



**Judicial Watch**<sup>®</sup>  
*Because no one is above the law*

**“THE VOTER FRAUD THREAT TO FREE  
AND FAIR ELECTIONS?”**

**MODERATOR:**

**TOM FITTON, PRESIDENT OF JUDICIAL WATCH**

**PANELIST:**

**JOHN FUND, A SENIOR EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN  
SPECTATOR; AUTHOR OF STEALING ELECTIONS: HOW  
VOTER FRAUD THREATENS OUR DEMOCRACY AND THE  
UPCOMING THE THREAT OF VOTER FRAUD TO FREE AND  
FAIR ELECTIONS**

**J. CHRISTIAN ADAMS, FORMER DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
ATTORNEY IN THE VOTING SECTION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS  
DIVISION**

**CATHERINE ENGELBRECHT, FOUNDER OF KING STREET  
PATRIOTS AND FOUNDER OF TRUE THE VOTE**

**TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2011**

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY  
DC TRANSCRIPTION – [WWW.DCTMR.COM](http://WWW.DCTMR.COM)**

MR. TOM FITTON: Welcome everyone to our panel here at Judicial Watch. I'm Tom Fitton. I'm president of Judicial Watch and we're here to discuss today the topic of the "Voter Fraud Threat to Free and Fair Elections."

Judicial Watch is a conservative, non-partisan educational foundation dedicated to promoting transparency, accountability, integrity in government politics and the law. Through our educational endeavors we advocate high standards of ethics and morality in our nation's public life. And we seek to ensure that political and judicial officials obey the law and do not abuse the powers entrusted to them by the American people. We do not endorse or oppose candidates for public office.

The integrity of elections is taken for granted by many Americans, but it cannot, we must remain vigilant. As the Supreme Court noted in 2006, confidence in the integrity of our electoral processes is essential to the functioning of our participatory democracy. Voter fraud drives honest citizens out of the democratic process and breeds distrust of our government. Voters who fear their legitimate votes will be outweighed by fraudulent ones will feel disenfranchised.

Unfortunately, our history is – (inaudible) – with elections whose results have been called into question not for good or for bad, because of allegations of fraud and misconduct. Whether it be the Daley machine in Chicago for JFK, or hanging chads in Florida for George W. Bush, even presidential elections in the modern age have been called into question. Some even make the credible argument that voter fraud handed a United States Senate seat to Al Franken which helped cement the Democratic majority for the first two years of the Obama presidency. Judicial Watch, by the way, for the record independently counted disputed ballots on its own in Florida and found that indeed George W. Bush, the governor, beat Vice President Al Gore.

The integrity of the 2008 election was called into question by the fraudulent activities of Project Vote/ACORN operation which was an ally and former employer of Barack Obama. Of the 1.3 million voter registrations gathered by them for the 2010 vote, at least 400,000 were thrown out. According to Judicial Watch's ongoing investigation, ACORN and its various affiliates and most notably, of course, Project Vote have been implicated in at least 35 well-documented election fraud schemes in 17 states, including just this year in Nevada. All that further confirms the endemic corruption in that pro-Obama voter registration effort.

ACORN and Project Vote seem to want to overwhelm the system. Using the Freedom of Information Act, Judicial Watch obtained documents of a 2007 investigation in Missouri that showed that the FBI found that those working for Project Vote and ACORN sought to, quote, "cause confusion on election day to keep polls open longer," quote, "allow people who can't vote to vote and allow people to vote multiple times." Moreover, the FBI found instances of canvassers thinking that if they used completely fake name, it would be less like ID theft.

Many Americans might be thinking that ACORN and Project Vote disappeared after these voter registration scandals and the release of undercover video showing ACORN operatives advising undercover investigative reporters how to avoid tax, immigration and child prostitution laws. But these groups are still up to no good.

This week Judicial Watch will release the results of a new investigation that shows ACORN/Project Vote bullied Colorado officials into implementing new policies for increasing the registration of public assistance recipients during the 2008 and 2010 elections. This push was to make it easier for those on welfare and other public assistance to register to vote. But following the policy changes in Colorado, the percentage of invalid registration forms in Colorado Public Assistance Agency is four times the national average. As a result of the collaboration, the number of voter registration by Colorado Public Assistance Agency rose from 3,340 in 2007 to almost 44,000 in 2010. However, the collaboration also led, as I said, to a large number of invalid and duplicate voter registrations. A total of 8 percent of rejected registration forms came from public assistance agencies in Colorado in 2009 and 2010. This is, again, more than four times the national average of 1.9 percent for that same time period.

Unfortunately, many – (inaudible) – efforts to stamp out voter fraud. Then Senator Obama attacked efforts by the Bush Justice Department to prosecute voter fraud. And now his Justice Department run by the pliant Attorney General Eric Holder has simply turned a blind eye to ACORN/Project Vote's historic levels of voter registration fraud. No one imagined that the tea party turned in 400,000 fraudulent or false voter registrations.

We're lucky here to have an excellent group of experts to discuss our topic, folks who have been on the front lines and investigated these issues in ways frankly that haven't been done before.

John Fund, on my far left, is a contributor to Fox New Channel and senior editor of the American Spectator magazine. He's a frequent contributor to publications such as the Wall Street Journal, Reader's Digest, and National Review. He is the author of several books, including his most recent, most pertinent to this discussion, *Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threatens Our Democracy*.

Also joining me on my immediate left is J. Christian Adams who served in the voting section of the United States Department of Justice where he brought a wide range of election cases to protect racial minorities ranging from vote dilution to redistricting losses. He also brought cases involving military voting protections and voter intimidation cases, including one against the New Black Panther Party which is a case you may have all heard about. He litigated a very successful Voting Rights Act case of the United States vs. Ike Brown, marking the first use of the law to protect a discriminated against white minority. Part of his time at DOJ he served as general counsel to a South Carolina secretary of state and was in private practice in Virginia. He's also a contributing columnist covering elections in the Justice Department and he is

a key reporter on this issue at pajamasmedia.com and he's written in various publications like the Examiner and the Washington Times. And he has an upcoming book about voter fraud in the Justice Department. Do you have a title for that one yet?

MR. J. CHRISTIAN ADAMS: Injustice.

MR. FITTON: Injustice. And last but not certainly least is a citizen activist, Catherine Engelbrecht who's president of King Street Patriots, an organization that you should be hearing more about true to vote. She was born in Richmond, Texas, and she's president of a high-precision oilfield machine shop started in 1994 by her and her husband, Bryan. Prior to 2008, Catherine had little involvement in the political arena like a lot of tea party activists. She was what could be called a "life activist." With roles as a wife, a mother, a founder and board member of her church, and an officer of her children's school's PTO, a city volunteer, a business owner, she had plenty to focus on. And she believed, as many Americans believe, that government was best left to "politicians" who could be relied upon to do their best on behalf of the American people. I suspect that's changed a bit recently without getting into why and who's to blame.

In 2009 she started the King Street Patriots to support and defend American exceptionalism, constitutional governance and civic duty. From King Street Patriots came the True the Vote initiative, a citizen-led effort to restore honor and integrity to our electoral system. True the Vote educates voters, researches the veracity of voter registries, trains and mobilizes volunteers who working in polling places, and advocates for comprehensive election code to form legislation.

So we are pleased to be joined by this excellent panel. And if I could remind the panelists to do what I have not been doing and speaking directly into the microphone so those of you listening on the Internet can actually hear what we're saying.

So, John, I'll – the way this will work – and I encourage you – ask you all to turn off your cell phones so we don't get interfered with as we proceed. Our panels will make presentations, I'll ask a few questions that cover topics that may have been missed, and then we'll open the floor up to questions and comments from you. So I turn the microphone over to Mr. Fund, John.

MR. JOHN FUND: Great. Thank you, Tom. And Judicial Watch has certainly done a yeoman's effort in the investigation on ACORN. It's so pleasing to see such a large group of people assemble at 2:00 p.m. on such a marvelous summer day. So thank you for being so civic-minded. But your presence here indicates just how important a lot of people think this issue is. I'm taking time off right now to completely rewrite my book on election fraud and election administration. So I sympathize with Christian and what he's just gone through.

And one of the things I found is how consistently over time Americans are concerned about this issue, about the broader issue of whether or not our votes count

because we have two civil rights in this country when it comes to voting that are paramount.

One is – and we fought a great civil rights struggle over this in the 1960s – people should be free of intimidation, artificial barriers to voting. We fought a long battle to make sure that there wouldn't be literacy tests and poll taxes and other devices that would prevent people from voting, that block the proverbial voting door. And we need to remember that struggle and we need to preserve those gains.

However, there's another civil right and it's an equally powerful and important civil right. Every American has the right not to have their vote canceled out because someone is voting who shouldn't be voting, is voting twice, is ineligible to vote, is dead or is an illegal alien or has voted multiple times or a variety of devices that sort of cancel out legitimate votes. Your vote can be cancelled out in two ways: if you're prevented or intimidated from voting or if someone votes and cancels out your vote. And we need to preserve both civil rights.

The American people are very concerned about the administration of our elections. Consistently over the last 20 years, about 40 percent of Americans believed there are serious doubts as to whether or not their vote is passed accurately and really counts. Some of that are people who believe there are artificial barriers and impediments to voting, and an awful lot of that is people who believe that there is voter fraud, there are things that compromise the integrity of elections. And there are other people who just don't trust the administration of elections and they have concern on all three counts.

One of the important things that I say in my book is it's not just voter fraud that we're concerned about, it's also administrative incompetence. Walter Dean Burnham, who is the leading political scientist, the dean of American political scientists, if you will, has said that America has the sloppiest voting systems of any industrialized democracy. And part of that is our strength because we have a decentralized system and part of that is we simply have – we've been complacent. We simply haven't believed that there were as many problems as they were in our election system.

And sometimes the real problem in our country is with loosey-goosey laws that are vague and subject to different interpretations and not clearly enforced. You can't tell where the incompetence ends and where fraud begins. You have a very vague amorphous situation in which you can't really tell what the motive or the reason for the election screw-up is but you can tell the election's been compromised.

And as the Supreme Court reminds us in a recent unanimous ruling upholding an Arizona photo ID law, when an election result is compromised so that a significant number of people questions legitimacy that goes to the very core of our democracy, the people do not believe the election was legitimate or the results can be trusted, they will tend not to vote. They will tend to question the actions of their elected representatives as to whether or not they're legitimate. And they will lose faith in the system as a whole.

So all of us have a stake in ensuring the integrity and the accurate administration of elections.

Now, two things have happened that I know Christian is going to go into more detail on this as well as Catherine – two things have happened recently that are of great concern to me. One is that a simple common sense reform backed by 80 percent of the American people, namely the requirement that photo identification be shown at the polls, has undergone a vicious attack by people who question not just the efficacy of this measure but the very motives of the people who are proposing it.

Photo ID is supported by every demographic group in America. You can't get up to 80 percent approval for anything in the polls anymore, including maybe – even apple pie. Some people don't like apple pie and some people are estranged from their parents. So 80 percent is pretty much close to unanimity – two-thirds of African-Americans support it; two-thirds of Hispanics; two-thirds of liberals, two-thirds of Democrats.

But, for some reason, this has become the focal point of a vicious attack on anyone who would propose this election reform. President Barack Obama, when he was a senator, said today the poll tax is taking on a new form, photo identification requirement for voter.

Debbie Wasserman Schultz who is his handpicked chair of the Democratic National Committee said you have to – Republicans want to literally drag us all the way back to Jim Crow laws and literally and very transparently lock access to the polls to voters who are more likely to vote.

Former President Bill Clinton said one of the most pervasive political movements going on outside Washington today is the determined effort to keep most of youth from voting next time. There has never been in my lifetime since we got rid of the poll tax and the Jim Crow laws the determined effort to limit the franchise that we see today.

Phil Noble, president of the South Carolina New Democrats said last month, instead of having hoods and Klan meetings, we've dressed it up as law but it still has the same effect as a barrier to keeping black folks from voting.

Now, I suspect most of these people know better that we're not returning to the era of Jim Crow. I ask any of you – photo ID has become part and parcel of living in a modern society, especially since 9/11. We have to show photo ID to fly a plane. We have to show – have photo ID available to ride a train. We have to have photo ID to cash a check. We have to have photo ID to enter a federal building. Some office buildings, private office buildings require photo ID.

For those who say photo ID discriminates against Americans without one, I'm sure there are few people who don't have a photo ID and I say we're doing them a favor, to paraphrase – to quote Andrew Young the former mayor of Atlanta and a colleague of Martin Luther King's, we're doing people a favor by getting them a photo ID, a free

photo ID. You cannot be part of the mainstream of American life today without a photo ID. Therefore, let's get photo ID in the hands of everyone, not just as a means to identify people when they've voting but to make sure that they're part of our larger society.

At the same time that we have this assault on photo ID, we have the Obama administration Justice Department engaging in a series of very questionable moves, which Christian will go into in more detail, which seems to indicate that they want to tilt the playing field in one direction and that's against the direction of more scrutiny, on the integrity of elections, whether it is to suggest that people should be required to prove they're a citizen when they vote, to show photo ID, a whole range of areas where there's been previously a broad consensus of election reform that's needed. They have challenged that and made very questionable rulings.

So all of this brings us to the 2012 election. You may have noticed that elections have gotten closer in America. We're a divided nation, blue states versus red states. The 2000 election just showed how close the contest can be. That recount in Florida, which I think had more incompetence in administrative oversight to it than perhaps a – (inaudible) – fraud, nonetheless showed just how divided we can become, how big the stakes are, because we still live with many of the scars of that election – (off mike) – recounts.

We don't want to go through such a situation again. The way to prevent another Florida style recount meltdown is to take steps today that will increase confidence of every American in the integrity of our elections and the accuracy of the vote count. If we don't do that, I suspect we're heading to a very close election again in 2012 and all the polls tell us that.

We are going to see enough invective and enough vitriol and enough questioning people's motives, even if we don't have any questions about the integrity of the elections. Imagine how divided we will be, imagine how much more difficult it would be for us to solve our fiscal problems, our debt problems, come together in any kind of a consensus if we have another election in 2012 that resembles at all the kind of furious contest and bitter dispute that we had in 2000.

And the danger is even greater that we will have in 2012 because in 2000 no one was expecting the election to be that close. No one had – there had not been the arms race of lawyers that we see today. In 2012 I guarantee you there will be thousands of lawyers on both sides of the political spectrum waiting to enter a contest, challenge it, litigate it in court and once again try to drag the results away from the ballot box into a courtroom. We cannot afford that. We can't afford that as a nation. Our problems are too big. Our challenges are too big. We have to act now to make sure we have an election in which whomever wins, there's the confidence and legitimacy of the voters and will take office with such legitimacy that they will be able to help solve our problems.

MR. FITTON: Thank you, John Fund. I will turn it over to Catherine Engelbrecht. Thank you, Catherine.

MS. CATHERINE ENGELBRECHT: Thank you. Thank you, Tom, for inviting me here. Thank you, Judicial Watch. Thanks to all of you for taking time out of the day. I can assure you that a couple of years ago I never in my wildest imagination I would be sitting on a panel like this having these discussions. But I would like to share with you the journey that brought me here and encourage at the end of it for all of you to find yourselves on a similar journey because I think that nothing less than the stake of our republic is at hand if you don't involve.

That is to say that in 2008 I found myself sort of swept up into what we all now know lovingly as the tea party movement. For me it was hearing Rick Santelli on the floor of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange just throw out to whomever was listening – and I happened to be one of the folks listening – you know, what are we doing here? I think it's about time that we as citizens get involved. And, as you heard Tom say, I had no political background.

So I thought I'll just step into it. I'll just step into this. If the tea party was to become something, I wanted to engage. And one thing led to the next and I found myself going to rallies and I'd never done anything like that before. I'd never bought a poster board and glue or paint to make a sign for anything since I was in the fifth grade science project. It was such a new experience. But the bottom line is it was really just a transitory phase in coming to grips with the fact that we have voices as citizens and that while I had always for most of my adult life thought that you just elect – you hire the right people to put into office, you hire the right guy and they go and they do their job and citizenry largely ends when you cast your vote, I had no real understanding of the importance – and shame on me that I had no real understanding of the importance of civic engagement.

And so we started an organization called King Street and we set about looking for things that we could do. Election integrity wasn't on my top 10 list of the ways to be involved but we wanted something. And this is now in 2009, we had been told that there was a need for people to go and work with the polls. We thought, we can do that. That's simple enough. We'll go – and I had this vision of me being the person that hands out the little "I Voted" sticker. That was going to be my big contribution for the day. And it really changed my path personally because of what we saw on the day that – about 20 of us at the time that we worked at the polls.

Now, to – (inaudible) – we were around Houston, Texas. Houston, Texas, is not known – Texas in general not known as a hotbed of voter fraud. We certainly had no intent to – (inaudible) – and expected that. We had been trained by the county. We thought that it would just be standard operating procedure. And what we saw set us back on our heels because we saw people who would come in and not show any form of identification whatsoever and be passed right through the voting booth. Now, in Texas you do – I know in some states you don't but in Texas at the time there were up to 11 different forms of ID that you can show. You can show your blockbuster video card. That was sufficient. But you had to show something. And that was not even being

exercised.

More disturbing still though we saw people who would come in and say, I don't remember who to vote for. And then the election judge would escort them to the voting booth and cast their vote for them. Now, what I'm speaking to please hear me clearly, I am in no way asserting that there should not be assistance when assistance is needed, okay? There are people who have language barriers, they need assistance. People who have physical limitations, they need assistance. People who don't understand how to operate the equipment or just the process, that's not what I'm talking about. What I'm talking about is people who literally didn't know who to vote for went to the voting booth and you would hear comments like, this is how you vote for this party. In 2010 we had 90 people on our ballot. And you would hear them say, 90 people that's an awful lot you just, I know you want to – (inaudible) – again. Just here's how you vote. Just press these top two – you click two to the left, three to the right, punch and you're done. And effectively what was happening was that person was having their vote stolen right out from underneath them.

Ladies and gentlemen, when you see something like that, if you go home and pretend that it hadn't happened, you are nothing more than an accomplice to the crime. And we couldn't. So we decided that we'd get involved and would see – what was the depth of the problem that we faced in our community, what was the depth of the problem possibly across the nation. We had no idea. What we knew were – would mean two things essentially. We knew what we'd seen and we knew that there was a desperate need for people to work at the polls across the country.

And so with that mind we decided to deconstruct the process soup to nuts. We began to look at how names and how registrations are added into our registry, looking at the accuracy of our registry in general, encouraging people to work at the polls, and then all along the way collecting data that would either bear out or support the need for election vote reform, comprehensive reform in the legislature. And each step not going in with any preconceived notion of what we might find but rather saying, look, it was always the intention for citizens to be involved. I think – you know, certainly John and Christian and here what happens at Judicial Watch, they represent – (audio break) – of the process. It's critical that the process be one of integrity. But that integrity is largely dependent at the most fundamental levels by citizen engagement. We are facing a pandemic shortage of election workers on both sides.

And from all of this then came True the Vote which essentially now a fully exportable model that trains citizens to be engaged at all levels of the process irrespective of political party. The end of the line message of True the Vote is let's just play by the rules. Let the best man win but let it be a fair and honest process. That is something that as citizens – it's our birth right as American citizens. We have to get engaged.

And observation does change things. So while today in the course of the panel we'll talk about the laws that are certainly being, as John rightly pointed out, the mystery

surrounding photo voter ID and how anybody can be opposed to that. And certainly we're seeing the vitriol fires stoked for questionable purposes, I might suggest.

All of the other issues that having to do with process, having to do with legislation. My message to you today is as citizens each one of us has a responsibility to make election day a red letter day on our calendars. We have the lowest voter turnout of any industrialized nation. When you talk to people and you question where their value is in that vote, the vote that people fought and died for, it's often sort of just slept off. We're so removed – we're so far removed from our government matters. Does it really matter? Does our voting really count?

But, ladies and gentlemen, everything that we're talking about here, you know from the debt ceiling debate that we've just had, point to anything – point to immigration, point to immigration – all of the topics of the day presuppose the underpinning of a free and fair election process is squarely in place so that the vote of the people is in fact their voice for their elected and that the elected are serving because they have been appointed in fair course. If that is not true, then we've got much bigger problems at stake.

And so as we begin to turn into the straightaway of the 2012 cycle, we are encouraging people across the country to begin working with their counties, understanding where the weaknesses are in their counties and where citizens can be involved. And there are wonderful vehicles already written into federal law that support citizens' rights to engage through citizen challenges, through the records request at the state level, the foyers at the federal level to get involved, to do far beyond just going and casting your ballot and getting your sticker when you're done. It's our responsibility. It's our responsibility to decide who is – (inaudible). And it's not a responsibility that we should take lightly.

I have two young children. I fully believe that if we do not, this generation, step into the gap, we will lose a free and fair process. You're already seeing certain states that are for a number of reasons chiefly among them lack of citizen participation saying, it's easier just to go straight mail in. Why do you even need polls anymore? And it's because citizens have lost touch with their real contribution, their real power of a voice.

So True the Vote is now going nationwide. We're working with really countless, tens of thousands of people. Our goal is to train and mobilize a million new election workers into the 2012 process. It is ambitious but more frightening possibly is the fact that it's needed because we are not doing it on our own. And so, to the extent that we can be a voice for that, a voice for supporting the process on either side of the aisle, just engage. Just get engaged. Observation changes things.

And so I'm thrilled to be here, thrilled to have an opportunity to talk about where we're headed, internally optimistic. These are exciting times. We're living in historic days. And it is thrilling to see citizens engaging on so many levels. I believe that engagement is going to send a ripple effect through our elections in 2012 the likes of which you cannot possibly imagine. And I think it's all for the good.

MR. FITTON: Thank you very much, Catherine. We appreciate your leadership. And just a personal note of encouragement. Those of you who don't know, I'm going to ask her to – (inaudible) – for obvious reasons but she and the folks around her have been subjected personally in some cases to retaliatory lawsuits for their activism. And she tries to suppress obviously further activism like the one which she's talking about today. So you have a lot more at stake than, as you point out, those of us at the 30,000 feet view, John, Christian, myself. Christian also happens to be Catherine's lawyer. But probably won't be litigating any lawsuits here. But your expertise certainly at the frontlines of the Justice Department is going to be very interesting to hear about, what happened and what ought to happen.

MR. ADAMS: Indeed. Thank you, Tom. Thanks to Judicial Watch. It's very good that they are the folks putting us into the forefront this early because the 2012 elections for practical purposes are happening right now. What I mean by that is from election administrative perspectives, these next six, seven, eight months are what is going to determine the state of play in 2012. What are states, secretaries of state doing to enforce various federal laws? What are the voter rolls going to look like?

John mentioned Colorado – or Tom mentioned Colorado actually. And he mentioned something fascinating and he told you half the story. I'll tell you the other half. You might remember that he mentioned that ACORN was very aggressive in getting registration in Colorado before the 2000 election. There's another side to that story. At the same exact time that was happening, left wing groups were very aggressive in stopping voter purges in Colorado. And they brought lawsuits under Section Eight of the motor voter law, which I'll talk more about in a minute, to prevent the Colorado secretary of state from cleaning the voter rolls of dead, ineligible votes. So it's a double whammy. You have groups like ACORN getting people registered and groups like the Advancement Project and other George Soros funded organizations preventing enforcement of federal law.

So let me give some credit to Catherine that I'll tell you why in a roundabout way. The other entity that has the power to enforce federal law is the Justice Department. It's the voting section of the Justice Department. And under Section Eight of motor voter, the Justice Department can step into states and say, you have too many dead people on the rolls or you're not doing purges, or you're violating Section Eight of the motor vote, okay? You have too many dead people on the rolls as they did in Missouri during the Bush administration. They enforced Section Eight of the motor voter. The Bush administration also enforced Section Seven of motor voter which is one of the favored fables of the left that the Bush Justice Department did enforce that provisional law but they did. So the two provisions are meant to be counterpart, Section Seven and Section Eight.

Well, I sat in on a meeting during the Obama administration Justice Department, which I've written about extensively at Pajamas Media, which I will cover in my new book called Injustice, where Julie Fernandes, who is the political appointee in charge of

the voting section, announced that there's no interest in enforcing Section Eight, that there is only interest in enforcing Section Seven. And, you know, the Justice Department never denied it. They never denied it in the Office of Professional Responsibility report on the Black Panther dismissal. They never denied it. And their behavior is in conformity with Julie Fernandes' instructions.

In two and a half years, this Justice Department has done no Section Eight investigations. As a matter of fact, Chris Coates, the former voting section chief who did the Black Panther case with me, testified that he recommended eight investigations because there were states that had more people on the rolls than people with a heartbeat. And Julie Fernandes and Loretta King and Tom Perez and Eric Holder do not want these kind of cases to go forward, which brings Catherine back into the story. Catherine and her organization, True the Vote, is doing what Eric Holder will not do.

True the Vote is doing investigations, particularly in Harris County, where they are finding people – and this is a jolly good story – they're actually marking the voter registration forms where it says, are you a U.S. citizen? You have a choice, yes or no. True the Vote found multiple voter registration forms of registered voters in Harris County that marked “no,” that they were not U.S. citizens. Go ahead. Get on the rolls anyhow. Well, it gets better. We alerted the Justice Department about this in October of 2010 prior to the elections, along with other indications of Section Eight of motor voter is being violated by Harris County. We gave them the evidence, the documents, the cover letter that explained it for them so they didn't have to learn it from scratch.

And, you know, we never received the courtesy of a reply from this Justice Department involving a referral. No FBI agents have come calling looking for details. No lawsuit has been brought. They've done nothing. So there's people in Harris County who are not U.S. citizens who are registered to vote which if they vote it is a federal crime. But there's no interest in that here. And I'll tell you some of the reasons why.

There is an entire industry – and I call it the vote fraud deniers, the vote fraud deniers. They're out there designed to run interference through a variety of means, which I'll go through in a minute, to prevent this sort of thing, this law enforcement from taking place. Now, thankfully, people like Catherine and now Judicial Watch, we're looking at the data that just came out from the 2010 election and there are counties across this country with more registered voters than living adults. The data is in plain sight for Eric Holder to do something about.

For example, many are in Mississippi. Today Mississippi is holding an election, Democratic and Republican primaries. Justice Department officials are flooding Mississippi today to monitor these elections but they're not going to look into this. There's counties like Leflore, Walthall, Tunica that have more people on the rolls than they have people alive in these counties.

Now, what do the vote fraud deniers do to prevent investigations like this? There's three steps. The first one is to deny the vote fraud even occurs. This is a favorite initial tactic. The voter fraud myth.

I will never forget Justin Levitt, who was one of the kings of the vote fraud deniers at the Brennan Center, and Michael Waldman wrote a piece in the Washington Post, "The Myth of Voter Fraud." Remember, step one is to deny. It said that voter fraud is as common as Sasquatch. When I was at the Justice Department voting section, somebody who worked there put this on their door to advertise to everybody there that voter fraud is a myth. We shouldn't really care about it. So that's step one.

People like Tova Wang at Demos – these groups all tend to get checks from George Soros, incidentally. If you do some research, you'll find this. Tova Wang at Demos wrote a report that there was no voter fraud in the 2010 election. It was clean. Nothing illegal happened. Do you know when Tova Wang wrote that report? It was the day after the election. It was as if she had sitting on her hard drive for weeks and then the day after the election Tova Wang publishes a report there was no voter fraud yesterday. I've polled all over the country and indeed I found none.

Catherine asked a great question: how much fraud is okay, which takes me to step two of the voter fraud denier industry established. Step two is when confronted with voter fraud, they have a fallback position and they say, well, it doesn't change the results of the election so we shouldn't be too concerned about it as if, as Catherine asks, how much voter fraud is okay? Since it doesn't change the results of the election in most cases they suggest that you not care about it, it's not that big of an issue. Or they say it's not very widespread, infinitesimal. It's all Sasquatch. It was purely mythical. Now it's just infinitesimal amounts of vote fraud. Once again, the Soros funded partisans tend to advance this once you show examples about voter fraud.

For example, Mississippi – a woman – there's two voter fraud convictions recently. In Mississippi a woman named Lessadolla Sowers, Lessadolla like when you pay the parking. She was an executive committee member of the NAACP in Tunica County, Mississippi. She voted in the names of multiple dead people and she was just sentenced to 10 years in prison. Another person named William McInerney, a Troy New York City council member just within the last few weeks entered guilty pleas. These are just two cases. There's dozens upon dozens more, but the voter fraud denial industry does not want you to know about these cases because it disrupts their narrative.

So, remember, step two is to say it's not that widespread. It doesn't change the results of the election. When that fails, there's a final step. And the vote fraud deniers will take this last step, and you're seeing it play out, and John mentioned, in South Carolina – call everybody a racist, attack them personally, sue them, attack their character. This is the last step and probably the most unsavory one because in a democracy like we have, if you can't talk about election mechanics and ways to

manipulate the system, what can you talk about? I mean, this is the fundamental for our entire system of government, the notion that our system is free and fair.

Lastly, one last final tactic of the vote fraud deniers is language coordination. I watched this occurring over the last seven months. As these voter ID bills are being introduced all around the country, you will see language coordination probably coming from some of the people that I mentioned in this speech where they would say things – I love this one. This is new, tea party tactic. Voter ID costs too much, the first time I've ever heard them talk about cost to voter ID. But, you see, it was hip in 2011 to be worried about cost so they started talking about cost.

One of their favorites, a solution in search of a problem. It's funny how that exact sentence was showing up in newspaper articles in Kansas, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Rhode Island, Ohio anywhere there is a voter ID bill, it was always a solution in search of a problem which of course relates to step one that it's Sasquatch you're really looking for.

So all I'm telling you is that voter fraud exists and there's an entire industry out there well-funded, devoted to giving aid and comfort to criminals. There is no other way to call it than that, that they are enabling criminal behavior by, first of all, denying its existence, denying the degree of the behavior, and then, thirdly, attacking anyone who wants to do something about the criminal activity. So that's sort of a different perspective on voter fraud. And I'll leave it at that. Thank you very much.

MR. FITTON: Well, thank you all three for really excellent and educational presentations. And now allow me to play the devil's advocate here, especially on the voter ID question. I guess there are a few lines (bargaining ?), I think would be worthwhile to address, that it's a Republican effort to suppress Democratic voters who tend to be minority, you know, they always tend to be minority and tend not to have the contacts with government that would require IDs and that whether you're at the 3,000-foot level or 30,000-foot level, we just have no idea how it is they interact in these communities. So having a government ID is something that is not needed. In fact, some of these communities are hostile to the idea of having government IDs. And all you're doing is just preventing people who you may not like voting for your opponents the opportunity to ease a new vote. And so when it's not racially motivated, it's partisan and it has nothing to do with anything other than suppressing the wrong people from voting.

MR. FUND: Let me take that on –

MR. FITTON: Not that I agree with them. I'm just – the last three arguments – (inaudible) – from the president.

MR. FUND: No, no, no. At least those are reasonable arguments that do not question the motives on those on the other side. Let me address the partisan issue straight on. Political power is a powerful drug. People will do an awful lot of things to get political power. There is no political party that is – (inaudible) – in this country.

In my book I go through the 230-year story and infamous history of voter fraud perpetuated by everything. There is a partisan distinction that emerged probably in the last 50, 60 years. There used to be a lot of big city Republican local machines: Saint Louis, Chicago, Philadelphia. The last one was – (inaudible) – Nassau County in New York. There was voter fraud on both sides. You can legitimately – even in the 1960 presidential election where it's thought that Mayor Daley deliberately stole votes in the city of Chicago from John F. Kennedy. There was some, although not sufficient, compensating voter fraud in downstate Illinois on the Republican side.

But something happened starting in the 1940s, '50s. The Republican machines basically fell apart. And they were replaced by Democratic machines. Now, there's something about big city machines, the concentration of votes, the need for the machine to perpetuate its existence, the patronage politics that tends to encourage voter fraud. The same thing with rural counties where you have all-time rural political machines, such as the one that was broken up by Ike Brown, or Ike Brown's political machine in Noxubee County that Christian can attest to.

So if there is a partisan intent to voter fraud, it's probably changed in the last 40 or 50 years so that Democrats are in a better position, a more likely position to take advantage of it. Their political machines make it easier to do so. It's much more difficult in suburban communities where Republicans – (inaudible) – much more difficult to do that. This is not just my opinion. It's the opinion of Larry Sabato who is the premier political scientist in America today who wrote a book in the 1990s on voter fraud and frankly confessed there is a partisan intent to voter fraud. It does not mean that the people in charge of the local party sanction it or agree with it, but may explain why some of them wish to look the other way or perhaps create diversionary tactics.

There is still Republican voter fraud in the hallows of Kentucky and a few other places and you can find it in some Republican – (inaudible) – recently convicted of voter fraud including the local judge. Having said that though there may be some partisan consideration in promoting issues such as absentee ballot cleanups because that's where much of the fraud takes place, photo ID. That does not detract from the legitimacy of the issue. If it exists, it is corrosive of our governmental process, regardless of whether or not there is a partisan tinge to it. And many honest Democrats agree with this.

Let's look at what happened in Rhode Island. Three days before Bill Clinton made his famous speech comparing photo ID laws to Jim Crow, what happened in Rhode Island? The Democratic legislature, and not just the narrow Democratic majority, four to one Democratic legislatures from Rhode Island passed a photo ID law. It was signed by the independent Governor Lincoln Chafee, who was a liberal, who said, I'm signing this law because of requests from the minority community about voting fraud in Providence and other cities.

The sponsor of this bill in the Rhode Island State Senate was Harold Metts who's the only African-American in the entire body. This is what he said, as a minority citizen

and a senior citizen I would not support anything I thought would present obstacles or limit protections. This bill ensures no one will be denied the right to vote. It is not about red state, blue state, who's on the left or who's on the right. It's about strengthening the people's faith in the system.

And here's the money quote: Rhode Island State Representative Jon Brien, a Democrat, this is what he said about all of the attacks on photo ID led by people in his own party, quote: "I think that party leaders have tried to make this a Republican versus Democrat issue. It is not. It is simply a good government issue. We as representatives have a duty to the citizens to ensure the integrity of our elections. And the requirement to show an ID will ensure that integrity. Those who are opposed to voter ID never let the facts get in the way of a real good emotional argument." That's the Democratic representative from Rhode Island.

Now, after the bill passed the state Senate run by Democrats and went to the state House, who do you think the sponsor of that bill was? The House speaker, Mr. Fox, who happens the only first African-American speaker in Rhode Island's history.

So at the local level, you have citizens acting from pressure from people like Catherine, including minority citizens, who are often the victims of voter fraud because much of the voter fraud is perpetuated in Michigan primaries. You want to see the worst voter fraud I've ever seen in the country? It's in Democratic primaries in St. Louis and Detroit and places like that. So at the local level you have many citizens of good will in both parties acting in concert, in unison to clean up our elections because they recognize that the legitimacy of elections are important.

At the national level, you have an appalling contrast where you have people literally yelling racism in a crowded political theater, further dividing us. This is not what we were promised. This is not what Barack Obama suggested that we should be. You remember his famous speech – we are not red states or blue states. We're only Americans. This kind of rhetoric and this kind of rhetorical assault against the integrity of people supporting election reform is appalling and only divisive. It's not what we were promised.

MR. FITTON: Catherine, you suffered some of these assaults first hand. Do you have any response to my question or to what John said?

MS. ENGELBRECHT: Well, speaking specifically to the topic of photo voter ID, this from a practical aspect, consider this, ladies and gentlemen. If you don't have a photo voter ID, you still get to vote. You are just voting provisionally and that is a huge myth in the narrative that's out there currently that photo voter ID denies you the opportunity. That's not the case. It is a further check but you still have an opportunity to participate. That point is never mentioned, that subtle little point which changes the entire discussion.

I also say that we supported in Texas and just passed a photo voter ID but it was modeled on Indiana's law model and Georgia's law. And when you look at those states, after they had passed photo voter IDs, they voter turnout actually increases. Why would that be the case? Well, it's because – in my opinion it's because people feel a renewed sense of integrity being brought to the process. They feel like, yes, okay. You know, we're looking at this in such a way that I can now have a little more confidence that when I go, my vote is going to count and be counted. So I think it's one of many steps in the right direction. But anything we can do to make an improved – (audio break) – citizens' confidence in the process is something that we ought to take a look at and not be fooled by the (shallow ?) rhetoric that's out there right now.

MR. FITTON: Well, you know, I'm going to – unless you have something, Christian – I'm going to open up the floor to questions and comments. I don't know if we've got a microphone for the audience members. Okay. Well, if you speak up so at least I can hear you, I will repeat your question or comment. And if you could identify yourself as well. Yes, right in the front.

Q: How difficult is it to get the illegals registered to vote or at least get them to the polls to vote and then get them (involved ?)?

MR. FITTON: Okay. The question is how difficult is it to get illegal aliens registered and voting. And I guess that would apply also to aliens – (inaudible) – I might add who are here illegally, who are here illegally.

MR. ADAMS: If I –

MR. FITTON: Go ahead.

MR. ADAMS: A couple of things I'd suggest to look into. Utah did a legislative audit report I want to say about 2005, 2006, that catalogued illegal alien presence on the voter rolls in Utah in the hundreds that participated in elections. The Utah Legislative Council IG, an investigative body that went through the rolls and cross-referenced with ICE records participation in Utah elections. There's data there. New Mexico might have a problem. Colorado might have a problem. You know, Houston, Harris County we saw – I got one in my hand, the voter registration forms, people who claimed they're not U.S. citizens registered to vote.

Now, this was exacerbated – I'm not saying this justifies not having a law, but motor voter exacerbates this because people who are green card holders who go to get a drivers' license are asked, do you want to register to vote? And in their defense, some of them say, well, heck, if this government official is asking me if I want to register to vote, maybe I'm allowed. And so they don't necessarily knowingly add their name to the rolls.

So that's part of the problem. I mean, there's many other in documented instances of illegals actually casting a vote or resident aliens. You can go to my blog. I think I've posted a couple of stories about those conditions in the last year.

MR. FITTON: John?

MR. FUND: First, I don't think the biggest problem we have is the illegal alien voting, simply because the illegal aliens tend to have a habit of not wanting to associate with government officials and government controlled processes for obvious reasons.

Having said that, it doesn't take many in a close election to swing a result. We have evidence in Washington State governors' race in 2004, the Minnesota Senate race in 2008. The elections were so close we can probably say that any number of categories of people voting probably swung the election. There were enough felons in Minnesota as you know could have swung the election. There probably were enough illegal aliens in Washington State.

Here's the rub. Government is supposed to be more and more transparent. The president ran on transparency. We're supposed to have openness in government, sunshine laws. In Washington State, citizens' groups similar to what Catherine runs sued to get access to what you think would be a public record which is the letter the people are sent when they're asked to serve on juries. You have to answer the letter and to answer some questions.

We know from Orange County, California – there was a congressional race in which a whole bunch of people voted who'd done two things: they had said when they got their jury summons that they were not citizens but, as Christian points out, they were registered to vote, and they voted. One of those two things is not true and it means that they've committed a crime of some kind. They've either lied in one area or they lied in the other area or maybe both.

We in Washington State, the citizens' group sued to simply say, we want the list of people who were sent jury notices and claimed they weren't citizens. Some of those people voted. We know that. We didn't know how many. They were denied and they lost in court. This is outrageous. These people were summoned for jury duty and we have the right to know whether or not they claimed they weren't citizens because they were trying to avoid jury duty or simply because they were – (inaudible).

So I think that there's an active effort on the part of some election administrators and some people in charge of the system to make it very difficult for us to figure out how much voter fraud there is. So they always say there's no voter fraud. Well, open up the books. Let's see.

MR. ADAMS: Let me add something really important to that question if I could. Number one, in a lot of places it's legal for non-citizens to vote in local elections. If any of you live in Maryland, have fun, because non-citizens participate in elections, in local elections in places like Montgomery County and Silver Spring.

Number two, Justice Department – Georgia citizenship verification. Georgia passed a law that required people registering to vote to prove they were eligible U.S. citizens to vote. And this Justice Department objected to it under Section Five of the Voting Rights Act in 2009 brought on by the complaints of MALDEF and Elise Shore that MALDEF do now – no longer works for MALDEF. She now works at the Justice Department in the voting section. So that's number two.

The third thing, the Justice Department filed a brief in a case in Texas called the City of Irving, Irving, Texas. The Justice Department, Eric Holder's position is that illegal aliens and non-citizens should be counted for redistricting purposes, essentially giving political power to non-citizens. Counting them is people who should be counted and diluting the districts of citizens. And they filed this with the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals a couple of months ago, a case called City of Irving.

MR. FITTON: Catherine, what was your – what's your perspective? Were the numbers, the documents that you examined close up, were you surprised by the numbers or was it a number that is always going to be a number of accidental registrations more or less, to put it charitable? What struck you in the data you found?

MS. ENGELBRECHT: I think I would agree with the way John characterized it. I did receive, certainly not through the research that we've done, nor from what I can gather across the country, that that's the biggest issue that our system faces. But I do think that it points to a generalized weakness in our system and that is that our election processes are largely dependent upon honor. We trust that our deputy voter registrars in our counties were not going to willfully, knowingly register illegal aliens. We trust that their identifications will be checked at the polls. There's a lot of trust built into this, as it should be, right up until the point when there is undeniable systemic apparently subversion of the process which then calls everything into question.

So, yes, we did see certainly enough. But as Christian got one of my favorite lines: how much fraud is okay? You know, how much fraud should we be – (inaudible) – because if it's a problem now, it is a much bigger problem just waiting to happen.

MR. FITTON: Are there any other questions or comments? Chris (sp).

Q: I had the impression that there are some who wish to steal elections and others who wish to void the electoral system. Can you give a couple of examples or a few names of the sort of – particular expert at either stealing an election or breaking an election – (inaudible) – process?

MR. FITTON: So for the listeners on the web, the question was, there are groups who want to steal elections and then there are groups who want to I guess break elections and (abandon ?) the system.

MR. ADAMS: Well, with a question that involves a title to John's book, Stealing Elections, I think we should defer to John on that one.

MR. FUND: Well, ACORN was a little bit of both. ACORN was modeled after a famous essay from the political social scientist Frances Fox Piven – (inaudible) – in which in the 1960s they advocated that people flood the welfare rolls in order to bankrupt the system and in the ensuing chaos there would be a revolution.

ACORN's model clearly was completely indifferent to the accuracy or integrity of elections. So on the voter registration front I think they wanted to flood the system and create chaos. In that chaos, it would be easier for others or people they were allied with to perhaps tilt the election through theft because the sloppier the voter registration rolls are, the easier it is to conceal other problems once you get closer there for voting.

So there was a method to their madness. They weren't particularly good about it. I mean, they were very sloppy actually. In fact the internal joke at ACORN was that the left-hand didn't know what their left-hand was doing. (Laughter.) But that was their intention was to subvert the system and make it easier in the ensuing chaos for things to happen.

Remember, if you're deciding to steal an election, you don't do it if it's a landslide. You need to do it when it's close. So the closer you get to an election, you then decide is it worth the effort to try to organize – attempt to steal an election. But if you've already in state after state salted the registration rolls with suspect or spurious registrations, it gives you the raw material with which you can more easily steal the election once you decided you're probably – (inaudible).

MR. FITTON: You know, we had done an investigation of I guess it was in Connecticut and – (inaudible) – out there they ended up with nothing even know it was a grievous voter registration fraud. It was a decision by the FBI and the Obama administration I guess with the U.S. attorney up there.

But I have followed up and called the Connecticut voting official to ask about what had happened. And, you know, this is true from other circumstances as well is that they're in there working their darndest to make sure the rolls are correct just prior to the election. And then someone like Project Vote or ACORN, the one and the same – Project Vote usually gives the money to ACORN to get the voting canvas who's out there, to register voters, they come in and dump thousands and thousands of voter registrations –

MR. FUND: On the last day.

MR. FITTON: On the last day. And it's mostly garbage. And so they get caught up in having to figure what's going on there. And what happens? If they're trying to get on the roll legally, and you're trying to make sure that your address that changed so that you won't have a problem voting, the voting officials isn't able to get to that. And so it disrupts the system so not only does it allow the opportunity for fraud but to make sure that people who want to vote legally have more difficulty doing so. It makes the job of the officials – ensured that we pay to make sure the integrity of our elections is protected

at the local level. Most of these folks are – and I'm sure you voted – of you voted – (inaudible) – probably be the same people there time after an election, after an election. And most of these folks at the local level are honorable people but they get caught up in some of these massive national efforts and their system is destroyed as a result.

MR. FUND: And the more chaos there is on election day, the easier it is to get – slip things past them because if they're constantly confronted with more and more inaccuracies and problems, it makes it harder to catch people who are trying to get in the system and actually vote.

MR. FITTON: If you have 1,000 voters showing up without ID, all of a sudden has one precinct asking for 1,000 provision ballots – our systems aren't designed to handle that sort of mass. And I guarantee you what's happening now, and you go to the Project Vote's website which is still in operation, they're desperately trying to register Obama's food stamp army to – (inaudible) – rolls again in 2012. So don't think it's ended, as I said in my opening remarks, with the scandals in the last few years. These groups are very active and they're using this, the Voting Registration Act, the federal law to register folks on the rolls – (inaudible). And there is benefit there. There are political outlets.

MR. FUND: And there's such a rich history here which we can't let pass. Tom mentioned it in passing. Barack Obama knows all about these issues. What he taught at the University of Chicago Law School was voting rights. He's all aware of all these issues. His entire career is based on these issues.

His first major political job in Chicago was head of Project Vote, the ACORN affiliate in Chicago. He did such a good job there he moved on to become the top trainer in Chicago for ACORN. He did such a good job there that he became ACORN's lawyer, upholding the motor voter law that Christian referenced in a famous case in – (inaudible) – that was the template for extending it nationwide. Barack Obama is married in the ACORN.

And he avoided at all costs any association or reporting with this – (inaudible) – organization in 2008. And we now know the extent to which he tried – his campaign to evade those ties. ACORN affiliates were paid \$900,000 in the Democratic primaries in Ohio and Pennsylvania for get out the vote efforts and motor registration efforts. But their role was concealed in Federal Election Commission reporting because it was said that the groups were being paid for staging and lighting and other things as if they were – (inaudible) – to a rock band or something. Both it was ACORN and its many affiliates.

So the Obama administration, they know what ACORN's been up to over the years and they willfully choose to ignore it, look the other way.

MR. FITTON: Well, Christian and Catherine, we're going to have to wrap up, but I want to give you a chance to make any final comments or recommendations of what we can expect. Catherine, please.

MS. ENGELBRECHT: I think that where we are as a country right now, sort of more so than any time in my life, we can say that citizens are aware and awake. Our elections are a place where citizens can make a real difference, where you can roll up your sleeves and put on your – (inaudible) – and get involved.

And so as you look sometimes with great frustration about some of the elements of our government that feel like are beyond our control, working in your elections is a place where you can have an impact. You can make a difference. You can support a process which goes on to and trying to support strong – (inaudible) – all the way – all the way up the food chain.

The counter to that is true as well. If we allow corruption at the most fundamental level of our government, at the polls, it will rise unchecked to the highest levels of office. And if we as a country find ourselves in a place where we – you know, with a wink and nod say, we're – (inaudible) – fraud, worry about – I – (inaudible) – if I asked the question so I'm just not going to ask the question, what have we become? That's not who our forefathers were. That's not what this country is based on.

And so it's an opportunity. There are problems. But it is up to us to step in and getting involved to solve them in constructive ways for the benefit of all people, irrespective of party. It's not about party. It's about principle. And True the Vote is an effort to do just that, an effort to engage citizens. Please stay aware of them because there are groups, and as much as I wish it weren't true, there are groups who will look to crack the system.

MR. FITTON: Thank you, Catherine. Christian.

MR. ADAMS: I always love predictions because people who nobody reads can say, you've got it wrong. So I'll make two. One, the Justice Department will reject the South Carolina's voter ID law shortly for reasons that are dumbfounding to anyone who follows the South Carolina submitted their voter ID law to justice as opposed to in federal court as Florida, as Virginia, as Louisiana, as Texas and on and on have done in the last year to bypass Eric Holder's proclivities. That's the first one so it will reject the South Carolina voter ID.

And secondly, between now and the election, the DOJ will do some (fete ?) to make it appear that they care about the things we're talking about here to get everyone off their back but in reality it will be just that, a small effort. Maybe they'll reply to the letter that True the Vote sent them last October. So that's all. Thank you.

MR. FITTON: Thank you. Now, John, when is your edited new book coming – (inaudible)?

MR. FUND: Summer next year.

MR. FITTON: Summer next year. In the meantime, you're on Fox and American Spectator and anywhere else you're writing. Christian, when is your book scheduled to – (inaudible)?

MR. ADAMS: October 4th, Amazon, Barnes & Noble – (inaudible).

MR. FITTON: You can pre-order, right?

MR. ADAMS: Yes. Yes.

MR. FITTON: And, Catherine, True the Vote is on the Internet I believe?

MS. ENGELBRECHT: Absolutely. You can go get involved right now assuming we – (inaudible) – Judicial Watch Internet access, you can sign up right now. Go to the [truethevote.org](http://truethevote.org). We are working with states across the nation to help mobilize and make sure that there's polling place left unmanned. We can all do this.

MR. FITTON: Well, you know, what strikes me from this conversation, and as Christian intimated, Judicial Watch obviously we've been investigating this for some time. But we'll be taking more direct action on these issues. But it is going to be up to activist groups and citizens to take this on. We'll always provide opportunities for that. You have rights as citizens to monitor the polls and to hold your local – (inaudible).

And what's wonderful about this topic is this is not happening in Washington. The elections happen at your local level, and from dogcatcher on up, and don't be shy about figuring out what's up and what's going on there and who's up and who's down and how it works because this is a unique opportunity for individual citizens to have a dramatic impact and just one – (inaudible) – consistent person can make the bureaucrats – (inaudible) – making sure our elections are well run. Pay attention. So do not be shy.

MR. FUND: I would be remiss if I didn't point out that we have another author of another book on this topic in the room, Matthew Vadum from the Capital Research Center. And remind us what the title of your book is.

MR. MATTHEW VADUM: Subversion Inc: How Obama's ACORN Red Shirts Are Still Terrorizing and Ripping off American Taxpayers.

MR. FUND: Let's just say – I'll call it Subversion, available at popular book stores and [amazon.com](http://amazon.com). It's an excellent – it's the single best recounting of the ongoing ACORN saga. ACORN is damaged but it is under new mismanagement. And it will not go away.

MR. FITTON: Well, thank you everyone for being here.

(END)