Who Placed a Cryptographic Algorithm into the Ohio Election Voter Registration Database, and Why?

By: God's Five Stone

AKRON, Ohio - **Sept. 16, 2024** - *PRLog* -- Today, Andrew Paquette, Ph.D., submitted to Brian Katz, the Public Integrity Division Director in the office of Frank LaRose, Ohio Secretary of State, a preliminary analysis of irregularities in the Ohio Board of Elections official voter registration database prepared for the upcoming November elections.

In a cover letter, attorney Thomas Connors, an attorney with the Mendenhall Law Group in Akron, Ohio, explained to Mr. Katz: "Dr. Paquette's initial review of the Ohio voter rolls, attached, shows that voter identification numbers in certain counties are assigned by an algorithm that permits a hidden means of tracking voter registrations. While preliminary and not comprehensive, his work is consistent with his extensive review of the New York voter rolls, which showed an algorithm that also permitted such tracking, which his analysis showed was tied to false registrations."

Jerome R. Corsi, Ph.D., attorney Connors and Dr. Paquette have been exploring the existence of cryptographic algorithms in various states, including Ohio, similar to intelligence agency complexity cryptographic algorithmic-based codes Dr. Paquette has fully decoded in both New York and New Jersey.

"The algorithm that Dr. Paquette found in the Ohio official voter registration list involves a complex form of 'modular arithmetic' in which voter identification numbers are assigned by a mathematical scheme that disregards the date of registration as the chronological, natural order in which voter identifications are naturally ordered," Corsi explained. "In three Ohio counties—Franklin, Lucas, and Montgomery—a "Modulus 8" scheme separates sequential voter records from their chronological order, opening a scheme in which criminals can add false voter records for 'non-existent' voters."

Corsi explains that the algorithm detected in Ohio is similar to codes professional card cheaters create to mark and hide cards.

"The first step in a card marking scheme involves shuffling the deck of cards to rearrange the manufacturer's ordering from the highest card in the highest suit to the lowest card in the lowest suit," Corsi notes. "Then the marked cards are placed back into the deck at locations known only to the card-cheating criminals."

The point in applying the "Modulus 8" scheme to the Ohio voter database is to plant records for "non-existent voters" such that these false records yet receive legitimate Ohio voter identification numbers.

"What Paquette has uncovered may explain how those seeking to commit election fraud may first create a large number of 'non-existent voter' records in the state voter registration database with legitimate state voter ID

numbers," Corsi continued. "Then, those controlling the algorithms may call upon their "non-existent voters" to request mail-in ballots to swing an election. Once the mail-in ballots are run through the vote tabulators, a certifiable vote is created because the voter ID of the "non-existent voter" requesting the mail-in ballot matches the voter ID on the mail-in ballot voted and tabulated, even though no real voter exists for that voter ID."

Paquette found a large number of voter regularities in the Ohio voter registration database, including over 15,000 "clones," i.e., double registrations for a single voter; nearly 69,000 voters registered with fictitious registration dates; as well as over 70,000 voters with missing voter registration dates.

"These irregularities create a large pool of suspicious voter registrations from which 'non-existent voters" could be drawn,' Corsi noted.

Additionally, in Cuyahoga County, Paquette found that in the nine years from 2012-2020, 73.38% of all registrations were generated, which means that the preceding 11 years are responsible for less than 27% of Cuyahoga's total. "These statistics are interesting though not illegal on their face. They may simply reflect that Cuyahoga had the most successful voter registration campaign in Ohio history. Or, as in New York, it may reflect the introduction of many false records in that year," Paquette noted in his preliminary report.

"While the Ohio Secretary of State has been diligently clearing the Ohio database of deceased voters and those who have moved out of state, our first meeting confirmed that Ohio election officials were unaware of algorithms such as the "Modulus 8" that Dr. Paquette has proved mathematically was embedded into the Ohio Board of Elections official voter registration list apparently from rogue actors who somehow gained access to the mainframe computers on which the Ohio Secretary of State's office maintains the official voter registration database," Dr. Corsi commented.

Dr. Paquette's analysis suggests that the "Modulus 8" algorithm may have been extant on the Ohio Secretary of State voter registration computers since 2007 and can be utilized in local and down-ballot elections.

"Finding actual 'non-existent voters' will require forensic examination—a level of access to voting data we do not have at this time," Dr. Corsi stressed. "Ohio may have to sample mail-in and 'vote harvested votes' in the three counties affected by the "Modulus 8" algorithm and in the Cuyahoga County 'vote harvesting' efforts. Trained employees of the Ohio Secretary of State's office may have to be sent into the field to determine whether or not mail-in voters and those registered through 'vote harvesting' campaigns exist and whether or not they have a legal right to vote in Ohio."

Corsi emphasized that Thomas Connors, Dr. Paquette, and he were not accusing anyone in Ohio of voter fraud or disputing the results of any past certified Ohio election.

"The very existence of the 'Modulus 8' in the Ohio official voter registration database may be a violation under

the Help America Vote Act (2002) requirements," Corsi commented. "What we are requesting is an investigation. Are we correct that the 'Modulus 8' algorithm has been placed surreptitiously in the Ohio voter database? Has it ever been used in any Ohio election? What steps can be taken to remove the 'Modulus 8' algorithm if its presence in the Ohio voter registration database serves no legitimate purpose?"

Attorney Connors confirmed that in addition to filing Dr. Paquette's preliminary Ohio report with Frank LaRose, Ohio's Secretary of State, the report will be filed today with Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost. Additionally, Thomas Connors is preparing to file Dr. Paquette's Ohio report with the Federal Election Committee (FEC) and the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, requesting a referral from the Committees to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Please go to GodsFiveStones.com, the 501(c)3 we have created to educate voters on voter integrity issues to review complete information about algorithms being placed in the state board of election websites, and in particular, regarding Dr. Paquette's analysis of New York and Ohio.