

# Passing the Torch

*Hosting Alternative Elections Within 45's OFP*

## **Executive Summary**

Last year, we observed a rapid succession of unprecedented global crises and foresaw that America would undergo a turbulent period of low-intensity conflict. Based on that prediction, we convened a task force to ensure the pro-American agenda would emerge from this conflict victorious. Despite our defeat in the 2020 election and post-election contest, we continue our work on behalf of the millions of real Americans whose way of life is now at risk.

The most pressing question to the pro-American coalition is its leadership: with 45 presently removed from power, we must rebuild the right and determine how to pass his torch to new, more effective pro-American leadership. This cannot be accomplished through the current electoral system, compromised as it is by systemic fraud and partiality, despite the claims of many conservatives that it needs only a few conventional reforms. The paradigm must change, and 45's Office of the Former President (OFP) introduces an expedient means by which real Americans can restore true representation through alternative elections.

Such a proposal would constitute no less than a refounding of America that, like the original founding, would create the opportunity for unfettered innovation and personal liberty. Although competition and conflict would inevitably arise from the regime change, it is not a vision of civil war — it is a vision of civic renewal.

## **Foreword to Analysis**

Because this is an internal strategy document, it does not include the data appendices and references from the analysis you received in December. Securely retain your paper copy of that document for reference.

This strategy document may only be photocopied for annotative use or member peer-to-peer sharing. Do not create digital scans or photographs. Do not share with any person or organization who cannot provide SC NcrptID.

## **Elections and Institutional Legitimacy**

### *Irregular 2020 Election Produced Irregular Outcome*

The 2020 election was unlike any in American history. During the COVID-19 pandemic, progressive activists used a media-driven national consensus about the need for radical emergency action to pass far-left legislation — including bailouts, privacy erosion, executive intrusion into education and private business, and even unconstitutional religious liberty violations. Election law was their primary target, particularly as regards the presidential election, because they perceived 45 as one of the last remaining obstacles to accelerating their progressive agenda worldwide. In COVID-19, the left saw its one chance to defeat a successful president who had built a strong economy and expanded his base.

The American democratic system's great strength, its federalism, is also a major weakness for elections in a globalist age of conflicting foreign and domestic interests. Because state legislatures and election officials are tasked with arranging and executing federal elections for voters in the state, differences between states arise that necessarily benefit one party or another. Differing laws for identification, absentee voting, dates and deadlines, count observation, verification, and ballot custody make aggregate differences in counting millions of votes. Attempts to reform state law to increase election security are met with litigious barratry on the tenuous civil rights grounds of "voter suppression." Attempts to reduce election security, on the other hand, either through legislation, bureaucracy, or personnel, are hailed as "pro-democracy." In swing states especially, interstate differences essentially decide American elections — and they are very difficult to fix through legislation on the federal level.

In 2020, officials in multiple states altered election laws and issued election guidance, in some cases violating their own state constitution, to achieve a desired outcome — not simply helping Democrats, but specifically defeating 45's re-election campaign. The secret weapon for this strategy was mass mail-in balloting, which (1) mitigated the "enthusiasm gap" between 45 and Joe Biden and (2) created an overall election integrity environment that election specialists called "a recipe for systematic fraud." Along with the mail-in ballots, the left initiated a massive campaign of ballot harvesting, county-by-county drop box gerrymandering, activist counting room volunteers, and legal, bureaucratic, and kinetic defenses against valid and court-ordered observation and audit. These measures were paid for by both state and federal taxpayer money (the CARES Act and state legislation) and philanthropic grants to local election officials from multinational corporations like Facebook, along with mass-fundraising networks like Arabella Advisors. *TIME Magazine* outlined this election strategy and called it a "Shadow Campaign" in a February 2021 article. As you recall from our December task force meeting, we focused our efforts toward peaceful resolution of these unconstitutional and illegal acts through a nationwide litigation effort that, in the end, failed because it was not taken up by the Supreme Court.

Other inequities in the 2020 election were more tiresome than irregular, as there is nothing out of the ordinary about progressive elites tipping the electoral scales toward their associates and

allies. The media intensified its anti-45 and anti-Republican bias in the weeks leading up to the election, even going so far as to censor the *New York Post*'s investigation about Hunter Biden's foreign business connections and influence-peddling on behalf of his father. Social media and tech giants followed suit, enacting temporary terms of service that slanted advertising and posting on their platforms in collusion with Democrat officials, while banning many pro-45 voices entirely. COVID-19 shutdowns disproportionately impacted the funding and organizing ability of small businesses and churches, two strong bases of Republican support, and limited 45's signature campaign rallies. Threat of infection, social unrest, and supply chain disruptions frightened many voters, especially the elderly, into staying home and/or voting by mail.

Despite the unprecedented amount of rules-changing before November 3, the level of support for 45 was historic. He earned an additional 12 million votes over his victory in 2016, and made inroads with minority voters that, alone, would have resulted in electoral victories for previous Republican candidates like John McCain and Mitt Romney. On election night, 45 quickly won Iowa, Ohio, Florida, and Texas, and seemed poised to win the election handily despite the structural disadvantages described above. Even official tallies that have not been corrected to account for fraudulent ballots show 45 winning 2,497 counties, including 18 of 19 bellwether counties, and boosting fellow Republicans for a net gain of 12 congressional seats. Only an extremely biased or naïve observer could conclude that Joe Biden received a mandate from the American people. His "victory" in the 2020 election was an embarrassment that highlights nothing but glaringly evident fraud and tampering.

### *Nov. 3 Election Tampering and Post-Election Bipartisan Conspiracy*

Election experts who watched the vote counting unfold on the evening of November 3 immediately and publicly raised concerns about election irregularities such as unprecedented vote-counting shutdowns, often on bogus pretexts like a "water leak," vote count observers being kicked out of precincts and windows papered over, and even tabulation anomalies and software malfunctions. Those raising the alarm were silenced by social media and deplatformed by mainstream outlets, some which declared a Biden victory even before the coordinated election interference was completed. Fox News, particularly the election night Decision Desk manned by Arnon Mishkin, was a key accomplice in slowing the reaction of Republicans to these events.

The election night debacle was followed by several discoveries that can be called, at best, extremely suspicious. For example, numerous states displayed statistical anomalies that violated Benford's Law, a data science tool that international election integrity experts use to catch systematic fraud. 45's victory in 87% of counties generated "coattails" that flipped 15 House seats to Republicans. Large batches of mail-in ballots from urban counties were tallied at 100% or the high 90<sup>th</sup> percentile for Biden, despite the same counties showing far lower support for Democrat candidates in previous elections. Rejection rates for mail-in ballots sank to all-time lows, raising suspicions of reduced scrutiny (which were later heightened by resistance to meaningful signature match verification in swing states). In at least one major swing-state county, more absentee ballots were submitted than were requested by registered voters.

The attack on the election resulted in many prominent Republicans, even those who were not 45's allies, calling for immediate investigation of these election irregularities to the satisfaction of both Republicans and Democrats. Some prominent voices were Trey Trainor, the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission; Lou Dobbs, *Fox News* host; Mike Pompeo, Secretary of State; Lindsey Graham, Senator from South Carolina; Peter Navarro, Director of the Office of Trade and Manufacturing Policy; and John Ratcliffe, Director of National Intelligence. These individuals and many more made official statements in support of immediate remedy, and some went even further, offering personal financial pledges for 45's legal defense and publishing detailed analyses of fraud allegations.

Plain evidence from the critical swing states revealed that the 2020 election was indeed stolen by both legislative manipulation before election day and election-night interference, certainly analog, but likely digital as well. Even including the mail-in and harvested ballots made possible by unconstitutional changes to the voting process before election day, our task force's statistical assessments have estimated that 45 still would have achieved a similar "slim" Electoral College victory as in 2016. But as hundreds of eyewitnesses and videotaped accounts attest, Democrat operatives in specific cities coordinated with election officials to insert numerous "no-crease" paper ballots, unobserved, into final tallies. And forensic examination has suggested that some vulnerabilities in vote counting software were exploited to a limited extent, enough to change some county-level results. It is not clear what level of coordination existed between analog and digital fraud efforts — or if Biden's infamous gaffe about his "voter fraud organization" simply refers to the "Shadow Campaign" from the aforementioned *TIME* article, or to something even more criminal, such as ballot-stuffing that was caught on video in some precinct counting rooms.

With a broad coalition of Republicans and other allies supporting a closer examination of suspicious activity in the 2020 election, our task force successfully motivated election officials, state legislatures, and state attorneys general to stand up for election integrity and ensure only legal votes were counted. The *Texas v. Pennsylvania, et al.* lawsuit presented an all-inclusive case that should have educed a judgment on vote dilution from the nation's highest court. This was unsuccessful through no fault of our own — none of us could have predicted or controlled for the feckless conduct of justices that 45 himself appointed, especially after the assurances that our task force received regarding the Rule of Four. Since December, other lawsuits in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Virginia attacking illegitimate rulemaking for absentee ballots that significantly impacted final vote tallies have been decided in favor of 45 — but similarly without remedy.

#### *Ineffectual Response by the GOP and Judiciary*

45's legal team did have a non-negligible chance to challenge Joe Biden's fraudulent victory in the 2020 election — but it failed in this endeavor. Partly this was because of limited time, partly because of constant attacks and narrative manipulation by the media and public figures. It also failed because of the aforementioned conspiratorial behavior by both Democrat and Republican officials, and the cowardice of judges in cases like *Trump v. Raffensperger*, which provided

evidence of nearly 150,000 votes being illegally cast. But in the aggregate, their efforts failed because of mistakes and mismanagement.

However, strategic errors by 45's legal team do not excuse craven and compromising Republicans whose weak response was equally to blame. For example, Georgia Governor Brian Kemp and his administration failed to administer a thorough ballot signature match verification in Georgia. Nevada and Arizona election officials actively blocked and are still attempting to obstruct forensic audits of ballots, in defiance of court orders. There is no excuse for judges — particularly recent appointees — who used arguments of timeliness, mootness, or standing to rebuff the many evidence-based election cases, despite clear national interest. These public servants had a duty that they abandoned to serve their own image or, in some cases, because they held a personal or ideological grudge. There is especially no excuse for Vice President Mike Pence, who refused to assert his constitutional power to send the contested dual slates of electors back to the states to recertify — especially after state legislatures in Pennsylvania, Michigan, Georgia, and Arizona formally resolved and requested that he do so.

However, 45 himself is not blameless for the failure to carry out a winning defensive strategy against election fraud. After spending months warning his voters about Democrats' purposeful election chaos and manipulation, he neglected to establish safeguards in electoral red zones like Philadelphia, Atlanta, Detroit, Las Vegas, and Minneapolis. He trusted his fate to a judiciary that was obviously unwilling to take up cases that would impact the outcome of the election. And instead of using the powers of the executive to defend against election interference — say, through a ballot verification audit run by the National Guard — he trusted the evidence-gathering methods of a dubious lineup of lawyers, political operatives, and media figures. Meanwhile, our advisory inroads were repeatedly blocked by campaign management before the election on the grounds that the fraud prevention measures we recommended would be “a bad look.” After the election, we believed the Supreme Court would remedy fraud, but our confidence was misplaced.

Just as nothing can truly test military preparedness like sudden warfare, the political warfare surrounding the 2020 election was the truest test of our electoral system. It taught us that American democracy was and still is unprepared to cope with the ideological polarization and conspiratorial corruption that has compromised our institutions in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and the social and demographic engineering that has compromised large swaths of our electorate. American politics is no longer a contest between two parties or even two ideologies, but between real Americans' interests and globalist elites' manipulation of the rule of law. Democracy has lost its meaning for millions who no longer have even a seat at the table with the globalist oligarchs who rule the country. Liberty and justice for the American people cannot be reclaimed by merely doubling down on the current order.

### *Election Integrity After 2020*

Some conservatives have insisted the opposite — that as long as state legislatures and Congress enact reforms to protect future election integrity, Americans need not worry that the

constitutional order they have been promised is permanently compromised. Among the proposals have been universal voter ID laws, ballot verification watermarks, strictly limited absentee voting, the end of ballot harvesting and “poll busing,” increased surveillance in precinct counting rooms, and the elimination of digital voting and vote tabulation. Some have even recommended constitutional amendments to reduce the impact of unprecedented levels of immigration, such as the elimination of birthright citizenship or at least a waiting period of four years or more between naturalization and initial voting.

These are all reasonable policy proposals and would likely make an impact on improving the quality of civic participation in the current electoral system. Of course, most proposals with institutional backing fall far short of the above. For example, disgraced former Vice President Mike Pence has written that his idea of election integrity is blocking further expansion of fraud-prone voting methods — not eliminating them. The think tank where he is now employed hosts a “Voter Fraud Database” whose intention seems to be proving that voter fraud is a limited phenomenon driven by individual lawbreakers. Even the widely-debated election reform recently passed in Georgia does little more than establish moderate limitations on the fraud-prone methods used in the 2020 election, such as drop boxes and absentee ballots — overall a weaker set of laws than those found in many Democrat-heavy states. This *status quo* model of election integrity will produce nothing more than repeat performances of the 2020 election every two or four years.

But even if the entire Republican establishment had the courage to fight for ideal election reforms, they would encounter a “bootstrapping” problem. Just as a person cannot achieve liftoff by pulling up his bootstraps, a broken system cannot be fixed with its own broken tools. Merely “campaigning harder” or “getting out the vote” will never elect enough representatives who will genuinely fix these problems, or even talk about them. As became clear with the all-out manipulation of law to defeat 45, candidates willing to reform the electoral system are targeted and destroyed.

Elections themselves are only part of this struggle to define American government. Most of the Democrats’ attacks on election integrity have been achieved not with votes, but with courts. Unfortunately, the entire judiciary — conservatives included — has experienced a measurable leftward tilt over recent decades, tracking with the leftward tilt of law schools and academic debates. Meaningful election reform has become nearly impossible because so many judges now deem any election safeguard racially prejudicial or undemocratic. Even if the Supreme Court, with its ostensible 6-3 “conservative” majority, were willing to stand against Democrats’ manipulation of elections, current plans to add more Supreme Court justices would accelerate and easily overcome their objections.

For these reasons, it is far more likely that Democrats will successfully enact the legal transformations of our election system that they prefer. The changes they have already begun to advance on both the state and federal level include: adding electoral votes for left-leaning regions like D.C. and Puerto Rico, child voting, permanent unrestricted mail-in ballots, eliminating

registration and identification safeguards against voter fraud, expanding felon voting, appointing “independent” commissions for gerrymandering, and ending the electoral college.

Without meaningful election integrity, the premise of American democracy lacks substance. As it stands, Americans’ confidence in their “government by the people” is at an all-time low, and rapidly diminishing. Meanwhile, the voices of the few who stand to benefit from fake elections have grown louder and louder — drowning out legitimate questions to the point of outright censorship. The official narrative that our 2020 election was, as the Elections Infrastructure Government Coordinating Council and the Election Infrastructure Sector Coordinating executive committees announced, the “most secure in American history,” tolerates no dissent.

### **Time for Regime Change?**

Too many Americans who understand the above situation and are unsatisfied with the resulting political outcome nevertheless believe that America does not find herself in a historically unprecedented predicament. After all, electoral and judicial misconduct or ambiguity has repeatedly produced fundamental transformations to the American way of life throughout our nation’s history. The Civil Rights, Voting, and Hart-Celler Acts of 1964-65, for example, were enabled by the highly suspicious 1960 election and even more suspicious assassination of President Kennedy. The contested 2000 election and September 11 tragedy of 2001 compelled the universal surveillance and restriction measures every young American now views as commonplace. And with the evolution of social media and a 24-hour news cycle, the repeated incidence of such society-altering anomalies seems to have accelerated. Today, few are shocked by mysterious mass shootings, top-secret material leaks, Epstein and Hunter Biden-style revelations, or deceptive footage that causes ruinous urban unrest.

However, rationalizing the present crisis with reference to America’s “tradition” of radical, fundamental, accelerating transformation fails to recognize that a point of no return has truly been reached. Laws that permit fraudulent national elections cannot be reformed by simply holding more of the same elections. This is not to say that the Democratic party now has a firm and permanent grip on all future elections. There can still be electoral victories for Republicans in states, districts, and counties that implement protective policies, and there may even be national elections where a pro-American candidate wins by exceeding the so-called “margin of fraud.” But such hopes do not constitute a strategy, especially given that one party is now working to permanently tip the scales in its favor.

The Democrats have long focused on controlling televised news, digital media, and schools to ensure that American voters are unable to make informed, pro-American decisions. Republicans, for their part, have created alternate channels, publications, and schools in reaction. But 21<sup>st</sup>-century developments have accelerated this situation to make it irreversible, first and foremost through technological advancement. Words like “surveillance state,” “censorship,” and “social engineering” have new meaning in a world characterized by smartphone tracking and monitoring, constant communication and personal data uploading, subconscious thought-

programming, advanced digital imaging technology, and cloud-based computing. Nearly all of the decision-makers in control of these systems share a single partisan ideological alignment.

Evolving political norms also make the 21<sup>st</sup> century unique. State and federal bureaucracies have used the 2020 pandemic as cover for a massive social control and wealth transfer toward their partisan allies. Multi-trillion dollar payments and regulations favoring certain states, programs, corporations, and constituents have drained the pro-American right of the resources to offer resistance. The Democrat trifecta of House, Senate, and White House are now poised to end the filibuster and reconstruct spending, voting, and individual rights like gun ownership and private schooling. Mass immigration, both illegal and legal, has irreversibly altered America's population, voting patterns, and overall national interests — and the latest border crisis began almost immediately after 45 left office. America's intelligence community, military brass, financial institutions, and highest courts have become partisan and jettisoned the constitutional, citizens-first order our founders envisioned. Thoroughgoing regime change may be the only option to reverse this situation.

### *Common Methods of Regime Change*

History has shown that a nation's ruling class cannot maintain its grip on power if its only standards are double standards. Modern regimes are not timeless, transcendent entities — they are contracts imposed upon a nation or people that will rise and fall at that people's behest. This is not only because of the threat of revolution; it is a reality woven into the values, goals, and human capital comprising every government. For a modern regime to survive, its best and brightest must be willing to sacrifice for it.

Our government no longer merits nor receives the sacrifice of the competent. The only vision our nihilistic managerial class can muster is a docile population that limps along, dependent on predatory elites to “generously” provide a society of ugliness, boredom, and ill health. America's most powerful and influential plutocrats have squandered whatever credibility or forbearance they may have been granted. They have operated in bad faith to betray, exploit, and replace the American people. The only question that remains is whether they have the technology or morally aligned force of arms to perpetuate their rule.

Successful regime changes have taken various forms throughout history. The imagination quickly conjures desert palaces stormed by troops loyal to a popular general, or a high-ranking Party bureaucrat ordering the arrest of the General Secretary. But regime change simply means the creation of new extralegal structures to accommodate an evolving political reality. America herself has already undergone several regime changes, including the nation's founding. The current mode through which the ruling class governs — its perpetual waste and corruption enabled by propaganda and perverse incentives — is itself a regime foreign to the original American way of life. Pro-American regime change is now the only possibility for anti-progressive reform: an innovative disruption of the globalist, bureaucratic, “woke” industrial complex that masquerades as the rule of law.



### *Constitutional Conservative Regime Change*

The regime is not defined by the party in power. Joe Biden and those who direct his presidency are certainly functionaries of the regime, but 45's administration employed plenty of regime loyalists as well. Both parties are subordinate to the regime. It is true that the Republican party is more likely to push back against and uncover the various strategies and intrigues of the regime, but this happens all too rarely and is even more rarely effective. 45's presidency demonstrated how easy it is for the regime to constrain even a Republican legislative trifecta through the strategic collusion of corporate media, intelligence agencies, and an activist judiciary.

Still, many Republicans are hopeful that extreme Constitutional measures would be categorically more effective than simple party politics. They believe that the path forward for a pro-American agenda is to work within the current system of elected representation toward "soft regime change"; that is, a constitutionally sanctioned re-ordering of legal precedents to stymie the progressive transformation of America. This would not simply be a matter of organizing more conservative votes, but would require a paradigm shift toward "playing for keeps" that goes beyond the GOP's typical approach. Thus, the constitutional conservative model could be a genuine avenue toward regime change and not simply an overture to reform.

For example, the idea of a Convention of States convened under Article V could indeed fix most of the extra-legal progressive developments of the past few decades. Such a Convention could add amendments to the constitution with the support of just two thirds of state legislatures. Or, a campaign of state-based Interposition (referred to by its critics as nullification) could assert federalism as a corrective to judicial or executive supremacy. If successful, these methods would contain significant potential for soft regime change.

However, our task force views these proposals as too reliant on the current electoral system and lacking the innovation to overcome deadlock within this system. Proponents of the Convention or Interposition strategies fail to recognize that only conservatives still restrain themselves to the Constitution; their activist opponents have discarded it as a scrap of paper to be "interpreted" or ignored at will. It would not be difficult for judges, either activists or *status quo* centrists easily swayed by public opinion, to overrule Interposition attempts or interpret Article V in such a way that the Convention would be limited to "approved" topics. In short, constitutional checks on federal overreach will not work because the nation's courts are full of misguided liberal or cowardly conservative judges presiding over a rule of law that has long been warped by precedent and is now a mere mask for their underlying politics and dispositions. Seeking to renew this judiciary through elections is a recipe for failure, for the reasons outlined above.

### *Pro-American Regime Change*

Tens, perhaps hundreds of millions of Americans, cannot hope for true representative government without a refounding of our political system on pro-American principles for the 21<sup>st</sup>

century. Pro-American regime change is not a military coup or an electoral or bureaucratic *fait accompli*. Like the founding, it requires nothing more than a group of men with vision. Instead of imposing laws from the top down, it designs a new order from the bottom up. Rather than coercion of the powerless, it becomes an invitation to the powerful. Principled regime change does not imply slavish adherence to unjust or outmoded laws; its means are directed by its ends.

Regime change is rarely peaceful, but it does not ineludibly require armed conflict. The refounding of America need not recklessly plot violence, because there are few enforcers who would be willing to visit destruction or death on their fellow citizens. But in order to challenge the regime's monopoly on force, the regime change must have strength in numbers; it must expand its invitation beyond the men of vision who currently comprise its leadership. There are certainly greater numbers of Americans who want what is promised by regime change than those who would fight to suppress it. But there are not yet enough who would be willing to take the first step, in unison, toward action. The remainder of this document outlines our strategy for using 45's OFP to initiate tens of millions of his supporters as partners in our plan of action for gradual, principled pro-American regime change.

## **The Office of the Former President and the Pro-America Agenda**

### *45: Better Figurehead than Leader*

Americans love their 45<sup>th</sup> president. One need only drive 10 or 20 miles outside our filthy, crime-ridden cities to discover in the wholesome countryside a middle class of patriotic families, freedom lovers, pioneers, and job creators who have warmed to 45 like no politician in American history. In advance of both the 2016 and 2020 elections, the backroads and bridges were adorned with almost as many of 45's flags and banners as with the stars and stripes. Even now, long after the fraudulent election that installed the current administration, most of these election flags and banners remain.

We can classify this affinity in three different ways. True, the majority of Americans who support 45 do so on the basis of their generic GOP alignment — most with increased enthusiasm, a few reluctantly. In 2008, nearly 60 million Americans voted for John McCain. In 2012, nearly 61 million voted for Mitt Romney. In 2016, nearly 63 million voted for the outsider candidate — a New York real estate tycoon. Optimistically, it seems that generic Republican candidates can win between 60-63 million votes. So how to account for the 15 million or so “swing votes” — particularly those in so-called “purple” states — that separated 45's support in 2020 from McCain's support in 2008?

There are two types of voters in this latter group. One is the old-fashioned values voter who was turned off by the fakeness and “Washington insider” identity characterizing every Republican candidate who lost to 45 in the 2016 primary. These voters, particularly their unprecedented enthusiasm, swelled 45's signature rallies and fortified his campaign against media attacks over unpolished language or crude gaffes. 45 resonated with these voters like no politician ever has.

The other is the “switch” voter, a type of moderate liberal who is not attracted to the GOP ethos, but who is growing increasingly uneasy about censorship, corporate influence over media and tech, and foreign belligerence and domestic surveillance by military and federal agencies. 45 promised to do something about these 21<sup>st</sup>-century threats, grouping them under terms like the “Deep State” and “rigged system.” These genuine liberals, though they may have despised 45’s demeanor and most of his policy positions, understood that he was the only candidate from either party who would resist the Deep State’s growing power.

We affirm without hesitation that 45 was a great president. He took action on policies that others would only talk about. His words themselves were actions, shifting the window of acceptable discourse to allow for debate on long-silenced issues. He freed the Republican party from outdated ideology and refocused it on culture and fundamentals. However, he did not do nearly enough, and this was not only due to opposition from the media or within his own party. His personnel decisions were disastrous, he myopically prioritized his public image, at times failing to act even when it was his executive privilege to do so — instead heeding the equivocations of feckless and crooked advisors.

Our task force has termed this the “two 45s” phenomenon. On the one hand, 45 has the power to snap his fingers and summon the energy of millions to storm the halls of power — even literally — and reshape the political landscape. On the other hand, the complexities of White House management and vote-whipping are not 45’s strong suit. During his four years in office, they were handled by internal enemies of his pro-America agenda. The two 45s phenomenon is a conundrum for any regime change strategy: no regime change can happen without 45’s energy, but his continued leadership would also dash any hopes of a successful American refounding.

The post-election battle for the White House is proof: Americans had plenty of political will to get to the bottom of Democrats’ fraud, but 45 himself refused to take even modest executive action, such as emergency ballot signature audits overseen by the National Guard. 45 also assembled an inadequate legal team to fight the fraud in court, and essentially abdicated the White House during the chaos of January 6. When opportunities for lasting change present themselves, the charisma and dynamism of one 45 seems to evaporate, and an entirely different 45 — a bureaucratic manager who passes the buck — takes his place.

### *Alternative Elections*

For this reason, 45 did not achieve the American refounding that many hoped he would. He did not end the mass immigration catastrophe; he did not bring the troops home; he did not smash the corrupt and anti-American federal agencies; he did not significantly curb the massive redistribution of Americans’ earnings to wasteful programs and foreign aid; he did not limit the growing tyranny of tech companies or the mass indoctrination of children. He accomplished much, but not nearly as much as he could have. And when the American people, patriotic rank-and-file servicemen, law enforcement officers, and all real Americans made clear after the fraud

of November 3 that they would back whatever move he made to restore freedom and fairness in our nation, he balked.

Now that the regime has removed 45 from the White House and effectively banned him from public discourse, we must decide his role in the pro-America agenda going forward. Two plans exist at opposite ends of the spectrum. One option would marginalize 45 indefinitely; he would remain a retired president, inevitably weighing in with endorsements and social commentary on occasion, or perhaps founding a social media platform or television channel. The other option would demand his return to public life with a run for Senate, Governor, or President — or perhaps an appointment to a future Republican president's cabinet. Neither option would be maximally effective toward achieving our goals; the first would squander 45's popular capital, and the second would result in similar disappointment as 45's presidential term.

Instead, we must present 45 an audacious middle path: a gradual separation of pro-America voters from the compromised electoral system into an alternative electoral system centered in 45's OFP. Under free and fair alternative elections, 45 could pass the torch of the pro-America movement to a successor who is not beholden to the internal power structures of the current regime or even the Republican Party. Rather, the alternative electoral system would operate as a direct democracy for a separate people — real Americans — and offer a leadership alternative to the current regime.

This audacious move would expose the regime itself to the free-market principles it currently manipulates through cronyism and corruption. Instead of a false choice between two regime candidates, or a doomed attempt to fight the Deep State from within, voters would be offered the possibility to choose the next standard bearer of the pro-America movement. Would-be leaders on the right would be forced to decide if they want their careers to be invested in the fruitless current system or if they prefer to back the OFP's new land of opportunity. There is nothing illegal or seditious about using the OFP in this way, as it currently consists only of member votes within a private, voluntary organization — labor unions, by comparison, regularly hold elections and referenda. And voting in alternative OFP elections would not prevent anyone from casting a vote in official regime-sponsored elections as well.

Now that election laws and even vote-counting itself have become partisan, the alternative OFP election model is the only way to restore free and fair democratic representation. Market competition is key, even between democracies. If the official election is obstructed by vote-rigging, fraud, rule manipulation, or deep fakes, Americans will place more stock in the alternate election. True, one election will decide control over the federal government, but there are two reasons this is less important than it seems. (1) The history of the presidency since the 1990s, and most recently 45's four years in office, proved that election victories do not really transfer control of the federal government's Deep State. (2) With enough Americans civically invested in the alternative OFP election, the federal government's power will ultimately diminish and become irrelevant. This diminution could happen via mass tax withholdings and other forms of civil disobedience, "digital secession" through technological advances like blockchain and

cryptocurrency, federalism movements and brokered local governance treaties, or simply as a natural result of the inflated dollar and weakened or politically bifurcated military.

Alternative OFP elections would entail complex logistics and would contain an inherent risk of duplicating the systemic problems of the current regime's elections. However, our task force can successfully guide the OFP toward rebooting the democratic process thanks to one key advantage: the alternative election rules would not be mired in precedent and partisan grandstanding over "voter suppression." 21<sup>st</sup>-century technologies like thumb print scanners, facial recognition, and non-fungible tokens would enable the first truly fraud-proof voter rolls and decentralized voting system.

As the alternative election accrues more buy-in from powerful interests and the general public, there will naturally be an increased threat of attempts to either discredit the process or manipulate the results. Such tactics are endemic to democracy itself. However, the competing election's initial challenge to the regime is a first step of the American refounding, and can be followed by further reform. But from the beginning, in order to safeguard democracy through the nascent alternate elections, new institutions and power structures must arise to protect alternate election integrity and make the OFP elections an attractive option for a plurality of Americans.

### *Alternative Institutions*

The first advantage we can guarantee participants in OFP elections is the very right they are currently denied: undiluted one-American-one-vote representation. The regime imposes mass immigration and criminal enfranchisement policies not because of politicians' great compassion and altruism, but because they believe they can buy the loyalty of newly-enfranchised or imported voters and their birthright-citizen offspring. Instead of waiting for the country's demographics to create an inevitable single-party government, voters can register to vote in OFP elections using highly secure, counterfeit-proof methods that are vetted along constitutional lines. The framers of the Constitution purposefully omitted a universal right to vote, and expansion of the franchise has been extremely controversial each time it has been attempted. It is always couched in the language of rights, but secretly motivated by projected electoral outcomes. With the sharp divide between voter demographics in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it will be a principal task of the first OFP election commission to determine anew what scope of franchise is most desirable.

This determination will require an internal system of bylaw and ordinance that is inviolable and subject to criminal and civil penalties. Such penalties will be the primary way of maintaining order and leadership during the gradual refounding of the country. Just as equitable rule of law is crucial to the operation of economies and nation-states, "rule of bylaw" will serve as the legal blueprint for new alternative institutions. Because the regime currently has an ostensible monopoly on force, these penalties must initially be limited by members' buy-in to the alternative institutions. Like a club or online platform, suspensions and revocations of rights or impositions of obligations will only have force insofar as a member desires to continue

participating. However, with the national growth of alternative institutions will come increased advantage to participation, whether financial, social, or otherwise. When this happens, the regime may instruct law enforcement or even military units to designate the alternative institutions as “secessionist.” In such a situation, strict adherence to anonymous data storage will be paramount—as will limiting geographic operations to states in which the governor and national guard are more likely to cooperate than to aggress. In its early stages, the ability to disappear underground will be most important.

Along with the renaissance of citizenship, voting rights, and rule of ordained bylaw must come the re-engineering of our fiat currency. Currently, the Federal Reserve wields an unearned power over capital and trade through its power to selectively provide loans for favored corporate banks, among other privileges. It deadens market competition in the financial sector and can even influence the policies of private banks regarding who can engage in commerce. Meanwhile, the Biden administration seeks to vastly expand the power and resources of the IRS, which has been shamefully politicized in the past and will now only escalate this bias. The federal government can use the power of these two institutions to destabilize any financial basis upon which alternative institutions would be built. Instead of subjecting regime change to the punitive market manipulation, redistribution of wealth, and consolidation of power that central banking and taxation enable, pro-American institutions should rely on cryptocurrencies and other types of confidential assets. Such monies are ideal because they can already be exchanged at any time for goods, services, and even the dollar, while it still holds value.

Just like the Federal Reserve essentially controls the value of American money, the narrative currency of American politics is still valued by legacy media institutions and their gatekeepers. Despite the rise in alternative media and social media, there is still the need for an entirely new paradigm of information-sharing that is immune to “cancel culture” shunning or Big Tech banning and throttling. In part, these new media enterprises must emphasize an awareness that current systems lack by being candid about the hypnotic-illusory nature of all modern media, not just so-called “deep fakes,” the credential-laundering citation of “experts,” the corporate and governmental interests who secretly direct narratives, and the controlled opposition that passes for “dissenting” voices in modern media. We must also invest in strength where current media is weak: intellectual independence and depth, sincere relationship-building, and secure peer-to-peer communications. Anonymity or quasi-anonymized deniable identifiers will be central to such communications — especially on social media platforms. Several exciting projects are currently being built and will feature prominently at the next task force roundtable.

Once an equitable and consistent rule of bylaw is established for the OFP electorate, with its institutions supported by alternative currency and media, newly-independent industries will enable research, exploration, and innovation that is currently inhibited. Unlike a nation with geographic borders enriched by natural resources like fossil fuels, agriculture, and mining, this new regime will reify a collaborative, innovative human capital that is currently alienated from traditional means of economic growth. Its flexibility and technological efficiency will outpace the ability of any government bureaucracy to sanction, penalize, or even identify its funding

sources. Researchers currently bogged down by regulation and taxation will forge secure, non-fungible contractual partnerships through alternative investment methods that will enable them to break ground in fields like genetics, space exploration, clean energy, and molecular physics — not to mention building reciprocity networks and breaking monopolies in other prime industries.

Establishing alternative institutions is not only a necessary albeit short-term means of protecting alternative elections to effect America's political refounding. It is also a demonstration of how impactful such a refounding could be: eliminating the country's dead weight and unleashing its entrepreneurial spirit. No governmental system is meant to last forever, and the failure to serve real Americans marks the time for change. Alternative elections and institutions will once more free real Americans to do what they do best: compete and win.

### **Concluding Observations and Next Actions**

Even months after the 2020 election, national opinion polling reveals that a majority of registered voters believe the final result was influenced by fraud. Given the evidence laid out above, this belief is not surprising. Even the tremendous effort to silence this viewpoint that has been undertaken by the mainstream media and online platforms has managed to convince less than half the country. This is a legitimacy crisis of historic proportions for the current regime, and it opens the door for regime change on behalf of the millions or hundreds of millions of real Americans who have lost faith in the national leadership.

Instead of viewing these Americans as a constituency for the next charlatan politician to pay lip service, they should be respected as an invaluable repository of human capital that is being held back by the current regime. Our task force can accomplish this using free-market principles: forcing the regime to compete for its customers against alternative institutions that offer genuine representation and limitless opportunity.

Carrying out alternative elections will require an institution-building process of tremendous proportions. The populist energy that 45 generated and continues to direct is the engine that will power this endeavor. That is why our task force must work prudently and quickly to direct resources toward each of the alternative institutions, first those that can be prepared confidentially, then slowly widening the pitch circle to more and more stakeholders. An immediate step in this process will be to rebrand the OFP with a more forward-looking, marketable label—a primary topic for discussion at the next task force roundtable.

The last task force roundtable produced several workable courses of action directed at solving the urgent post-election crisis. Although the course of action we selected was unsuccessful, task force leadership still believes it was the right choice with the greatest chance of success. It garnered the support of numerous states' Attorneys General, members of Congress, legal experts, and GOP leaders — not only those in attendance, but many more outsiders who were drawn to our strategy on its merits. Despite its surreptitious origins in our task force, it was largely held up as a mainstream Republican election integrity strategy.

At the next task force roundtable, we will settle on an immediate ground plan for each element of the pro-American agenda discussed above. Since our last meeting, a significant influx of new talent and expertise has joined our core group and contributed to the present task force report. We are now equipped to ascertain the required financial and logistical needs under each heading and prepare a planning, funding, and execution itinerary over the next 40 months. A forthcoming prospectus will be distributed by the same mechanism as the present task force report.

SC NcrptID

111 1 375 2 423 4 307 14 169 11 463 28 511 45 189 1 215 8 147 5 563 7 287 3 391 9