

“Officials Had Something to Hide” - There is Enough “Preponderance of Evidence” to “Doubt the Result” – Democrat Elections Observer Weighs in On Corrupt Georgia Vote

By Jim Hoft

Published November 29, 2020 at 10:16am

619 Comments



A Georgia Trump rally and a Biden circle “rally” in Georgia

Rick Hanson is a registered Democrat and former Oregon state elections official.

On Friday Rick posted a thread on the fraud he saw in the Georgia election this year.

Rick’s arguments are solid.

Rick Hanson’s observations have gone viral. The honest Democrat can see how Georgia officials, in particular Secretary of State Raffensperger, for his

unlawful moves on mail-in ballots in the state.

Here are Rick Hanson's observations.

Rick Hanson: I've finished reviewing the Georgia filing and I have a few comments to share with the socialverse in my capacity as a 30-year registered Democrat, former Oregon state elections official (with policy and admin experience), and former CIO.

I will not comment on the legal claims because, while I have familiarity with the law and court filings, I'm not a lawyer. I am also going to mostly stay away from alleged behaviors, too, as I wasn't there and, anyway, they add color but are more open to dispute.

The original intent of the software code (acc'd to affidavits) was to manipulate votes without detection. When you start with one goal in mind, it's tough to pivot to the opposite goal later—no matter how hard you might try. Not that it seems anyone tried... Absence of secure audit log (to record every action in the software) is so indefensible that I LOL'd when I read it. This fact alone should be enough to negate the results when there is ANY question about fraud because it cannot be proven that fraud DIDN'T occur Elections administration.

Lawsuit alleges that many procedures required in state law—for good, common sense reasons to ensure the one voter, one ballot rule is adhered to—were not followed, including Receipt of absentee ballots in their return envelopes was not recorded (this reduces risk of ballot box stuffing, i.e., to ensure that only one real ballot has been submitted by one real voter) Signatures were not verified against voter registration on return envelopes (same reason as 6, above). There might be missing envelopes, too; it wasn't clear to me in my reading or I missed it. Ballot processing is not allowed before Election Day in Georgia (this varies by state); in this election, by rule

inconsistent with state law, Secretary of State Raffensperger allowed counties to start 3 weeks early. Absent a rigid accountability processes, this risks double or counterfeit voting.

Conducting one election with INTEGRITY is hard enough; when you overlay what is, in effect, a 2nd election (by mail) that has to be reconciled with what happens at the polls ... this is very high risk this "2 concurrent elections" risk was a primary argument for all elections being conducted by mail in Oregon, which was adopted after 20 years of practice with dual polling/mail elections—practice that none of these states whose elections are in question have had Observers were not allowed during the original count or the recount. **There is no defense for this and intrinsically implies that elections officials had something to hide. There are other things to pick on, but these I cannot think of a way to defend and probably are sufficient to meet the apparent (according to the lawsuit) standard of "preponderance of the evidence" to "doubt the result." Eager to read defendants' response!**

Here is the twitter thread.

2/12 I will not comment on the legal claims because, while I have familiarity with the law and court filings, I'm not a lawyer. I am also going to mostly stay away from alleged behaviors, too, as I wasn't there and, anyway, they add color but are more open to dispute ...

– Rick Hanson (@visionfarm) **November 27, 2020**

4/12 Tech 2/2: Absence of secure audit log (to record every action in the software) is so indefensible that I LOL'd when I read it. This fact alone should be enough to negate the results when there is ANY question about fraud because it cannot be proven that fraud DIDN'T occur ...

– Rick Hanson (@visionfarm) **November 27, 2020**

6/12 Receipt of absentee ballots in their return envelopes was not recorded (this reduces risk of ballot box stuffing, i.e., to ensure that only one real ballot has been submitted by one real voter) ...

– Rick Hanson (@visionfarm) **November 27, 2020**

8/12 Ballot processing is not allowed before Election Day in Georgia (this varies by state); in this election, by rule inconsistent with state law, SecState allowed counties to start 3 weeks early. Absent a rigid accountability processes, this risks ...

– Rick Hanson (@visionfarm) **November 27, 2020**

10/12 ... this “2 concurrent elections” risk was a primary argument for all elections being conducted by mail in Oregon, which was adopted after 20 years of practice with dual polling/mail elections—practice that none of these states whose elections are in question have had ...

– Rick Hanson (@visionfarm) **November 27, 2020**

12/12 There are other things to pick on, but these I cannot think of a way to defend and probably are sufficient to meet the apparent (according to the lawsuit) standard of “preponderance of the evidence” to “doubt the result.” Eager to read defendants’ response!

– Rick Hanson (@visionfarm) **November 27, 2020**