

# Stanford University: “Odds of Hillary Winning Primaries WITHOUT Fraud Were 1 in 77 Billion”

By [Matt Agorist](#)

Since the beginning of the year, the political election process has exposed Americans to more corruption and vote rigging than at any time in their history. The allegations of fraud and vote-rigging even sparked the interest of several academic researchers who [published a report](#) on their findings earlier this month — what they discovered in their research is disturbing.

What the research shows is that Clinton’s sweeping victories could not have been possible — **without fraud on a massive scale.**

As [Alexander Higgins reports](#), one of the statistical models applied by Stanford University researcher Rodolfo Cortes Barragan to a subset of the data found that the probability of the “huge discrepancies” of which “nearly all are in favor of Hillary Clinton by a huge margin” was “statistically impossible” and that **“the probability of this happening was is 1 in 77 billion.”**

According to Higgins report,

Analysis also showed repeatedly irregularities and statistically impossible reverses in reported live votes in several locations across the country.

In commenting on the research, Barragan stated that some of the models are rock solid and 59 years old and the results seen here have never been witnessed in non-fraudulent election during that time period.

To summarize, at least four different independent studies were conducted with various statistical models applied.

The researchers applied the different statistical models to:

1. Actual vote counts as they were reported
2. Discrepancies in polling data verse actual counts.
3. Various subsets of demographic polling data verse actual vote counts

The results of each study corroborated the results of the others and some of the researchers have reviewed the work of the others and go onto to confirm the findings in those studies.

It will take months for the studies to undergo peer review.

However, all of their research statistically proved there must have been widespread fraud to create the discrepancies in the vote counts that exist in all 3 subsets of the data analyzed.

The research of Barragan, done collaboratively with Axel Geijsel of Tilburg University in The Netherlands, corroborates independent mathematical research conducted by *Richard Charnin*.

Further independent research was conducted by Beth Clarkson of Berkeley who also not only corroborated the two previous studies but reviewed them and after her research was done and confirmed their results.

Beginning in Iowa and eventually getting blown wide open in Arizona, the fraud and suppression of votes have let Americans know that their rulers are *selected* not *elected*.

Examples of this fraud were captured on video, documented on paper, and even broadcast live on television.

In Iowa, to break the supposed ties between Clinton and Sanders, the precincts held actual coin flips to decide this most crucial primary of the cycle. [Clinton won all 6](#). However, the video below clearly shows Sanders winning at least one of those coin flips that was credited to Clinton.

But it doesn't stop there, the fraud was so rampant and on display that a [C-SPAN video even caught it](#).

As the primary moved to Nevada, another blatant act of election rigging was captured on video. As a poll worker tries to stop them from entering before they are registered, dozens of voters, wearing Clinton T-Shirts, walked right past the caucus registration booth to participate in the caucus. They never registered.

In March, Clinton brought in her husband to break the law for her, giving her an upper hand at polling sites during the Massachusetts primary.

Bill Clinton blatantly violated Massachusetts election law that states [campaigning within 150 feet of a polling site](#) on election day is a felony, as reported by KTAR News. Not only did [Bill Clinton campaign well within 150 feet](#) of multiple election sites during voting hours causing gridlock, he even [entered polling sites](#), with his security detail effectively shutting down the voting while the former president was present.

Another dysfunctional disaster unfolded in Arizona which led to even more people waking up to the fraud. The election rigging was so obvious that a hearing was held the following week in the House Gallery to discuss possible courses of action to correct it.

In April, during that hearing on the election challenge, [a Maricopa County poll worker testified the computer system](#) she used to check in voters would not allow her to give the correct ballots to voters.

The testimony from Dianne Post confirmed the rampant voter suppression and election rigging which led to the hearing taking place. Post, who is an attorney in Maricopa County, testified a machine she was using to check in voters at a location failed to give 36 people the proper ballot.

It gets worse.

According to Post, another 22 people at her location were listed in the wrong party and their polling place ran out of ballots for at least two congressional districts.

“Every single time it happened to me it was a Democratic voter who wasn’t able to access a Democratic ballot,” she said.

Post was only one person in one station, the allegations of suppression spread throughout the state.

Sadly, it seems, that all of this evidence of fraud and rampant corruption is hardly enough to register as a blip on the establishment radar. In spite of the criminal evidence against her, the unscrupulous control Clinton illustrates over the media has allowed for and promoted her savior-like persona. Perhaps if Americans were more concerned with the rigged game of selecting their rulers than they are with the [rigging of a basketball game](#)— we may not find ourselves in such a despotic state.

### **About the author**

Matt Agorist is an honorably discharged veteran of the USMC and former intelligence operator directly tasked by the NSA. This prior experience gives him unique insight into the world of government corruption and the American police state. Agorist has been an independent journalist for over a decade and has been featured on mainstream networks around the world. [Follow @MattAgorist](#)

# **Racketeering Lawsuit Exposing Nationwide Vote Rigging in DNC Primaries Could Derail Clinton**

By [Jay Syrmopoulos](#)

Corte Madera, CA – A major lawsuit is on the precipice of being filed by the [Institute for American Democracy and Election Integrity](#), the implications of which could dramatically alter the landscape of the 2016 U.S. presidential race.

The group claims that in about eleven states, there has been noted a significant difference between the exit polls and the electronic vote totals presented on the morning after the primaries. These differences show votes appear to be shifted from Bernie Sanders to Hillary Clinton. The chances of this kind of shift happening are considered to be statistically impossible between Tuesday night and Wednesday morning in these eleven states. See the chart below.

## EXIT POLLS MARCH 1, 2016 VERSUS WEDNESDAY REPORTED VOTE COUNT

SUMMARY								
	CNN TUESDAY EVENING EXIT POLLS				WEDNESDAY CNN REPORTED VOTE COUNT %			
	CLINTON	SANDERS	MARGIN CLINTON-SANDERS		CLINTON	SANDERS	MARGIN CLINTON-SANDERS	DISCREPANCY IN FAVOR OF CLINTON
GEORGIA	64.8%	33.8%	31.0%		71.20%	28.30%	42.9%	11.9%
VIRGINIA	62.2%	37.4%	24.8%		64.30%	35.20%	29.1%	4.3%
VERMONT	12.9%	86.5%	-73.6%		13.60%	86.10%	-72.5%	1.1%
MASSACHUSETTS	45.7%	52.3%	-6.6%		50.10%	48.70%	1.4%	8.0%
ALABAMA	70.6%	25.9%	44.7%		77.80%	19.20%	58.6%	13.9%
TENNESSEE	60.9%	35.5%	25.4%		66.10%	32.40%	33.7%	8.3%
OKLAHOMA	46.6%	50.9%	-4.3%		41.50%	51.90%	-10.4%	-6.1%
ARKANSAS	64.7%	33.3%	31.4%		66.30%	29.70%	36.6%	5.2%
TEXAS	60.6%	37.9%	22.7%		64.30%	35.20%	29.1%	6.4%

## EXIT POLLS VERSUS REPORTED VOTE COUNT - 2016 PRIMARIES

Democratic Party	CNN EXIT POLLS [1]					NYT REPORTED VOTE COUNT [2]				
	CLINTON	SANDERS	MARGIN CLINTON-SANDERS	NUMBER RESPONDENTS	MoE [3] ON THE DIFFERENCE	CLINTON	SANDERS	MARGIN CLINTON-SANDERS	DISCREPANCY IN FAVOR OF CLINTON	DISCREPANCY GREATER THAN EP MoE
NORTH CAROLINA	53.8%	41.7%	12.1%	1,744	4.55%	54.60%	40.80%	13.8%	1.7%	
FLORIDA	63.7%	35.9%	27.9%	1,632	4.65%	64.50%	33.30%	31.2%	3.4%	
ILLINOIS	48.4%	50.7%	-2.3%	1,341	5.33%	50.46%	48.72%	1.7%	4.1%	
MISSOURI	47.4%	51.1%	-3.7%	831	6.75%	49.60%	49.40%	0.2%	3.9%	
OHIO	51.4%	47.6%	3.8%	1,670	4.77%	56.50%	42.70%	13.8%	10.0%	5.2%

[1] Exit polls published by CNN shortly after the closing of polls for the state.

[2] New York Times reported 99% vote count <http://www.nytimes.com/elections/results>

[3] Note that the Margin of Error (MoE) is for the differences between the two candidates (at 95% CI). This MoE is about double the usual MoE for each candidate. MoE calculated according to: Franklin, C. *The 'Margin of Error' for Differences in Polls*. University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. October 2002, revised February 2007. Available at:

<https://abcnews.go.com/Images/PollingUnit/MOEFranklin.pdf>

“We are going to be filing a racketeering lawsuit under the Ohio Racketeering law, the strongest in the country and we can bring in every state, our RICO statute is coextensive with the federal RICO statute... So they’re nailed,” said Cliff Arnebeck.

Arnebeck, an election lawyer, got his J.D. from Harvard and is the chair of the Legal Affairs Committee of [Common Cause Ohio](#) and a national co-chair and attorney for the Alliance of Democracy. He will be joined by Bob Fittrakis, an election lawyer and political science professor, as co-counsel.

Computer security expert Stephen Spoonamore, who worked with Arnebeck on [exposing GOP election fraud in Ohio has noted](#) that when exit poll data varies more than 2% from electronic vote totals, the electronic vote totals are questionable.

In fact, 2% is the boundary by the US government when determining whether an election in another country has possibly been stolen. **Please notice the exit poll differences in the 2016 DNC primaries**

**listed above are significantly more than 2%.** These differences point to questionable results for the electronic vote totals and likely electronic vote switching.

*“This is not a Republican-Democrat issue, this is not a partisan issue, this is a Democracy issue, if you actually care about a Constitutional democracy in which each person votes, that vote is validated and the people who end up in office are reflected on the basis of the way people voted you care about this issue,”* said Spoonamore.

According to the Institute for American Democracy and Election Integrity:

**IMPORTANT NOTE: Although we have taken note of the shift here from Sanders to Clinton, we are NOT in any way stating who has done the shifting. WE DO NOT KNOW WHO HAS DONE THE SHIFTING OF THE ELECTRONIC VOTE TOTALS. This situation has galvanized three organizations, The Institute for American Democracy and Election Integrity (ADE) , the Columbus Institute of Contemporary Journalism, and Democracy Counts to set up our own exit polls and audits to track apparent election results in California.**

**Richard Charnin, a mathematician and statistician and author of the book, Matrix of Deceit, has been reporting on the apparent shifting of electronic vote totals and the non-release of raw data from Edison since 2004. Richard Charnin, well-known for what he calls the “Red Shift” which has been a shift between exit polls and electronic vote total differences of about 4-5% each year. This constitutes a shift to the political right. Although he is unable to analyze the raw data, he has been able to get screen shots of what the exit polls showed minutes before all of the electronic votes have been totaled since 2004.**

In 2004, when Edison Research initially got exit poll data that said that Kerry was winning and Bush was losing at 9pm on election night and that the reverse was true shortly after midnight, Edison Research made a choice to “adjust” the raw data after that time so that it would match the electronic voting machine totals. Edison Research definitely wanted to keep being hired by the Media Consortium which proposes to tell viewers the true election results but which also chooses to trust electronic voting machine data. That was the last time that the American public has been able to see raw exit poll data.

Unfortunately this year, substantial exit poll differences have been noted in the US primary. In this year’s primary, the Red Shift appears to have become the “Clinton Shift”.

Arnebeck was the lead attorney, with Fittrakis as his co-counsel in the *King Lincoln Bronzville v. Blackwell* case, which [exposed electronic vote rigging](#) in Ohio’s 2004 presidential race. During the lawsuit, a very revealing deposition of Michael Connell, head IT guru for the Bush family and Karl Rove, provided insight into how the election fraud conspiracy operated.

According to a report by [Truth-out](#):

Connell served as the IT guru for the Bush family and Karl Rove. Connell ran the private IT firm GovTech that created the controversial system that transferred Ohio’s vote count late on election night 2004 to a partisan Republican server site in Chattanooga, Tennessee owned by SmarTech. That is when the vote shift happened, not predicted by the exit polls,

that led to Bush's unexpected victory. **Connell died a month and a half after giving this deposition in a suspicious small plane crash.**

One can clearly see how deep the rabbit hole goes, as the one person who could implicate the actual individuals responsible for the election fraud conspiracy happens to have an "accident" that kills him. Essentially the investigation could go no further upon the suspicious death of Connell, thus protecting those behind the conspiracy.

Given these facts, it's apparent that Arnebeck and his team are the real deal, and have experience in bringing a major legal action involving voter fraud and electronic vote rigging/switching.

Initially, the new lawsuit was to be filed on June 6, as stated in the video release announcing the results of their investigation, but the filing was delayed due to ADE wanting to include data from California's primary, which was held on June 7.

Suspiciously, the Media Consortium and Edison Research, which control election polling, has now decided to cancel the remaining exit polls for the 2016 primaries. Many suspect these exit polls have been canceled because these exit poll differences could be used as an indicator of election fraud when contrasted with electronic voting totals.

*"There is no way the Democratic Convention is going to nominate somebody on the basis of obviously stolen votes...the facts are coming out and that's a fact...We are suing the media as being complicit in the crime. They are acting as accessories after the fact. They are covering up evidence of criminal activity, it's a crime,"* said Arnebeck.

*In my opinion Hillary Clinton has been used for the purpose of scuttling Bernie Sanders campaign for president, she is being used...but they've been caught, it's obvious, it's just like Bernie Sanders when he talks about the system is rigged, ah the elections are rigged, the evidence is clear, everybody's gonna see it and the game is over...Bernie has won in fact..."*

The fact that electronic vote rigging is currently taking place, while the mainstream corporate media remains curiously silent, indicates a massive fraud being perpetrated on the American public. Make no mistake, had the vote been closer in the GOP primary the nomination would likely have been stolen from Trump in the same manner. This isn't a partisan issue, but one that slashes across the political spectrum and should alarm every American.

The time has come to ask ourselves who is behind the stealing of U.S. elections, and maybe more importantly; why does nobody in a position of authority seem interested in finding out?

In the video below Arnebeck breaks down how they prevented the Ohio presidential race from being stolen in 2012 and explains exactly what is taking place in this election cycle.

Please share this crucial information with every person you know!

Jay Symopoulos is a political analyst, free thinker, researcher, and ardent opponent of authoritarianism. He is currently a graduate student at University of Denver pursuing a masters in Global Affairs. Jay's work has been published on Ben Swann's Truth in Media, Truth-Out, Raw Story,

MintPress News, as well as many other sites. You can follow him on Twitter [@sirmetropolis](#), on Facebook at [Sir Metropolis](#) and now on [tsu](#).

<http://thefreethoughtproject.com/election-fraud-rico-lawsuit-alleging-widespread-e-vote-rigging-dnc-primaries-derail-clinton-nomination/>

Topic: Hillary, Hillary Clinton, Huma, Election Fraud, RICO lawsuit, Stanford University