

## Twitter Thread by [Harry Haury](#)



**[Harry Haury](#)**

[@letsthinkdeeply](#)



**My friend Nate Cain and I have worked hundreds of hours with various politicians and legal groups trying to explain the election laws and how they fit together. There are many misperceptions of what happened during this election and what it means.**

[@cain\\_nate](#) Simply put, our election laws are an intricate tapestry designed to ensure accuracy and prevent fraud. They work together like parts of a car. But when certain parts fail, the car is just a hunk of scrap iron and plastic. In this case critical parts failed.

2/

[@cain\\_nate](#) You do not have to prove fraud or intent, you just have to show that the election officials were unable to conduct an election that met the law and relevant certification requirements. In this case, the election does not come close to meeting accuracy requirements.

3/

[@cain\\_nate](#) These specifications are found deep in laws like FISMA, HAVA, and state adoptions of EAC guidance. 1 ballot error out of 125,000 or 1 position read error out of 500,000. Just look at the discrepancies between incoming ballot counts and total votes, the system fails.

4/

[@cain\\_nate](#) It is worse in the the swing states in Democrat strongholds but it is bad in many places. You add the apparent losses of ballots through the Mail and error rates in the 'system' are staggering. Why do we have these rules? Sure it is to prevent fraud, but.....

5/

[@cain\\_nate](#) The system is intended to measure "voter intent", not pick the President of the United States through a random flip of a coin. This happens whenever the error rate grossly exceeds the margin of victory. In this election our systems have failed, they fail legal certification.

6/

[@cain\\_nate](#) Simple conclusion:

- 1) this election is a disaster,
- 2) the election process failed to meet a myriad of legal requirements, and
- 3) where the election results fail the law they do not exist and have no legal binding, "void ab initio"!

House Contingent Election or a Revote?

7/

@cain\_nate There has been great work on this matter by the Amistad Project of the Thomas More Society and @PhilDKline. Whether conservative or liberal we need fair and accurate elections, without them we have no Democratic institutions. There is more to come.

/end

@cain\_nate @PhilDKline @threadreaderapp unroll