmax (*and by The Western Journal – Ed. note*), but largely ignored by the other networks. The consensus mainstream media terms used to describe charges of election fraud continue to be “baseless” and “unproven.”

There is good reason to believe that significant election fraud occurred, and the source of this alleged fraud was not just the “run-of-the-mill” Big City Democrat election fraud. The briefing by the Trump attorneys asserts there is significant evidence that this election fraud that been aided and abetted by three particularly disturbing sources: (i) the Deep State and elements of the Intelligence Community [footnote 1]; (ii) foreign governments; and even (iii) some Republican office holders who benefited from the election systems that have been put in place.

Nonetheless, the Trump Campaign has made a *prima facie* case of fraud based on statistical abnormalities and several key affidavits explaining **systemic election fraud**. (As one illustration, the Appendix to this Memorandum sets out an analysis of the Georgia and Pennsylvania vote dumps which appears to demonstrate a pattern of voter dumps that can only be explained as election fraud.) As such information is presented in a more systematic manner, it will be increasingly difficult for anyone to say that there is no evidence of fraud.

Importantly, upwards of 70 percent of the Trump base — which constitutes the great bulk of the Republican Party — believe that there was widespread election fraud [footnote 2]. Politico, [“Poll: 70 percent of Republicans don’t think the election was free and fair,”](#) (Nov. 9, 2020). And, even more significantly, they

believe that unless this fraud is exposed and the voice of the lawful voters is honored, this will be the end of free and fair elections in the nation, and thus, the literal end of our nation's status as a "Constitutional Republic."

These lawful voters expect that election officials and state legislators will do their duty to ensure that the lawful votes of the people as cast are honored — not diluted or debased by systemic fraud.

The Constitutional Responsibility of State Legislatures with Respect to the Electoral College

The "Electors" Clause of the U.S. Constitution specifies that the President is selected by electors chosen in the states, and that electors are selected as state legislatures direct:

Each State shall appoint, **in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct**, a Number of **Electors**, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress... [Article II, Section 1, clause 2 (emphasis added).]

This clause specifies both the function of electors and the governmental body responsible for determining how they are selected. The reasons for the creation of an independent body of electors to be entrusted with the duty to select a President and Vice President are clearly explained in the Federalist Papers (these essays were written and disseminated to explain the need for the U.S. Constitution). The process of electing the President through a vote of electors was designed to guard against domestic political corruption. And it was to guard against what the Framers thought was the "chief" danger to the nation — the threat posed by foreign governments might seek to influence the selection of our President. Thus, it appears that the threats perceived in the 18th Century are not that different from the threats recognized in the 21st Century.

Nothing was more to be desired than that every practicable obstacle should be opposed to **cabal, intrigue, and corruption**. These most deadly adversaries of republican government might naturally have been expected to make their approaches from more than one quarter, but **chiefly from the desire in foreign powers to gain an improper ascendant in our councils**. How could they better gratify this, than by raising a creature of their own to the chief magistracy of the Union? But **the convention have guarded against all danger of this sort**, with the most provident and judicious attention. [Federalist No. 68 (Alexander Hamilton).]

As to how presidential electors are selected by states, the U.S. Constitution vests that authority *exclusively* in state legislatures. The offices of President and Vice President were created by the U.S. Constitution, and when a state legislature exercises this power to determine the manner in which electors are chosen, that power is governed solely by the federal Constitution. *See Leser v. Garnett*, 258 U.S. 130, 137 (1922) (function of state legislature in carrying out a federal function derived from the U.S. Constitution “transcends any limitations sought to be imposed by the people of a State”). No state constitution, state law, or state court can alter or constrain that grant of power. In one century-old case, the U.S. Supreme Court applied the electors clause, recognizing the exclusive authority of the state legislatures to act for the people with respect to selection of electors.

The appointment of these electors is thus placed **absolutely and wholly with the legislatures of the several states**. They may be chosen by the legislature, or the legislature may provide that they shall be elected by the people of the state at large, or in districts, as are members of congress, which was the case formerly in many states; and it is [no] doubt competent for the legislature to authorize the governor, or the supreme court of the state, or any other agent of its will, to appoint these electors. This power is conferred upon the legislatures of the states by the constitution of the United States, and **cannot be taken from them or modified by their state constitutions** ... Whatever provisions may be made by statute, or by the state constitution, to choose electors by the people, there is **no doubt of the right of the legislature to resume the power at any time, for it can neither be taken away nor abdicated**. [*McPherson v. Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1, 34–35 (1892) (emphasis added).]

Arizona State Law on Selection of Electors

In the first presidential election, six out of ten states that chose electors did so through their state legislatures [footnote 3]. However, for most of the last 200 years, electors have generally been chosen by popular vote [footnote 4]. Arizona law presently provides that the electors are to be those chosen at the November 3, 2020 general election [footnote 5].

The task at hand is to determine whether the slate of electors to be certified reflects the lawful vote of the people of Arizona. The legislature has a duty to thoroughly investigate the claims of fraud and ensure that a lawful election has taken place — i.e., to ensure that irregularities and illegally cast votes did not alter the outcome of the popular vote.

If the legislature is reasonably certain that a lawful election occurred — that the outcome of the popular vote truly reflects the will of the people — then the results should be certified and the chosen slate of electors seated. To be sure, this obligation is political in nature, and the legislature retains full legal authority to certify any slate of electors it wishes, or no slate of electors at all. If, however, the legislature (and by extension, the people) harbors serious doubts about whether the election results reflect the true will of lawful voters, that body is free to determine how to proceed. The legislature’s plenary constitutional authority under the Electors Clause is reflected in 3 U.S.C. § 2: When a state “has failed to make a choice on the day prescribed by law, the electors may be appointed on a subsequent day **in such a manner as the legislature of such State may direct.**”

Process of Selecting Electors

Congress has passed a number of statutes related to the selection and certification of electors. For instance, 3 U.S.C. § 5 addresses what happens when a controversy as to the appointment of electors occurs in a state:

If any State shall have provided, by laws enacted prior to the day fixed for the appointment of the electors, for its **final determination of any controversy or contest** concerning the appointment of all or any of the electors of such State, **by judicial or other methods or procedures**, and such determination shall have been made at least six days before the time fixed for the meeting of the electors, **such determination** made pursuant to such law so existing on said day, and made at least six days prior to said time of meeting of the electors, **shall be conclusive**, and shall govern in the counting of the electoral votes as provided in the Constitution, and as hereinafter regulated, so far as the ascertainment of the electors appointed by such State is concerned [emphasis added].

Additionally, 3 U.S.C. § 2, discussed above, suggests that the plenary authority of state legislatures only applies in the event that the voters “failed to make a choice on the day prescribed by law.”

Any interpretation of these or any other statutes that would curtail the constitutional authority of state legislatures under the Electors Clause under the U.S. Constitution would likely be unconstitutional. The Electors Clause is unequivocal: a state’s electors are appointed “in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct.” Contrast this with the Elections Clause in Article I, § 4: “The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators.” The Elections Clause provides Congress with authority to override state regulations. The Electors Clause does not. As the Court recognized in *McPherson*, the power to choose electors lies “**absolutely and wholly** with the legislatures of the several states.”

And even if 3 U.S.C. § 5 is constitutional, it merely provides a safe harbor for a state if a law in effect before the election is used to resolve a controversy or contest. It is simply not an issue if the legislature elects to resolve such a controversy another way pursuant to its authority under the Electors Clause.

If Fraud in the Vote Count in Arizona is Established, What is to be Done?

The question for each Arizona state legislator should be whether the vote counting system that is in place has generated an accurate reelection of the lawful voters of Arizona, or whether the system either is flawed, or was hijacked, to reach a pre-determined result. If it is believed that there was systemic election fraud in Arizona, then allowing the State Certification process to go forward unchecked would make the legislature complicit in the perpetration of a fraud upon the United States and its people.

However, there is no reason why a State Legislature could not send its own **Certificate of Ascertainment**, which, in this scenario, (i) could give all of the state's electors to Trump, (ii) could split them between Trump and Biden, or (iii) could refuse to send any electors at all.

Conclusion

The Founders recognized that elections could be corrupted or stolen. They established the Electoral College as a safeguard and empowered state legislatures to ensure the integrity of the election. Lawful voters expect state legislators to do their constitutional duty to ensure that the lawful votes of the people as cast are honored — not diluted or debased by systemic fraud.

Footnotes:

1. As to Deep State involvement, recall that Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer warned President Trump as he was coming into office, “they have six ways from Sunday at getting back at you.” *The Hill*, “[Schumer: Trump ‘really dumb’ for attacking intelligence agencies](#)” (Jan. 3, 2017).

2. In another poll, 30 percent of *Democrats* thought it was at least somewhat likely that the election was stolen. PJ Media, “[Nearly a Third of Democrats Believe the Election Was Stolen From Trump](#)” (Nov. 19, 2020).

3. The legislatures of Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and South Carolina all chose their states’ electors. New York failed to send any electors. Neither North Carolina nor Rhode Island had ratified the Constitution. [*McPherson*, 146 U.S. at 29–30].

4. Following the Election of 1824 — which was decided by the House of Representatives after no candidate received a majority of the electoral vote — “the states moved to the selection of electors by popular vote, and by 1832, electors were ‘chosen by general ticket in all the states excepting South Carolina, where the legislature chose them up to and including 1860.’” Margot Cleveland, “[State Legislatures Must Investigate Fraud And Choose Electors Accordingly](#),” *The Federalist.com* (Nov. 19, 2020) (quoting *McPherson*, 146 U.S. at 32).

5. Arizona Code Section 16-212.B. provides: “After the secretary of state issues the statewide canvass containing the results of a presidential election, the presidential electors of this state shall cast their electoral college votes for the candidate for president and the candidate for vice president who jointly received the highest number of votes in this state as prescribed in the canvass.”

Appendix One: Analysis of Election Fraud

by former Louisiana State Senator Woody Jenkins.

1) Read pages 1, 6, and 7 of this newspaper — Central City News.

<https://centralcitynews.us/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Central-City-News-11-19-20-Small.pdf>

2) **Georgia**. The following are the NY Times' moment-by-moment updates from the Nov. 3, 2020 Presidential election in **GA**. Go way down, to Line 289. Then go across to the **Net Difference** between the two candidates. Note the number marked in Yellow, 18,000. You are now into the vote dumps. Go down to every new vote dump — all the ones marked in Yellow. They will ALL be multiples of 4,800 +/- 200 votes. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1T_wB66S79FkEDsvUWwRWXSg4Ja-JxoE4WDNHGmUbvvk/edit?fbclid=IwAR1ljIwtGIPYqOc8xqrd8SbOSjHYNTK_H3kgLck98UKmvQB6g1iaz7z

Notice that the new Biden totals are NOT multiples of 4,800. But the NET increase for Biden each time was 4,800 or a multiple of 4,800. So Biden might get 6,000 in a dump and Trump 1,200. Or Biden might get 3,600 and Trump -1,200. No one would notice this because Biden was not getting a uniform number of votes each time. But the algorithm was set to give Biden a NET increase of 4,800. 15 vote dumps like this, **providing 104,000 votes in GA**. Just enough.

3) **Pennsylvania** was the same as GA but there each vote dump gave Biden a net increase of 6,000 +/- or a multiple thereof. 44 dumps with over 347,000 “votes” — every dump gave Biden an increase of 6,000 or a multiple of 6,000 +/- <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1cyZb1ckbMhm5D8HxG9FLTVUH1lm4se2nxrp4kv6qHRw/htmlview#gid=0>

For PA, start at line 359 and note the yellow box. Then follow the yellow boxes down. Every vote dump thereafter gives Biden a NET increase of 6,000 votes or a multiple thereof. 44 dumps totaling **347,000 votes**.

These dumps were NOT real votes. They were simply digits in Dominion's computers. This entire election was rigged and no telling how many other elections in the United States and around the world. This is truly The Scandal of the Century!

HOW THE ELECTION WAS STOLEN IN GEORGIA

By Woody Jenkins, Editor

Central City News, Baton Rouge, LA

woodyjenkins2020@hotmail.com

225-921-1433

Election Day in the United States, held this year on Tuesday, Nov. 3, 2020, was really a series of 51 separate elections — one in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The vote total in each determines how the electoral votes of that state or district will be cast in the Electoral College on Dec. 14, 2020.

Thirty of those states and more than 2,000 counties have something in common. The citizens of those areas vote on voting machines provided by **Dominion Voting Systems** with software from **Smartmatic Vote Counting System**.

While supporters of President Trump cast about for evidence of vote fraud in the form of unsigned ballots, mishandled paper ballots, and evidence of “retail” vote fraud, **proof of massive computer-based vote fraud is right before the nation’s eyes**. It is going unnoticed in this hyper-partisan atmosphere.

Ironically, **The New York Times**, a vocal critic of the President, has recorded the fraud for all times, even though they have not reported it.

While the mainstream media has crowned former Vice President Joe Biden as “President-elect,” the facts on the ground are quite different, at least in two swing states that have been called for Vice President Biden — Georgia and Pennsylvania.

In those two states, a careful analysis of the data shows that both states voted for President Trump and the election was stolen.

It was **fraud by computer**.

Since Dominion and Smartmatic have control of the voting machines, the software, and the reporting of the results, it should be up to the owners and officials of those two entities to explain how it was done. But it was done, as will be shown.

Unraveling this mystery begins with The New York Times. After polls closed on Election Day, The Times begin to report the results hour after hour. The coding for that data is still online, and we have downloaded it in case it is taken down.

The data from The Times shows the time, expressed as UTC, or Universal time, which is Greenwich mean time in England.

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1T_wB66S79FkEDsvUWwRWXSg4Ja-JxoE4WDNHGmUbvvk/edit?fbclid=IwAR1ljIwtGlPYqOc8xqrd8SbOSjHYNTK_H3kgLck98UKmvQB6g1iaz7z

It also shows the totals for Trump and Biden, Trump's lead, and then new votes for Trump and Biden as each change in the results was uploaded. Then it shows something very significant: The increase or decrease in the lead for Trump after the new dump of votes occurred. Therein lies this story.

Late on Wednesday, Nov. 4, at precisely 16:35 UTC, The New York Times reported President Trump was leading in Georgia by 103,997 votes. However, a new group of votes was being dumped. That one dump reduced Trump's lead by 18,563 votes. Remember that number.

Three hours later, another dump occurred. This one reduced Trump's lead by **4,656** votes. Remember that number. Thirty minutes later, another dump reduced Trump's lead by **4,685** votes. An hour and a half later, another dump reduced Trump's lead by **9,323** votes. An hour and a half later, another dump reduced Trump's lead by **9,509** votes.

Are you beginning to see a pattern?

The pattern is that **all the dumps were multiples of 4,800.**

But it didn't end there!

An hour and 26 minutes later, another dump reduced Trump's lead by 9,501 votes. At that point, Trump's lead had been reduced to about 48,000 votes.

Then an hour and 8 minutes later, a vote dump reduced Trump's lead by 9,606 votes.

An hour and 34 minutes later, a vote dump reduced Trump's lead by 4,827 votes.

Forty minutes later, a vote dump reduced his lead by 4,861 votes. Then 2 hours and 26 minutes later by 4,863. Four hours and 47 minutes later, a vote dump reduced Trump's lead by 4,864 votes. Biden was coming on strong!

Trump's lead was now only 9,625 votes. It was 10:53 UTC on Nov. 5.

Bear in mind that while all this was happening, Trump was gaining votes or holding his own if you exclude the vote dumps.

Georgia was hanging in the balance, but not for long. Five hours later, a vote dump cut Trump's lead by 4,891. Five hours after that, a vote dump cut Trump's lead by another 4,913. At 21:58 UTC on Nov. 5, less than a thousand votes separated the candidates.

An hour later, a vote dump reduced Trump's lead by 4,916 votes, and two hours and 32 minutes later, the vote dump reduced Trump's lead by 4,953 votes.

The election was tied with each candidate having 2,447,591!

At 22:00 UTC, Nov. 6, a vote dump cut Trump's vote by 4,969, and Biden led 2,454,662 to 2,449,693, a lead of 4,969.

The final vote dump came at 23:52 UTC on Nov. 7, when Biden's lead widened by 4,983! The former Vice President had made an amazing comeback and was now leading by 10,000 votes!

Of course, the statistical possibility of **Biden picking up multiples of 4,800 votes 16 times during this four-day period** would be firmly in the impossible range. But it happened.

How did it happen? There is no possible explanation except vote fraud — fraud by manipulation of computer programs.

This is all the more obvious in view of the fact the average of 4,800 or multiples thereof not only happened by adding votes to Biden but also by subtracting votes from Trump. The computer had to be programmed to produce net votes for Biden without being obvious. And they would have succeeded, if The New York Times had not kept such timely records and if somebody had not done some calculations.

The fraud in Georgia is all the more significant when one considers that **exactly the same thing happened in Pennsylvania**, except that the computer was programmed to add **6,000** votes at a time instead of 4,800.

In both states, the "votes" counted were not the votes of real people. They were simply added digitally, which a complete recount of both states would detect.

In years past, newspapers like ours have published **precinct-by-precinct voting returns** to let their readers know how the people in their community voted. Today, with so few people voting in their home precinct, that data is virtually useless.

With tens of millions of people voting early or by mail, only a fraction of votes are attributed to the voter's home precinct. Rather, they are simply lumped in with other votes from across the county or state. As a result, the only thing we can report on a precinct basis would be the votes cast on election day at the precinct

itself. That is a far cry from reporting how people in a given precinct voted. So it is impossible to determine where the votes are coming from.

In larger states such as Georgia and Pennsylvania, which had millions of early votes and mail-in ballots, the problem on November 2 was even greater. The public was told for days after the Nov. 3 election that “votes are still being counted.” However, as new vote totals were uploaded, neither the public nor the media knew where those votes were from.

Fear generated by the virus created an acceptance of the widespread use of mail ballots, but there was no corresponding effort to insure that those ballots were being collected and counted honestly and correctly. On the contrary, some states actually reduced normal security safeguards on mail-in ballots.

In the aftermath of the Nov. 3 vote, the media never told the public how or why it was necessary to still be counting ballot days after Nov 3. The confusion and uncertainty of the “new normal” in elections led to acceptance of votes being uploaded without knowing where they came from.

On Election Day, in the Commonwealth of **Pennsylvania**, Donald Trump took an early and commanding lead.

By 22:54 UTC Nov. 4, President Trump was leading former Vice President Joe Biden by roughly 285,000 votes. However, that began to disappear as someone, somewhere began to dump “votes” into the system. There were 44 separate vote dumps, resulting in 347,768 votes being put into the system — all in increments of 6,000, 12,000, or 18,000 additional net votes for Joe Biden. The chart attached showed the 44 vote dumps. The NET gain to Biden was 11,679, 11,314, 5,662, 5,907, 11,388, 5,445, 11,035, 5,807, 5,782, 11,738, 5,975, 6,081, 5,938, 12,281, 11,841, 6,098, 18,577, 12,475, 12,552, 6,265, 6,385, 12,796, and so on — all multiples of 6,000!

The remarkable consistency of the votes added to Joe Biden’s totals has shocked even Democratic office holders who have seen The New York Times’ election

data.

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1cyZb1ckbMhm5D8HxG9FLTVUH1lm4se2nxrp4kv6qHRw/htmlview#gid=0>

It was quite a feat for **Joe Biden to come back from an election night defeat by 285,000 votes to a 46,000-vote margin of victory four days later**. Election fraud has been around a very long time. However, **election fraud by computer is something relatively new**. The totals from Pennsylvania are conclusive proof that this election was stolen by computer fraud.

This election is proof that much more work will be necessary to insure free and fair elections in the future.

[The initial New York Times data was provided to the Central City News by an anonymous source. The writing and research for this piece was by Central City News editor Woody Jenkins with assistance from Jolice Provost.]

The views expressed in this opinion article are those of their author and are not necessarily either shared or endorsed by the owners of this website. If you are interested in contributing an Op-Ed to The Western Journal, you can learn about our submission guidelines and process [here](#).

We are committed to truth and accuracy in all of our journalism. Read our [editorial standards](#).

[Submit a Correction](#)



William J. Olson

Summary

More Info

Recent Posts

Contact

William J. Olson held three positions during the Reagan administration and his law firm focuses on constitutional law and defending against government excess. He has filed nearly