<p style="text-align:center">The Election Was Not "Free and Fair"</p>

Peter Peckarsky
February 4, 2017

The United States Department of State observes elections around the world using international election observers. After a foreign election, the State Department either certifies that the election was a free and fair election or it refuses to make such a certification.

An international election observer has written that if the November 8, 2016 U.S. election had occurred anywhere outside the United States, the U.S. State Department would have refused to certify that the election was a free and fair election. Further, the State Department would have reported that there is a "suspicion of fraud or error."

The State Department uses exit polls to determine whether it will make a certification for a given foreign election (See Department of State's "Vote Count Verification" document). According to the international election observer, the reason the State Department would refuse to certify the election was free and fair is the shift in results from the exit polls to the reported vote counts.

In order to understand the view of the international election observer and the State Department, one must understand a few things about polls in general.

The results of a typical pre-election poll are stated as Candidate Jones 52%, Candidate Smith 48% with a 3% margin of error at a 95% level of confidence. The 95% level of confidence means that 95% of the time if the pollsters had received responses from everyone who voted, the vote for Candidate Jones would have been between 55% and 49% which is 52% plus or minus 3% and the vote for Candidate Smith would have been between 51% and 45% which is 48% plus or minus 3%.

Similar statements can be made about an exit poll.

You can see below the charts of the exit poll data as broadcast by the television networks on Election Night. The unadjusted exit poll data on the charts was broadcast by the television networks as the polls closed in the various states. The vote share numbers are the numbers certified by the various states. (continued below)

In North Carolina, the unadjusted exit poll shows Hillary Clinton winning the state 48.6%to 46.5% for the loser Donald Trump. For Trump's 46.5% exit poll result, the 95% confidence interval is from 44.5% to 48.5%. This means that if all people who voted in North Carolina were asked to state who they voted for, 95% of the time Trump's percentage of the vote in North Carolina would have been between 44.5% and 48.5%. In fact, all the people who voted in North Carolina were asked to state who they voted for. They were asked at their polling places. The certified percentage for Trump in North Carolina was 50.5%. This result as so far outside the 95% confidence interval that it

would be expected to occur by chance only once in18,000 U.S. Presidential elections. Given that Presidential elections occur once every four years, the means that with an exit poll percentage of 46.5%, one would expect to see Trumps' certified winning total of 50.5% about once every 72,000 years.

In Florida, where Trump lost in the exit poll with 46.4% but won in the certified result with 49.1%, the result is expected to occur by chance once every 880 years.

The states of North Carolina and Florida have 44 electoral votes. These 44 electoral votes plus the 227 Clinton won in the certified result of the Electoral College would have given her the victory with a total of 271 electoral votes.

Further, in Pennsylvania, Hillary Clinton had an exit poll share of 50.5% and the exit poll loser, Donald Trump, had 46.1%. The 95% confidence interval on Hillary Clinton's exit poll share of 50.5% is from 48.0% to 53.0% but her vote share was outside the margin of error at only 47.6%. This result is expected to occur by chance once every 340 years.

In Wisconsin, where Trump lost in the exit poll with 44.3% but won in the certified result with 47.8%, the result is expected to occur by chance once every 2,400 years.

In short, it is theoretically possible that Trump won by chance but it is highly improbable.

There are only two possibilities with respect to the certified vote count, either the wildly improbable vote counts occurred by chance or they did not. If the vote counts did not occur by chance, they occurred because some person or persons arranged for them to occur. The exit poll to vote count vote shift and the charts say nothing about who might have caused such a shift or how such a shift was caused. They do indicate that if the shift were deliberate, the shift was deliberately caused by someone who wanted Donald Trump to win. The charts do not establish that Donald Trump or anyone acting for him had anything to do with what it appears probable was deliberate tampering with the result of the Presidential election.

According to research performed by Theodore de Macedo Soares of the website tdmsresearch.com, the same type of shifting outside the margin of error occurred in the spring primaries, where, out of 27 Democratic primaries where exit poll results were analyzed, the exit poll results shifted outside the margin of error as measured by Mr. Soares against Bernie Sanders12 times and there were no shifts against Hillary Clinton. It is theoretically possible but highly improbable that such results occurred by chance. By way of comparison, in the 23 Republican primaries where exit poll results were analyzed by Mr. Soares, there were two shifts outside the margin of error against Donald Trump and no shifts outside the margin of error against any other Republican candidate.

Again, there are only two possibilities with respect to the certified vote count in the Democratic spring primaries, either the wildly improbable vote counts occurred by

chance or they did not. If the vote counts did not occur by chance, they occurred because some person or persons arranged for them to occur. The exit poll to vote count vote shift and the charts say nothing about who might have caused such a shift or how such a shift was caused. They do indicate that if the shift were deliberate, the shift was deliberately caused by someone who wanted Hillary Clinton to win or, alternatively, someone who wanted Bernie Sanders to lose and be unable to challenge Donald Trump in November. The charts do not establish that Hillary Clinton, or Donald Trump, or anyone acting for either of them had anything to do with what it appears probable was deliberate tampering with the result of the Democratic primaries in 2016.

Thus it seems probable that some unknown person or persons demonstrated the ability to tamper successfully with the results of both the primaries and the general election in our 2016 Presidential election.

As shown by the charts above of exit poll to certified vote count results from 2004, a similar capability to tamper with the result of a Presidential election was also demonstrated in 2004 with the result that John Kerry was not inaugurated.

The act of voting, just going to a local polling place and casting a ballot, is the only means by which the power to govern is legitimately conferred in our nation. This act is the essence of our national security. An attack on any part of the voting process is in effect an attack on our nation. These attacks do not involve or require guns, or troops, or planes, or air craft carriers. Without security for the entire voting process, our essential national security is severely degraded. Security for the voting process can most efficiently and effectively be provided by a full-time election protection effort of each state's Democratic party.

Even without determining who is responsible for what appears to be a deliberate and generally unrecognized attack on our national security through tampering with the vote count sufficient to change the outcome, **there are means to prevent or substantially reduce the possibility of such tampering in 2020.**

Peter Peckarsky is a candidate for Chair for the Democratic National Committee, 2017. His bio can be seen here: http://www.peter4dnc.com/about