Twitter Thread by Larry Schweikart



Larry Schweikart
@LarrySchweikart



Let me suggest something, in love.

Earlier, you said and I agreed with you, that the Trump side should be looking to poke holes in their case. It would only make it stronger. I wanted you to be a part of the hearings here.

Now, I think you need to do the same.

I'd like to see you approach the state's case--that there's no fraud--with the ferver of a full Tumper.

Earlier you admitted that, yes, if 35,000 votes were programmed as a baseline in Pima, it would be possible if 35,000 paper ballots were inserted there.

That wouldn't . . .

be hard to do. In fact, while I agree with you that it would be almost impossible to do it statewide, it would NOT be impossible to do it in several select locations. When a few thousand votes decide an election, this would do it.

So I challenge you to start again.

Start with the eyes of someone who sees fraud (cuz is sure as HELL looks that way). For example, pollsters are wrong. But Richard Baris is rarely wrong. When he misses, it's by a half a point.

His AZ poll was "off" by over 4. Maybe he just erred. Maybe not.

Give it a try.

Show everyone that indeed you ARE the AZ Data Guru and mount the most substantive case you can for fraud before you set to knocking it down.

I think both sides should be represented before the full AZ legislature, under oath, questioned by both sides (NOT ACCUSED but questioned)

Start by thinking of Alan Weinstein, who was absolutely sure Alger Hiss was innocent . . . til he thoroughly investigated and found the opposite.

Or think of Ron Radosh who thought the Rosenbergs were innocent . . .til he concluded convincingly they were not.

Be THAT guy.