
I. Truth in Elections

International Investigative Commission Releases Report on the Not Yet Decided 2020 U.S. Presidential Election

The International Investigative Commission for Truth in Elections met on November 28 in a hearing sponsored by the Schiller Institute to hear testimony regarding irregularities and charges of voting fraud in the U.S. Presidential election. The following is the statement issued today by the distinguished panel of jurists. A number of the members of the Commission also issued additional, individual statements of their findings, which are included here after the joint statement.

Dec. 5, 2020

Statement of the International Investigative Commission for Truth in Elections

Commissioners:

- 1) Marino Elsevyf (Dominican Republic): Attorney-at-law; member of the 1995 Martin Luther King International Tribunal.
- 2) Simón Levy (Mexico): Doctor of Law from the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM); former Under-Secretary of Tourism of Mexico.
- 3) David Meiswinkle (United States): Attorney-at-law in the state of New Jersey.
- 4) Juan Francisco Soto (Argentina): Constitutional attorney; legal counsel to Yacyretá Binational Entity (Paraguayan-Argentinian Yacyretá Dam).

Witnesses:

1. William Binney
2. Harley Schlanger
3. Col. Richard Black
4. Sen. Mario Scavella
5. Bennie Smith
6. Leah Hoopes

On Saturday, November 28, 2020, a virtual meeting was held on Zoom with a group of attorneys and legal

experts who served as Commissioners in order to hear testimonies of six witnesses to alleged election ballot fraud concerning the recent U.S. elections, held on November 3, 2020, which included a record number of mail-in ballots sent before the election began.

Witnesses presented testimony regarding the different problems and incidents that they were aware of that occurred in the recent general election, as well as their insights into those problems.

In summary: The witnesses recounted a host of what they understood to be violations of election law and of equal protection under the law concerning the fundamental right to vote, and to have one's vote counted.

From their observations, they believe the election law was violated and that the massive violations could have been the result of an organized and orchestrated plan to violate election law, especially in swing states, and to unfairly and illegally alter the outcome of the election, including but not limited to the following examples:

- 1) The Smartmatic and Dominion companies were reported to be owners of voting machines and software that were used to alter the vote and direct that vote in favor of the Democratic presidential candidate, according to testimony presented to the Commission. Testimony was given concerning fraudulent voting results involved with the use of these particular machines in Venezuela and the Philippines, and that the Commissioners were informed that these vote tallying machines were banned from use in elections by such countries as Sweden, Switzerland, Norway and Great Britain. Electronic fraud was alleged particularly in the states of Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Nevada, Tennessee and Wisconsin.

- 2) William Binney, the former technical director of the National Security Agency, testified about the security problems involving the vote tallying machines, and

spoke about the evident inconsistency, in one case, of having 100,000 votes in Philadelphia which were stated to have been counted at 3:00 a.m., all for Joe Biden. Binney asserted that he believes that this anomaly cannot possibly be explained without recognizing the strong possibility of the existence of fraud.

3) Bennie Smith, a voting machine expert, testified that algorithm programs were used in voting machines which cause the fractioning of the vote in favor of Democratic party candidates, thereby violating the principle of “one person, one vote.”

4) Former Virginia State Senator Colonel Richard Black, USA (ret.) stated that the circumstances surrounding the U.S. elections and the planned protests that accompanied the elections were similar to the Arab Spring protests, and government changes in the Far East and Eastern Europe.

He also highlighted the arson of St. John’s Church, a few feet from the White House, the undermining of Presidential authority, and the media’s praise for the turbulence and insurrection.

He also noted articles published in *Defense One* magazine, where retired officers practically called for a coup against President Trump and his removal from the Presidency if he did not accept the current election result.

Col. Black emphasized that, in his experience as a former state senator, the vast majority of voters who indicate their preference in the category of President, go on to fill out their choices for the various other categories on the ballot. Therefore, the unusually large number of ballots that were filled out only for the office of President, but which left the other lines empty, seemed implausible. This indicated to him the existence of massive fraud, which made a Democrat the winner for President, but which made Republicans victorious throughout the rest of the ticket, including the election of congressmen, senators and state and local officials.

5) Harley Schlanger, a spokesman for the Schiller Institute, testified about the reported electrical blackouts in the early morning hours of the elections, which affected the voting machines. He also referred to reports of improper linking of voting machines to the internet, as well as ballots cast with missing signatures and without verification of the same. He highlighted the developments in Georgia, Wisconsin and Arizona, where narrow margins of victory for Biden were reported.

He further spoke about the close business and political connections between Lord Mark Malloch-Brown, the Chairman of Smartmatic’s parent company SGO, and the billionaire financier of the Arab Spring, George Soros. He also stressed further the fingerprints of Wall Street, the City of London and the “Deep State” as players in this election.

The significance of so-called “glitches” was also discussed, and that “glitches” were actually indications of vote fraud opportunities in the software, as were the existence of backdoor access to the machines.

6) Leah Hoopes, a Republican Committeewoman and poll worker in Pennsylvania, testified that starting at 7:00 a.m. on election day, many polling centers had no Republican observers present. She observed that many voting machines did not provide receipts to voters, after they cast their ballots, exercising their right to vote. She said that she had seen between 50,000 and 70,000 unopened ballots without a chain of custody. She also stated that she felt intimidated and very angry about the inability to exercise the right to vote. She stated that, as an observer, she was kept 20 feet or more away, and could not even see, and therefore was unable to challenge the ballots from where she was located. She stated that scanners were not working and that votes were being counted for two-and-a-half days in a back room without observers present to see how the ballots were being handled.

7) Pennsylvania state Senator Mario Scavello testified that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania had no problems with their previous voting machines, but that the state’s governor nevertheless decertified the voting machines this year and forced the adoption of new, problematic voting machines on Pennsylvanian voters. He said that those machines are a suspected source of fraudulent voting. This 2020 general election is the first time the new voting machines were used.

8) Mexican citizen Daniel Marmolejo, a journalist, in the course of asking a question of the witnesses, spoke about the importance of scanners in creating a voting record and the vulnerability of electronic voting. He made a reference to the electoral crisis in Mexico in the 2006 elections, which involved fraud against Andrés Manuel López Obrador, currently the President of Mexico.

The Commission of attorneys and legal experts had the opportunity to question each witness concerning their testimony. The legal battle that is currently being

waged in the courts of swing states was taken into consideration by the witnesses, and they expressed serious concerns over violations of election rights law, and questioned whether the Federal Election Commission would investigate fraud.

Finally, all the participants and the members of the Commission stated their appreciation of the Schiller Institute's efforts in organizing this hearing on the 2020 electoral crisis in the United States.

The Commission heard testimony from six credible witnesses and concludes from that testimony the following:

1) The U.S. Presidential elections held on November 3, 2020, appear to have had serious irregularities, especially in key swing states, which raise legitimate legal and civil questions regarding the violation of both Federal and state election laws.

2) The Commission recommends that evidence of voter fraud must be specified in each state, whose validity must be determined in part through forensic tests, audits of voting machines, expert testimony, eyewitness accounts, and examination and cross examination of witnesses in the courts.

3) There must be a determination by the courts as to whether the alleged fraudulent votes which apparently occurred were so significant and appreciable, that they could have altered and impacted the results of the election sufficiently to make that election null and void in those states where the manipulation or alteration of the vote occurred.

4) The competent committees should be called into session in each of the state legislatures where there were reports of serious irregularities. Votes cannot be validated where there is a "reasonable doubt" that they may have been fraudulent. Furthermore, it is a Constitutional responsibility (cf. Constitution of the United States, 1787) that falls to each of the states, to arbitrate with all means at their disposal in order to protect votes cast according to the will of the voter.

5) There must be a federal criminal investigation into the possibility of a conspiracy to undermine the Presidential election of 2020, not only by domestic and internal interests who may have been involved, but also by the possible connection to foreign agents and or countries that would trespass on the sovereignty and freedoms of the United States and its citizens.

Some of the questionable voting-day practices which were mentioned during the witness testimony, and which should be investigated, include:

- 1) Third parties voting on an untold number of unlawfully acquired absentee mail-in ballots with no signature verification.
- 2) Republican challengers denied the right to observe and monitor voting.
- 3) Republican challengers denied access to monitoring of absentee votes.
- 4) Ineligible ballots counted.
- 5) Lack of signature verification.
- 6) Receiving absentee ballots not requested.
- 7) Remote access to voting machines.
- 8) Remote troubleshooting of voting machines.
- 9) Back door possibilities on those machines.
- 10) Lax control of memory cards.
- 11) Early processing of absentee ballots.
- 12) Absentee ballots never requested.
- 13) People moved out of state voting.
- 14) The integrity of the voting machines and the manner in which the votes are counted.
- 15) Scanners not working.
- 16) The influence of the news media.
- 17) The influence of social networking platforms.
- 18) The influence of George Soros, Lord Mark Malloch-Brown, and others.
- 19) The influence of Wall Street, the City of London and the "Deep State."

Statement of Marino Elsevyf

International Investigative Commission for
Truth in Elections
Dec. 5, 2020

After listening to the testimony and assessments at the virtual hearing of the International Investigative Commission for Truth in Elections held on November 28, 2020, sponsored by the Schiller Institute, I would like to state my individual opinion regarding the crisis in the United States in the aftermath of the Nov. 3, 2020 elections.

The American people have been tampered with and frustrated by electoral manipulation, while exercising their right to vote and casting their ballots at the polls, where there is reasonable doubt of fraudulent results coming from the companies that provided the voting machines and software (Smartmatic and Dominion). The electrical blackout that occurred in the middle of the night, affecting the counting of votes, as

well as the consistent complaints about the possible use of algorithms to divert electronic votes, are also of concern.

This is a long-standing practice of which Lyndon LaRouche was also a victim in his candidacies in the Democratic Party primaries. He was also targeted by the media, and state and federal officials, who have privatized the electoral process in the United States and subjected it to the control of supranational private interests committed to globalization and turning the American political parties into private clubs, in order to hand-pick their own associates who best suit their global strategic interests.

We are reminded of the example of Tennessee, the home state of the then-presidential candidate Al Gore, and the treatment given supporters of LaRouche in January 2000. Only 2,500 signatures were needed to place Lyndon LaRouche on the ballot, and yet local officials refused to certify the signatures. The same thing happened in Connecticut, and in Michigan, Arizona, South Carolina and Utah, where they not only privatized the elections but also the rights of Americans to choose a candidate.

Today the victim is President Donald Trump himself, who has seen the country mobilized around countless organized mobs and protests, in a strategy ordered by the financial elites who have desperately taken sides to avoid free, fair and democratic elections, respecting the electoral rights of the American people.

Now, in the middle of this great public health crisis due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which has triggered the most serious economic crisis since World War II and the 1929 depression, the economic forces of what were once Venetian groups are today found in the casinos of Wall Street and the City of London, and who are ensconced in the media and on social networks that control the private information of citizens in their privacy, these forces have divided the American people in a radical way.

Our legal opinion is that, in each of the states where there is evidence of manipulation of the elections through the voting system and mail-in ballots, the vote count must be verified in accordance with the electoral laws of the American people. Where significant vote fraud is found in states, those elections must be annulled. This may well alter the preliminary results of the present American elections, since there are reasonable doubts which require the investigation of electoral crimes.

Statement of David R. Meiswinkle

International Investigative Commission for
Truth in Elections
Dec. 5, 2020

1. I, David R. Meiswinkle, an Attorney at Law in the State of New Jersey since 1989, was asked by the Schiller Institute to be a member of a panel of legal experts and attorneys to hear witness testimony concerning perceived violation of election law pertaining to the 2020 General election.

2. I was joined on the panel by three distinguished legal experts.

3. We listened to the statements of seven witnesses who made specific references to numerous actions which they considered violations of election law.

4. I was involved in this proceeding as a private citizen and an attorney at law, not as an expert in election law.

5. I have, however, had the experience as a private attorney of overturning a Primary election by proving in a State court the fraudulent use of absentee ballots.

6. I have also been involved in a number of General elections as a candidate, which required the notification of the State Attorney General during the election seeking his assistance because of major outrageous violations of election law by the opposition. and which resulted in Federal lawsuits.

7. The evidence presented to the Commissioners was not sworn to under oath, but the tenor of the witnesses and information conveyed appeared to be sincere, consistent and credible. Some questions were asked of each witness after they gave their presentation.

8. The bottom line for myself is that the witnesses appeared to be in agreement that serious and multiple violations of the election law occurred which were related to the 2020 General election.

9. There was also a consensus that this appearance of impropriety must be investigated and challenged.

10. I am not partisan to any political groupings for the purpose of my involvement in this proceeding, but I am dedicated to the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights and the necessity for free elections and the importance and sanctity of the vote in preserving and protecting our freedoms and democracy in the United States.

11. Both my private and professional opinion concerning the witness testimony is that there is a serious

appearance of impropriety and unlawful conduct surrounding the 2020 General election which has been raised by credible witnesses that needs to be further investigated and challenged in the courts on both a State and Federal level.

Statement of Juan Francisco Soto

International Investigative Commission for
Truth in Elections
Dec. 5, 2020

We have heard very clear testimony about different ways in which the U.S. legal electoral system was altered and violated in the November 3, 2020 elections, which allows us to assert with conviction that massive fraud occurred, and that therefore President Donald Trump won the elections. Now it is up to the relevant Constitutional authorities to address these matters.

In complying with the wise provisions of the 1787 Constitution of the United States of America, whose Article II, Section 1 states: “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: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under

the United States, shall be appointed an Elector,” those states must bear in mind the wise Constitutional guarantee that they cannot deprive citizens of their right to hold property (in their capacity as taxpayers who indirectly, through their representatives, paid for Smartmatic and/or Dominion election software and machines) nor their freedoms (to freely elect their representatives and to guarantee the protection of the vote) without respecting Due Process of Law, as required by the 14th Amendment, Section 1: “... nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” We highlight the last part of this Section 1 of the 14th Amendment, which also implies an urgent call to the courts with Federal jurisdiction to guarantee compliance with the laws that protect all citizens under conditions of equality before the law.

Therefore, the Federal justice system and each of the aforementioned States must submit to the principle that guarantees that each of its citizens has certain basic guarantees, in order for the result of this electoral process to ensure fair and equitable treatment for all voters. This right means that citizens who report fraud must be heard before the proper courts, and have the opportunity to provide the evidence they consider relevant. The same holds for all the state legislatures, which are also obligated to authorize the procedures for receiving all testimony and evidence.



Commissioners (clockwise from upper left): Marino Elsevyf, Simón Levy, David R. Meiswinkle, and Juan Francisco Soto.