even consider persuasive authority. The Commission’s codified procedures did not provide sufficient guidance for the Commission to determine whether the allegations of probable cause to perform its statutory duties once met.

For these reasons, Wolfe should remain as a respondent.

Conclusion

We should all agree that the conduct of elections are a core governmental function. Complainants believe a Commission adjudication are warranted as probable cause has been shown. The city and the other Wisconsin 5 cities have established a dangerous precedent allowing private corporations with $8.8 million in grant money, and 90 profit corporations were concerned enough about the private sector’s impact to criticize this phenomenon.

The Commission, for the common good of Wisconsin, should adjudicate the complaints, win or lose, to preserve the sanctity of elections meant to protect the fundamental right to vote.
TO: REPRESENTATIVE MARK SPREITZER
FROM: Peggy Hurley, Staff Attorney, and Brian Larson, Senior Staff Attorney
RE: Legislative Subpoena Authority and Special Counsel
DATE: October 6, 2021

You asked this office to review copies of subpoenas issued to elections officials in Milwaukee and to determine whether the subpoenas comply with the State laws. State law specifically states that a legislative subpoena may compel witnesses to provide documents to a legislative committee. However, other statutes suggest a conclusion that a duly authorized representative of a committee may issue a subpoena to compel a witness to provide documents to a legislative committee. Therefore, issuance of the subpoenas appears to be valid, and carrying them out must protect the due process and First Amendment rights of the individuals.

BACKGROUND

2021 Assembly Resolution 15 was passed by the Assembly earlier this year, establishing the Joint Committee on Campaigns and Elections to investigate the administration of campaigns and elections, focusing in particular on elections conducted after January 1, 2019. The Joint Committee on Assembly Organization adopted separate ballots on May 12, 2021, authorizing the Speaker of the Assembly to hire legal counsel and to designate the Special Counsel to oversee an Office of Special Counsel.

The August 27, 2021, ballot provides that the Special Counsel shall conduct the investigation, assist the Assembly Committee on Campaigns and Elections, and other staff.

On September 28, 2021, the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the Assembly directed the Assembly Committee on Campaigns and Elections, to require the Special Council on October 15, 2021. The subpoenas were signed and served under statutes.
The legislative subpoena statute, s. 13.31, Stats., states:

The attendance of witnesses before any committee of the legislature, or of either house thereof, appointed to investigate any subject matter, may be procured by subpoenas signed by the presiding officer or chief clerk of the senate or assembly. Such subpoenas shall state where, and before whom, the witness is required to appear, and the such attendance forthwith or on a future day named and the books, records, documents and papers therein to be designated. It require any officer of any corporation or limited liability company to produce any such business entity, to produce the same before such committee. Subpoenas may be served by any person and shall be served and returned. (Emphasis added.)

This statute and case law establish that a witness may be compelled to appear before any committee charged with investigatory authority.

**DISCUSSION**

**Validity of Subpoena**

A plain language reading of the phrase “before any committee of the legislature, or of either house thereof, appointed to investigate any subject matter” in s. 13.31, Stats., witness may be compelled to appear and to produce documents before that committee is appointed to investigate the subject matter to which the Office of Special Counsel is not a legislative committee, although it has Assembly Committee on Campaigns and Elections.

Some of the duties of the chair established in ss. 13.32 (1) and 13.34, statutes anticipate that a witness would appear before a legislative committee. The committee may file with the presiding officer a certificate stating to appear or refused to answer questions or provide requested document directs that the chair of the committee before which a witness appearance in order to authorize the payment of witness fees.

If a court considers the statutes directly and specifically relating to legislative proceedings, the statutes appear to compel a witness to appear before a legislative committee and not a separate entity. However, a court has consistently held that unless an action interferes with a county
will not interfere with the Legislature on matters of legislative procedure. [Ozanne v. Fitzgerald, 2011 WI 43 (2011); La Follette v. Stitt, 114 Wis. 2d 60 (1984)].

There are several facts that indicate an appearance before the Special Counsel was an appearance before the committee. First, a legislative committee may hire an outside expert to perform work on its behalf under appropriate circumstances. In this case, the committee with conducting an investigation; and, in connection therewith, the Committee Speaker to hire an investigator to perform work on behalf of the committee, which is similar to other instances in which the legislative branch utilizes outside experts. This may require specialized knowledge or skills, such as actuarial services to generate recommendations or legal counsel. In some cases, these outside experts are hired in accordance with outside expert procedures. In other cases, the house or body authorizes the hiring of the expert by a resolution or motion approved by the relevant committee on organization.

Second, the ballot adopted by the Committee on Assembly Organization could assist the committee. The subpoenas signed by the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the Assembly before the Special Counsel, were issued in the name of the committee. The language used indicates that an appearance before the Special Counsel could be considered an appearance before the committee for purposes of s. 13.31, Stats.

There is statutory support, as well, for the proposition that an individual may be heard testimony on behalf of a legislative committee. Under ss. 13.32, Stats., a committee for which a subpoena was issued may initiate contempt proceedings if the witness fails to comply with the terms of the subpoena. However, the legislative contempt statute states that a person may be held in contempt only if they refuse to attend or be examined as a witness, either before the house or a committee authorized to take testimony in legislative proceedings, or to produce books, documents, papers or keys according to the exigency of any subpoena, as defined in ss. 968.02, Stats.; emphasis added.] This language appears to indicate that someone appearing before the committee may investigate or take testimony on behalf of the committee.

A court adopting this view would likely determine that an appearance before the committee would be considered an appearance before the committee. In that case, the state court may find that it is not entirely clear what it means for a witness to appear before the committee. There are several facts that indicate an appearance before the Special Counsel was an appearance before the committee. First, a legislative committee may hire an outside expert to perform work on its behalf under appropriate circumstances. In this case, the committee with conducting an investigation; and, in connection therewith, the Committee Speaker to hire an investigator to perform work on behalf of the committee, which is similar to other instances in which the legislative branch utilizes outside experts. This may require specialized knowledge or skills, such as actuarial services to generate recommendations or legal counsel. In some cases, these outside experts are hired in accordance with outside expert procedures. In other cases, the house or body authorizes the hiring of the expert by a resolution or motion approved by the relevant committee on organization.

---

3 The Joint Survey Committee on Retirement Systems (JSCRS) routinely contracts with the committee in evaluating proposed changes to the retirement system, as provided for in s. 13.52, Stats.] The statutes specifically authorize the Joint Survey Committee on Tax Exempt Personnel as required for the performance of its duties, in accordance with proposal nos. 12-59, Stats.] Also, the Joint Committee on Legislative Organization (JCLO) is a committee of which the Speaker serves as a member, and it authorizes the hiring of outside experts to assist in its work.
TO:   Members of the Committee on Assembly Organization
FROM: Speaker Robin Vos, Chair
DATE: August 27, 2021
SUBJECT: Ballot 21-06 ~ Authorization to designate special counsel

[MOTION] It is moved that the Committee on Assembly Organization authorize the Assembly to designate the legal counsel hired pursuant to the Lenz letter as special counsel to the Committee on Assembly Organization, as special counsel to the Speaker and Campaign Committee, and hire investigators and other staff to assist with the

I am recommending adoption of this motion. Please review and initial the attached ballot with "aye" or "no", signing your name, and inserting the date. Thank you.

[If this ballot is not returned to the Speaker’s office by Monday, August 30, 2021, you will be designated as not voting.]
INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT

THIS MASTER INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT (the “Agreement”) was entered into as of ________________, 2021, by and among THE ASSEMBLY (the “Assembly”), and CONSULTARE LLC, a Wisconsin limited liability company, by and through its President, Michael J. Gableman (collectively, “Gableman”, and together with the Assembly, the “Parties”) shall constitute a binding contract for indemnification of Gableman by the Assembly against the liabilities of Gableman described herein.

RECITALS

A. Gableman has agreed with the Assembly to act as the Special Counsel with respect to the Assembly’s inquiry and investigation into fraud and/or illegality connected to the 2020 November election in Wisconsin to that certain Independent Contractor Agreement attached hereto (the “IC Agreement”).

B. The nature and subject of the Inquiry and Gableman’s role as Attorney or Special Counsel under the IC Agreement may subject Gableman to suits and/or other obligations or liabilities.

C. Gableman requires that the Assembly indemnify and hold harmless any such legal challenges, suits and/or other obligations or liabilities as set forth in the terms of this Agreement.

D. The Parties wish and intend by this Agreement to provide indemnification of Gableman for all legal challenges, suits and/or other obligations or liabilities in any way related to the Inquiry and/or the IC Agreement.

E. The Assembly is aware of Gableman’s reliance on the agreements contained herein in acting as the Coordinating Attorney for the prosecution of the Inquiry.

AGREEMENTS

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing and the premises and agreements contained herein, and for other good and valuable consideration of which is hereby acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

The parties acknowledge and agree that the recitals set forth in this Agreement are not part of the Agreement and are for convenience of reference only and do not constitute a part of the Agreement.
liabilities and damages (including, without limitation, special, consequential damages) ("Costs"), that the Gableman Indemnified Parties (defined to become subject to, that arise out of, result from, or relate to the IC Agreement other than Costs resulting from recklessness or willful misconduct of a Party(ies).

3. **Indemnification of Gableman by the Assembly**

   (a) **Indemnification.** The Assembly shall indemnify and hold harmless the Gableman Indemnified Parties (defined to include their respective members, directors, employees and investigators as "Gableman Indemnified Parties" and each a “Gableman Indemnified Party”) against, and shall pay to, any and all Costs that any Gableman Indemnified Party may incur or become subject to, that arise out of, result from, or relate to any of the matters identified in Section 3. Such indemnification shall include limitation Gableman’s involvement as Coordinating Attorney or Special Assistant pursuant to the IC Agreement, unless caused by the willful misconduct of a Party. The Assembly acknowledges and agrees that the indemnity obligations set forth herein shall apply notwithstanding anything in the agreements between Gableman and the Assembly.

   (b) **Procedures for Claims.**

   (i) The Gableman Indemnified Parties shall, by notice to the Assembly of the assessment of any suit, action or claim, commence the suit, action or claim, in which indemnity may be sought ("Action") and, collectively, the “Gableman Indemnified Parties” shall pursue the Action in accordance with this Section 3. The Assembly shall be liable to the Gableman Indemnified Party with respect to any liability that the Assembly assumes under Section 3, except to the extent that such liability would prejudice the Assembly.

   (ii) The Assembly shall allow the Gableman Indemnified Party, at its choice, that the Assembly shall either defend or settle the Action and the Assembly shall, upon the Gableman Indemnified Party’s request, defend the Action actively and diligently.

4. **Waiver of Breach.** The failure or delay of a Party in the performance by any other Party of any provision of this Agreement, shall not operate as a waiver of the right of such Party to require performance of that provision or any other provision.
engine valves, heads, or pistons in all Ford motor vehicles.” Id. 269-272. The plaintiffs sought the “name, address, and telephone number of each of the claimants.” Id. 270. The information sought required Ford to go through the records of every vehicle owner across the country over a five year period. The court found that the burden of completing the discovery request substantially outweighed the value of 272 (finding that the claim for damages of $2,200 was vastly outweighed by answering the interrogatories of $10,000). That is not the case here.

All the information sought is necessary for the Assembly to fulfill its need for legislation regarding elections in Wisconsin. It is limited in time to the 2020 General Election and any potential irregularities and/or illegalities that occurred during that election. This is manifestly different from the scope of discovery sought in Rumsfeld. The plaintiffs argued that producing a “massive quantity of documents” that are all contained in the databases of the Commission would impose an extreme burden. Plaintiffs failed to make that argument here. However, all discovery is “burdensome and expensive to some degree.” However, all discovery is “burdensome and expensive to some degree.” Of the information sought here is much more than the expense of reproducing the requested documents.

The Assembly is attempting to exercise their plenary Constitutional authority for the furtherance of a valid legislative purpose. Without this information, “shooting in the dark, unable to legislate wisely or effectively.” The burden of producing the requested documents is not on the plaintiffs but on Ford.
is that no order is necessary; the movant must show a positive reason for entry of an order.” Id. at 165.

Plaintiffs have not shown good cause for stopping the enforcement. There whole argument is that the number of documents is large and required to produce them. Pl. Br. Doc. 7, at 12. That is not reason enough to impose an undue burden. See *Spacek*, 102 Wis. 2d at 270-71.

Finally, even if the subpoenas do impose a burden on the Plaintiff, the power of the legislative to investigate is that set by the legislature and subpoenas follow the standard set out by Wisc. Stat. §13.31. It is due explicitness that the Plaintiffs will have a reasonable basis for whether the question under inquiry so as to satisfy due process. The resolution related to a valid legislative purpose. By investigating potential problems with the 2020 Election, the Assembly can take any action they deem necessary.

As shown above, the power of inquiry with process to enforce the legislative function. *Trump v. Mazars USA, LLP*, 140 S.Ct. 2041, 2047 (2020). Information, [the legislature] would be shooting in the dark, unable to effectively.” Id. (citing *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 175 (1927)). Exercising the power and conducting investigations rests *entirely* with the legislature. *In re Falvey*, 7 Wis. 630, 638 (1858). “If the legislature finds the investigation shall be...
The burden is upon the plaintiffs to show that they will face irreparable harm. *Milwaukee Deputy Sheriffs’ Ass’n*, 370 Wis. 2d at 659-60. Not only do they fail to carry the burden, but they fail to allege that they face any harm in complying with Br. Doc. 7. They do not provide any affidavits, evidence, or otherwise expense in complying with the subpoena. Plaintiffs seem to suggest their own harm with the subpoenas itself. *See id.* at 4. However, any potential harm that the subpoenas is through the Plaintiffs own action by refusing to comply.

“Equitable remedies are not available to one whose own actions cause their harm.” *Matter of Estate of Lohr*, 174 Wis. 2d 468, 477 (Wis. Ct. App. 1996) (emphasis added). They have been lawfully issued and are within the authority of Justice Gableman to issue. There is no evidence to any harm that they face in complying with the subpoena, other than the refusal to comply. *Pils. Br., Doc. 7*, at 11-13. The only potential harm faced is the potential for a contempt charge. *See, e.g.*, Wisc. Stat. §13.26(1)(c). A contempt charge would only come as a result of refusal to comply with the subpoenas. @add: In that event, Plaintiffs harm is not irreparable, because of that, a temporary restraining order is not necessary [them since their] own actions or inactions result in the harm.” *Matter of Estate of Lohr*, 174 Wis. 2d at 477.

Therefore, there is no irreparable harm facing the plaintiffs.

**D. Plaintiffs have other Adequate Remedies at Law**
5. **Termination.** This Agreement shall terminate upon the death of the Parties hereto.

6. **No Assignment.** No Party to this Agreement may assign obligations under this Agreement without the prior written consent of each of the Parties hereto.

7. **Invalidity.** If any provision, clause or part of this Agreement, under certain circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the Agreement, and each provision, clause or part under other circumstances, shall not be affected.

8. **Amendments.** Amendments to this Agreement must be made in writing and signed by each of the Parties hereto.

9. **Governing Law.** This Agreement shall be governed in accordance with the internal laws of the State of Wisconsin.

10. **Binding Effect.** Each of the Parties hereto, their successors and respective heirs, personal representatives, pledgees or trustees, are bound and shall execute any instruments and perform acts, or refrain from performing acts, as may be necessary or proper to carry out the intent and purpose of this Agreement.

11. **Effective Date and Counterparts.** This Agreement is subject to execution by all Parties. This Agreement may be executed and delivered by facsimile, e-mail transmission or original, and each such duly executed counterpart shall have the same validity, force and effect of the original.

[signature page follows]
Plaintiffs not show that there is no other remedy at law, a temporary injunction is an adequate remedy itself. “Historically, it is clear that both declaratory and injunctive relief have been withheld with respect to legislative investigations.” Goldman, 286 F. Supp. 2d at 48.

The correct way to combat these subpoenas is through a motion to quash a subpoena. 805.07(3). Michael, please update to Wisconsin statute. Not only is the correct way to combat a subpoena, but it is also an adequate remedy at law. Chisholm were the plaintiff sought a permanent injunction after having the sentence on the other remedies element saying that since the motion was granted, there were other adequate remedies at law.

Similarly here, a motion to quash is an adequate remedy at law. Plaintiffs could enter into negotiations with Justice Gabler, seeking to narrow the subpoenas. Such negotiations and narrowing presents another remedy.

Because a motion to quash is available to the Plaintiffs, and even appropriate, see Goldman, 286 F. Supp. at 48, then there are other adequate remedies at law. This factor weighs against granting relief.

E. Status Quo

The burden is upon the movant to show that a temporary injunction is necessary to maintain the status quo. Milwaukee Deputy Sheriffs’ Ass’n, 370 Wis. 2d at 659-66.
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IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereby enter into this Agreement written above.

THE WISCONSIN STATE ASSEMBLY

By: ________________
   Robin J. Vos, Speaker

CONSULTARE LLC

By: __________________________
   Michael J. Gableman, President

MICHAEL J. GABLEMAN

_____________________________
Michael J. Gableman
Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served in this matter on November 23, 2021, via the @Court’s electronic filing system.

/s/ Michael D. Dean
Michael D. Dean

Similarly, congressional “staff depositions” have been used for decades to use their investigatory power. Doing so allows the committee to obtain sensitive information confidentially and in a quick manner. Wisconsin legislature has that same authority.

Government cannot assert constitutional rights.
COordinating ATTorney
independent contractor agreement

This Independent Contractor Agreement (Agreement) is entered into this [Date], between The Wisconsin Assembly (Assembly) and Consultare LLC, by and through J. Gableman, an independent contractor (Contractor), in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants set forth herein, as follows:

Term of Agreement

This Agreement will become effective on [Date] and will continue in full force and effect until [Date] unless altered or extended by mutual agreement of Assembly and the Contractor.

Services to be Rendered by Contractor

Contractor agrees to:

- Coordinate the day to day investigatory work relating to potential or actual illegalities connected to the 2020 November election in Wisconsin;
- Analyze and delegate to the investigators leads/allegations from various sources, including but not limited to those that have been submitted to the Assembly's Committee on Campaigns and Elections, raised in the media, provided to members of the Assembly during the investigation, or generated through the course of this investigation;
- Receive investigative reports from investigators and keep a weekly status of findings;
- Routinely consult with investigators to help direct them in the nature of the investigatory work;
- Compile all investigator reports and weekly attorney reports into a comprehensive election investigation, to be submitted to the Speaker of the Assembly;
- Keep all information/findings related to the services rendered under this Agreement confidential, except when working with Integrity Investigators and Assembly whom the Speaker shall from time to time identify in writing for such purposes. At present, the Speaker hereby designates Attorney General, Assembly's point of contact with the Contractor. The identity of individuals with whom the Contractor may share such information may be modified in writing by the Speaker. The requirement for confidentiality set forth in this Agreement shall apply to any and all employees or agents of the Contractor.
Compensation

In consideration for the services to be performed by Contractor, the Assembly agrees to pay the sum of Eleven Thousand dollars ($11,000), on a monthly basis, the first 15, 2021, and payment continuing on and through the 15th day of each subsequent month, this Agreement (August, September, and October 2021) until the “Term of Agreement” has ended.

Equipment, Supplies and Related Expenses

Contractor will supply all equipment and supplies required to perform the services under this Agreement. Contractor will also be responsible for all related expenses, including mileage or hotel stays, required to perform the services under this Agreement.

Workers Compensation

Contractor agrees to hold harmless and indemnify the Assembly for any and all injury, disability, or death of the Contractor and Contractor’s employees or agents. Contractor agrees to provide workers’ compensation insurance for Contractor’s employees or agents as necessary.

Insurance

Contractor agrees to hold the Assembly free and harmless from any and all claims for negligent act or omission by the Contractor or Contractor’s employees or agents during the performance of any duties under this Agreement. The Contractor shall obtain and maintain insurance to cover any negligent acts committed by the Contractor or Contractor’s employees or agents during the performance of any duties under this Agreement.

Obligations of the Assembly

The Assembly agrees to meet the terms of all reasonable requests of Contractor that reasonably facilitate the performance of Contractor’s duties under this Agreement.

Assignment

Neither this Agreement nor any duties or obligations under this Agreement may be assigned by the Assembly or Contractor without the prior written consent of the Assembly.

Termination of Agreement

Neither party may terminate this Agreement at any time prior to the “Term of Agreement” herein absent good cause, except at the sixty (60) day mark either party may terminate the contract, by written notice, should either party desire to terminate.
Notices

Any notices to be given hereunder by either party to the other may be made in person or by mail. Mailed notices shall be addressed to the parties at the following addresses:

Contractor:

Consultare LLC
c/o Michael J. Gableman, President
P.O. Box 510145
New Berlin, WI 53151

Assembly:

Speaker Robin Vos
c/o Steve Fawcett
PO BOX 8953
Madison WI 53708

Dispute Resolution

In the event the parties disagree to the terms or execution of the contract, they shall give the other party as soon as possible to said conflict and work in good faith to resolve the matter. In event that no resolution can be found, the parties agree that any conflict arising under the terms of this agreement is within the sole jurisdiction of the Circuit Court for Waukesha County, Wisconsin, and the county of residence of the Contractor.

Entire Agreement

This Agreement supersedes any and all other agreements, either oral or written, hereto with respect to the performance of services by Contractor and their covenants and agreements between the parties with respect to the rendering of services by the Contractor in any manner whatsoever. Each party to this Agreement acknowledges that no representations, agreements, oral or otherwise, have been made by any party to this Agreement, and that no other agreements, promises, or agreements, orally or otherwise, have been made by any party to this Agreement, which are not embodied herein, and that no other agreements, promises, or agreements, orally or otherwise, have been made by any party to this Agreement, which are not embodied herein, and that no other agreements, promises, or agreements, orally or otherwise, have been made by any party to this Agreement, which are not embodied herein, and that no other agreements, promises, or agreements, orally or otherwise, have been made by any party to this Agreement, which are not embodied herein, and that no other agreements, promises, or agreements, orally or otherwise, have been made by any party to this Agreement, which are not embodied herein.
Governing Law

This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of Wisconsin.

Assembly, by: [Signature] Date: [Date]

Contractor, by: [Signature] Date: [Date]
Goldman

In October 1967 a riot took place in and near the Commerce grounds of the Madison Campus of University of Wisconsin was alleged to be a leftist agitator and organizer and member students for a Democratic Society quotation plaintiff Cohen a graduate student and teaching assistant at the U.W.

On October 29th 1867 the Wisconsin legislature adopted an investigation for by means of a select committee quotation gathering the facts with respect to the riotous and unlawful October 16th and any prior or further such activities and the members of the w e b Dubois club and students for a Democratic Society ellipses "

Goldman and Cohen were served with subpoenas requiring the committee The subpoena was served November 7th 1967 hearing was November 9th 1967.

Plaintiffs went to the federal district court claiming that they trying to embarrass them and we're also infringing upon their Amendment right to due process because they said the land did not make it clear as to what subject matter they would more particularly their First Amendment right of Association want to have to name names about either the conduct of or their names.

Writing for the three-judge court which is been impaneled Judge James aedile cited fully with the legislature. He finds actions brought pursuant to chapter 42 section 1983 of the allegations are made alleging that the defendants, under color undertaken to subject the plaintiffs, to the deprivation of their immunities, secured by the Constitution and the laws of the state in character panel which decides whether Bi-State actor such...
roots in the state constitution," sightings State x r l r o s e n W WIS. 173, 1676 - 177(1909).

He cites Jordan the Hutchison 323f. 2D 597 (4th cir., 1963) courts will recognize and respect the state's right to exercise broad investigatory Powers, nevertheless these powers are. Remains the duty of the federal courts to protect the individual rights from Invasion either by state action or under color the. true in the sensitive areas of First Amendment rights and no. it'd at page 601.

Thoughts with one brief quoted paragraph does the three-judge. the idea that courts have no supervisory capacity over legis. What follows next is a lengthy discussion about whether a. one judge bench ought to decide the case and they settle on. which would likely be the same result when the witnesses. Witnesses in this matter run to the federal courts which act. advantage because if they just picked the same one who run. conservatives at every turn at least we double our odds with. Madison. What's the new legislation concerning declarator. legislative Council seek declarative relief in the courts? A.

I'm paid 9 out of 21 judge Doyle addresses the validity of. citing the rosenheim 1909 case: " the legislature has very. power to investigate any subject respecting which it may see. of the proper discharge of its function to make or unmake. any other act delegated to it by the fundamental law, state. proceed, with that end in view, by a duly authorized Com. branches of the legislature and to incur reasonably necessary. of the public fun. " State ex Rl rosenheim the Freer, 138 1909.

Judge Doyle then notes that with respect to the Congress

In Section 1 title due process judge Doyle starts his discussion of the first objection by noting that in Watkins v United States, 354 U.S. 110 involved a conviction under To USC section 192, which makes it a crime for a witness someone to buy a congressional committee to refuse to answer a question pertinent to the question under inquiry. It was held that the precedent to a conviction under this criminal statute, the questions must have been defined with sufficient explicitness and careful consideration of whether a particular question was pertinent to the question under inquiry.

Similarly to Justice goolsby, judged or oil I'll be at in a different place, the borders all of the object of inquiry quite broadly: "the Witness Contempt" statute refers to chapter 13- contain no express provision that provides that contempt may be visited Upon A Witness only if the question which he is required to save the contempt statutes from unconstitutionality; it was held that to punish for contempt a witness who has declined to answer a question clearly far beyond the scope of the authorized investigatory powers. The borders have been set the borders have been set with plenitude in order for which the committee to work.

Just Royal refers again to the Watkins case and Watkins case and thus begins a lengthy discussion concerning whether the witness can possibly discern that their conduct would it all be relevant and pertinent to the resolution. Correctly do oil concludes that did is whether the investigation authorized by the resolution was sufficiently relevant to a secondary subject of the investigation, that is the member of the committee does having Nexus between it and the primary subject.

A lengthy discussion about whether the witness has been properly

...
the ensuing difficulty. "He's simply taking a swipe at the reflected legislature for not drafting the resolution as clearly as Jimmy have.

Significantly for my purposes, Doyle almost as an afterthought, significant to me part of the preceding colon, "the record has transcript of the examination of the witness Goldman by counsel on November 9th. After considerable preliminary difficulties, his willingness to answer only those questions of the committee that pertain to his conduct and activities and not those that concern those of others. The first part - regarding questioning of the witness by counsel - is significant because it tacitly recognizes the position designate committee counsel and to allow committee counsel questioning. II issue - that Goldman wanted to avoid testimony, simply serves as a springboard for a very lengthy discussion of the primary subject of the investigation that is unlawful conduct, the secondary object of the investigation that is who caused the conflict in the primary in the secondary is established which here, the question then becomes whether the state has demonstrated interest in overriding what would otherwise be a First Amendment of Association.

Quotation the initial question relates to the presence or absence of Nexus between the primary and secondary subject. If we Nexus has been established by the record presented here, it is to consider whether the state's interest in the primary subject is overriding, and compelling as to permit invasion of the secondary. Quotation marks.

The next paragraph starts with the panel's recognition that he has already concluded that the state has a legitimate interest in the October 18th demonstration. It has been recognized that it sometimes proceed step by step. Quotation barenblatt bar 269 at 19-0, 1-20, (1959 parentheses. Which he then goes...
Later in the opinion, Doyle does concede that historically he tremendous discretion and freedom from Court interference its investigations into legitimate State questions: "historical declaratory and injunctive relief have been withheld with its investigations. Citing note, the application of the fourth and Congressional invest investigate a Shins, 52 Minnesota law notes 34, 35 (1968 parentheses. It appears that you dis or not such relief is abating citation citations omitted it is unnecessary determine definitely the circumstances in which such do just appropriate. For the purpose of the present action, it is enough very process of legislative investigation must often be ten not reasonable to require the legislature, even before it's in been commenced, to define the subject or subjects of invest of specificity and Clarity which must Mark its ultimate and prohibition. In its investigative function, the legislature must We have concluded that it is the better course to examine as written, but as applied or as threatened to be applied. " well he notes a purported abatement in the judicial relucta in legislative investigations, he's clearly articulating that is wait for a court to wait until the proceedings are conclusion the Constitutional interest is so clear and apparent and is a legitimate State interest so as to offend the constitution broad parameters.
The Formula For Finding Phantom Voters

1. **Official vote tally for an election = sum of counted, valid ballots.**

2. **Cross search ALL counted ballots containing a voter registration to CURRENT voter registration rolls.**

3. **Currently INACTIVE voters with corresponding valid recent ballots.**

Narrative:

Registrars and voter officials can change people from “inactive” votes to active, and then change them back to “inactive.” It is almost impossible to enforce changes to the voter registration rolls. Status changes do NOT change the vote.

We cannot take snapshots of the voter rolls before the election, then after the election, and find potential phantoms.

This fails because a phantom vote can take seconds and the status changes are made directly to the “inactive.”

Phantom Voter Scenario:

Every ballot is attached to a person. In this example, Johnny Madison is dead, moved out of the state or a felon, Johnny Madison.

If Johnny Madison is dead, moved out of the state or a felon, Johnny Madison is an active registered voter in the election week, an election official can change Johnny Madison’s voter status to “active” to favor his favored candidate. Johnny Madison’s status is then changed to “inactive” after casting his vote.

Johnny Madison has a unique voter registration number, 123456, for his voter registration number.
Solution:

Cross search the current voter registration database (where Johnny may have recently been cast a valid ballot) and you find a phantom voter (Johnny Madison) who is currently cast a valid ballot.

Johnny’s voter registration number appears in both files. In one file you see a real vote that was counted. Yet in the other file, the registration was marked as inactive voters cannot cast a legitimate ballot.

This test can be run with Fractal Programming in EVERY state using:

1. What is the official state record of total ballots cast in total?
2. The current voter registration database
3. The list of all ballots cast and their associated voter IDs making up the total

SUMMARY:

We are taking one dataset, voter registration, where changes AFTER changing someone from active to inactive without impacting official totals.

We compare this to the cast ballot data view WHICH CANNOT BE COMBINED and does not add up to the OFFICIAL, REPORTED TOTALS.

The difference = likely phantom voters.

3 Clicks With Fractal Programming:
One view is voter registration information that ALSO CONTAINS THE LAST 10 YEARS OR MORE OF ELECTIONS.

A second view is BALLOT DATA of sent/received/accepted/rejected over 10 years.

Does every ballot have a legitimate voter attached to it AND portion of the associated voter registration record show matching?

---

**Example fields from Wisconsin (these will vary slightly from state-to-state):**

You should gather 2 datasets.

The first dataset is a data export of the Voter Registration database(s) which contains each voter's participation in each election (whether they voted in-person, by mail, etc).

The second dataset is a data export of the Ballot database(s) that includes the status of each ballot (was it used in-person, was it sent and returned, etc).

Both datasets MUST exist in your state’s system. The voter registration system must show voters and their addresses, etc.

The ballot dataset MUST exist because it is the detail that added to the reported election results.

**The ballot dataset is the one dataset that almost nobody is asking for.**

Below are examples of the column headings for these two data sets, which will vary from state-to-state:

**Voter Registration Dataset**

Voter Reg Number
FirstName

[...other fields]
UnitNumber
Municipality
State
ZipCode
County
Address1
Address2
MailingAddress1
MailingAddress2
MailingCityStateZip
Voter Status
Voter Status Reason
ApplicationDate
ApplicationSource
IsPermanentAbsentee
Voter Type
Jurisdiction
DistrictCombo
Ward
Congressional
State Senate
State Assembly
Court of Appeals
Multi Jurisdictional Judge
County Supervisory
Aldermanic
School
High School
Sanitary
Technical College
Representational School
District Attorney
Circuit Court
First Class School
Incorporation
November2020
October 2011
August 2011
July 2011
May 2011
April 2011
February 2011
November 2010
September 2010
April 2010
February 2010
April 2009
February 2009
November 2008
September 2008
April 2008
February 2008
April 2007
February 2007
November 2006
September 2006
April 2006
February 2006

**Ballot Dataset**

Ballot ID
Voter Reg Number
FirstName
MiddleName
LastName
Suffix
PhoneNumber
EmailAddress
HouseNumber
StreetName
UnitType
UnitNumber
Voter Status
Voter Status Reason
Abs Application Date
Application Source
Is Permanent Absentee
Voter Type
Jurisdiction
District Combo
Ward
Application Type
Absentee Address Name
Election Name
Ballot Reason Type
Ballot Type
Ballot Status
Ballot Status Reason
Ballot Delivery Method
Date Ballot Sent
Date Ballot Returned

The point of the exercise is to reconcile two views of the data – ballot view and voter view. One view from the perspective of Voter Registration with voter participation data, the other view from the perspective of Ballot tracking systems.

The two different views of the data should reconcile and provide a consistent with officially reported results.
Office of the Special Counsel

First Interim Report

Delivered to the Wisconsin State Assembly
Office of the Special Counsel

First Interim Report

Delivered to the Wisconsin State Assembly
Elections in the United States are the bedrock of our constitutional system, subject to the law, including the fundamental laws found in the United States and the State of Wisconsin. But fair elections must be just that: fair. To secure republican government it is important that the people feel the law is followed, but that the citizens have confidence the law is followed. Following the election of November 3, 2020, polling showed a majority of Wisconsin voters have confidence their vote would count. In a democracy, this lack of confidence is unacceptable.

To help address these concerns, the state Assembly established the Office of the Special Counsel, to investigate the recent elections in our state. As Special Counsel, I am authorized by law to take all reasonable steps to investigate the circumstances in regard to the November 2020 election, what should have happened, what did happen, the difference between the two, and to recommend steps to enhance future elections as well as restore public confidence in elections going forward.

This interim report is a first step in discharging that mission.

While this report does not definitively answer all questions that have arisen from the November 2020 election, it takes an important step in collating and presenting them in a structured manner.

Over the approximately sixty days since my office was created, I have spoken with, and listened to, everyone who has wanted to share their experiences and insights. I will continue to do so, and will provide you with updates as we work through this important work.
challenge posed by the COVID lockdowns and historic levels of outside corporate money unduly influence the election and/or the election? Above all, what changes can the state of Wisconsin make to ensure elections are not only secure, but as important, widely known to be secure?

In the coming weeks, my Office will continue to collect and analyze information about the November 2020 election, because the public has a right to know the truth and I have no partisan agenda: I am not running for office, and I do not seek any remedy in the state of Wisconsin to change the certification of its election results in favor of President Joe Biden to former President Donald Trump. Furthermore, I do not have preconceived answers to any questions. Why were so many voter registrations given under an invalid address? Why were so many voter registrations given under an invalid zip code? Why was there a “blip” at 4:00 a.m. in the reported statewide results in the election? All of these questions may have innocent explanations, or they may not. My Office intends to discover facts which will allow the legislature and the public to draw their own conclusions about the integrity of the November election.

Many of these answers might have already been obtained with the cooperation of clerks and the Wisconsin Elections Commission (WEC). Specifically, I requested the WEC provide me with information they possessed. With a large degree of political will, the WEC might have been able to report this information. With the obstruction of this investigation. Specifically, I requested the WEC provide me with information they possessed. With a large degree of political will, the WEC might have been able to report this information. With the obstruction of this investigation, I issued subpoenas, as I am lawfully authorized to do, in an attempt to secure the information. However, the WEC has refused to provide the information, WEC has filed a lawsuit in an attempt to avoid providing governmental data and information to my Office;
What is the OSC Investigation?

November 3, 2020, was election day nationwide, and was, in our country, the culmination of months of work by dedicated election workers. It was an unprecedented and expensive undertaking which is critical to the health of our democracy. However, it is beyond debate that questions remain about the fairness of that election. In discharging its duty under both the Federal and State constitutions, the Wisconsin State Assembly saw fit, on June 26, 2021, to appoint me to establish the Office of the Special Counsel to investigate the election and report those findings and recommendations to the Assembly. I am committed to fulfilling that duty.

The Office of the Special Counsel is an authorized agency of the State staff, including and especially the Special Counsel himself, to investigate applicable state and federal laws, including open records laws, rules of court, and the practice of law. My Office will abide by the highest ethical standards, with a commitment to transparency, inclusion, and accountability. Established various internal policies, continues to maintain records, and discloses all public records upon the conclusion of the present investigation.

To-date, my Office has already collected and reviewed thousands of other documents. My Office has interviewed numerous witnesses and will do so until the conclusion of the present investigation. The Office has a comparatively modest budget and has relied heavily upon volunteers and citizens' groups: the vast majority of the Office's budget, which
Senate and Assembly can change election regulations in the absence of books, indeed Wisconsin law appears silent on this question, matter for the Senate and Assembly to seek to repeal an existing code.

This brings up a second, equally important issue—certification of serious and legitimate questions that the certification of Wisconsin have been undertaken in an unlawful and unconstitutional manner. The legislature has specified how presidential electors are selected and empowered the governor or WEC to certify the results of the election by electors by the governor while recount challenges were pending. Of the right to certify the vote pursuant to Article II of the U.S. Constitution. Hasty certification of electors in a tightly contested election may have the same extent as missing a deadline and failing to certify electors. Certification may violate the state constitutional duties of the Legislature's certification of electors until resolution of relevant issues does not violate legal system.

Statutory Authority

The authority of the Legislature brings with it the legislative information, debate bills, and pass laws. In discharging these duties the constitutional obligation and has the authority to conduct legislative ability to compel production of documents and testimony. Under the authority of the Legislature has the authority to subpoena information from.
in the case of the current report, these changes are extraordinary, recognizing its limited authorization. Finally, its sole product was the legislature, which includes discussion of any “illegal or improper” conduct, the extent illegal or improper conduct does not implicate the specifics beyond the purview of LAB inquiry.

By contrast, my Office’s investigation has a wide mandate to Wisconsin, beyond mere “waste, fraud, and abuse,” as well as the right to necessary testimony and documents, even when recipients of municipalities are not otherwise inclined to “cooperate.”

Can Private Groups be Involved in Running Wisconsin Elections?
Undue Corporate Influence

While this Office draws no conclusions yet, initial interviews and suggest there is widespread and substantial confusion about outside money in the administration of Wisconsin elections. Office’s possession indicates undue influence by well-funded, leveraged large grants to certain Wisconsin cities in order to confer to their benefit. The recent LAB investigation did not completely address these concerns by clerks and the public, concerns with the untimely resignation of at least one long-serving clerk and complaints to WEC. Indeed, contracts made between our municipalities led directly to actions contrary to Wisconsin state noted harmed both election security and the physical safety of right to know if there was a quid pro quo arrangement between...
This cursory reporting is concerning, because it substantially was the
information relating to the involvement by a number of private
administration, and it suggests problems were raised and addressed
and WEC.

In fact, in both instances, evidence is already available to this
to the LAB’s report, and which indicates a more widespread
example, one private organization referred to in the LAB report
all aspects of management of election officials, was entrusted
physical keys to the city’s central count location, managed the
and instructed the counting of unlawful ballots that had arrived
location beyond the lawful time window.

Furthermore, under Wis. Statutes § 7.41, there are express rules
“public” to exercise their right to observe Wisconsin elections, but
on the ability of observers to obtain confidential voter information
with election officials. Individuals are, under Wisconsin law,
members of the public, and do not “become” observers, as were,
Finally, issues involving possible unauthorized access to
impersonation of a municipal employee cannot be remedied by
a single bureaucrat at WEC. None of these issues are directly
report.

The LAB report also fails to address to what degree state instruc-
contract with private groups for purposes of administering public
investigate precisely how much authority was ceded to private subservience hindered the fair administration of elections and confidence in that fairness.

Who Runs Wisconsin Elections? Finger-Pointing and the Commission

Clerk Authority

The core of the constitutional and statutory responsibility for Wisconsin resides with county and municipal clerks. Under WI law, the municipal clerk has “charge and supervision” of not only elections within a municipality. In turn, these municipal clerks assist the county clerk and provide county clerks with all materials necessary to discharge their lawful duty to administer elections in their county. These clerks are appointed by political officials such as mayors, county supervisors, and some are directly elected.

Government Accountability Board Scandal and Creation of Wisconsin

To assist with developing best practices, the Wisconsin Election Commission was established in 2016. Prior to 2016, a large, opaque, politically powerful agency, the Government Accountability Board (GAB), was charged with vast swaths of statewide ethics and election law. In the wake of a scandal that drew national attention, the John Doe investigations, the
provides them with a legal “safe harbor” in the event the Clerk with the guidance are challenged in court. In a recent statement, disavowed that its actions could provide a basis for a defense to is the clerks who bear all the responsibility for election related issues

Additionally, WEC guidance, such as online FAQs, are apparent Commission vote. Other documents, as the LAB report notes, 2020 Commission-approved guidance regarding Special Voters contrary to law. As noted above, much authority is delegated to WEC. Importantly, under Wisconsin law, there is slight legal recours for WEC to challenge such unlawful behavior. When WEC implicitly actions contrary to Wisconsin law, such as enabling poor security voter registration data systems or authorizing “shortcuts” and ballots without applications or enabling widespread ballot curry is are left with no choice but to file expensive and time-consuming report, consistent with the LAB mission discussed above, did not which this Office continues to investigate and collate.

**Lack of Legal Remedies**

Furthermore, the LAB did not investigate various decisions WEC run-up to the 2020 election, some of which appear designed courts, including the Wisconsin Supreme Court, from weighing a decision by WEC to quickly issue ballots without a Green determining factor in the Wisconsin Supreme Court declining
LAB report implicitly notes the statutes were violated by DeWitt and recommends the law be changed.

What was Democracy in the Park, and why has it been the subject of complaints, lawsuits, and legislative inquiries apart from this Office?

While this Office draws no conclusions, we possess evidence that occurred on September 26 and October 3, 2020, involved numerous state law, calling into question the validity of over 17,000 absentee these involved large outdoor gatherings where purported designs office assisted with absentee ballots that yielded over 17,000 votes, clear that all of the workers at those events were properly dep迎合 and filed the mandatory oath of office, or documents related properly handled. Finally, this Office also seeks to review the process. Each of these fact-intensive avenues of inquiry are crucial for improper and how to prevent future impropriety in absentee voting.

Clerk Training

In addition, this office has obtained evidence that WEC failed mandated training duties. As the LAB report notes, Wisconsin lays out training protocols for clerks. But county clerks are political voters, and WEC certification or lack of certification does not a. However, if a clerk is not certificated by WEC, such as for failing WEC is required by law to notify the "governing body"
This Office has evidence that WEC and some clerks instructed or to act in a manner prohibited by law, collecting and assisting individuals in these group facilities, including those with demographic high voting by individuals who had not voted for nearly a decade, the cognitive ability to vote.

On its face, this type of activity could lead to criminal referral employees, as the Chairperson of WEC has suggested. But residue the “little fish” in this alleged criminal enterprise. This Office Wisconsin statutes to facilitate the criminal referral process recommendations. This includes reviewing legal methods citizens are not bullied or taken advantage of, and neither residents are used for any unlawful election activity, merely vulnerable, easy targets for partisan predators.

WEC: Self-Policing and Self-Serving

Numerous members of the public, as well as the clerks, have quite authority clerks have to administer an election consistent with guidance, which in several instances was contrary to those voted WEC may legally bind the clerks in granular decisions about clerks are concerned about repercussions for not following WEC have expressed disagreement with WEC conclusions, and so Numerous members of the public have raised concerns about
of 2002 (HAVA) is tasked with approving all voting systems and with approving all modifications of voting systems used in U.S.C. § 20971. As a part of this, voting systems vendors submit systems to the EAC for approval. Typically, once a system is tested and approved by the vendor will make a similar application to WEC, which makes the same sale and use within the state of Wisconsin. However, beginning in Wisconsin allowed GAB (and now WEC) to approve systems that are not approved by the EAC. Wis. Stat. § 5.591. While there is vested in WEC to approve changes to voting systems, federal records and papers... relating to any application, registration, or other act requisite to voting in such election” be preserved by 6 months following the election. 52 U.S.C. § 20701.

But as was made eminently clear in a recent WEC meeting, request issued by this Office, WEC officials and staff are not “modifications” to voting machines require WEC approval, lawfully be made, or what certain software updates actually approval of actions that might violate federal record keeping, legal immunity for clerks with final say over what happens in locales. In fact, as one machine vendor noted during that open a software update, that company would be obliged to entirely to delete all information from election hardware. Whether this election records in contravention of federal law is a question unable to answer.
cost, and that subsequent individuals requesting a list that have been charged the same rack-rate. Further, there is some evidence provided privileged access to this data without fee, and on an exchange that continues to investigate this matter, and again, this issue is raised in this report.

Conclusion

The people of the state of Wisconsin have a right to know how the legislature has the common law and constitutional right and is responsible for how our state laws are being administered. Without adequate information, citizens in a democracy justifiably lose confidence that their voice and the will of government is working properly.

This Interim Report seeks to build upon the good work of many others, including the vast majority of county and municipal clerks and others on issues and concerns of interest. It is a healthy exercise in good faith, an attempt to overturn any election. As this investigation unfolds, we will vigorously seek out and obtain all available truthful information and make this information to the public and to the Assembly.

If, in the course of this investigation, the Office obtains information, a criminal prosecution, this Office will cooperate fully with law enforcement entities.
Organizations that reportedly participated in the 2020 election at various levels of participation:

Wis Right to Life

Is a 501 charter. Heather Weininger is the President of WI Right To Life. I need to verify with her about WRTL having a 501. WRTL promoted get out to vote, they did not endorse a candidate. However, they gave the facts of the Platform. The Platform supports the abortion issue. Their supporters obviously oppose any platform endorsement in Wisconsin. Jacque, Green Bay

Our Wisconsin Revolution

(No Local offices found, but they have an email address)

https://www.ourwisconsinrev.com/about-us/ Our Wisconsin Revolution is a large organization. Terrance Warthen was the organizer of Wisconsin Revolution. He was passed down to be a director after Bernie Sanders lost his bid for the Democratic nomination. Terrance Warthen then allegedly became the organizer for The Ambassador project, which was a ballot collecting scam. It is believed that he organized for the WI-5 district. It is possible he may have a CTCL connection as well.

This organization has several chapters, Dane County Chapter, Green Bay Chapter, and Fox Valley Chapter. They seem to be affiliated with Action Network.

https://actionnetwork.org/. This is from action network website. Use Action Network to:

- Organize people to take action online and offline
- Send mass email to recruit and mobilize new activists
- Engage activists with mobile messages
- Raise funds to fuel important work
- And much more

Progressive Action Network

https://actionnetwork.org/groups/progressive-democrats-of-america

Action Network is an open platform that empowers individuals and organizations to mobilize their bases online and empower them to take action in real life.
and they paid $1200.00 mper month for the rent. They paid rent from the 15th 2020. $200 for the first 5 months and $600.00 for the month of July. They moved out mid November. The Badger Building is located about halfway between the Big Festival Hall building which is where teh City Clerk was operating in the early months of 2020. About a 2-3 block walk. I am not familiar with any group of 500-1000 voters in the Metro Milwaukee area. Article here.....

https://urbanmilwaukee.com/pressrelease/common-ground-turn-out-57-for-2020-presidential-election/

Gamaliel

https://www.facebook.com/gamalielnetwork/
https://gamaliel.org/
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gamaliel_Foundation

Founder is Saul Alinsky, no more needs to be said about Gamaliel

Wisconsin Affiliate in Kenosha

**CUSH** - Congregations United to Serve Humanity
5605 Sheridan Rd, P.O. Box 1324
Kenosha, Wisconsin 53141
http://cushkenosha.com

**President** – Rev. Kathy Gloff, Michael Remson
**Primary Contact** – Lori Hawkins, lhawkins@cushkenosha.com
Micah: Milwaukee Inner-city Congregation Allied for Hope (aka CACAH)
https://micahmke.org/
Worked in inner city of Milwaukee to educate voters and to get them to vote. Appear to be somewhat affiliated with both Wisdom and Gamaliel regional offices and operate across 16 States.

Ric Racine
The Racine Interfaith Coalition is a nonprofit organization working with faith-based congregations to social justice. Worked throughout the 2020 election to get the vote. Not a lot of information available on Ric. Facebook page https://www.facebook.com/ricracine/

Joshua Green Bay
Joshua has been around for a long time in the Green Bay Area. They do a lot of building and deepening relationships within and among faith communities and work together on issues of justice and community building. However, they are a small group and have been active in elections for years organizing people. Facebook page https://www.facebook.com/joshua4justice/

Esther Appleton
Yet another faith-based organization that has been involved in the area for a number of years. They have a website https://esther-foxvalley.org/ and work in the community and worked during the election on voter registration and early voting. On their website they have links to both Gamaliel and Wisnem.

Jonah Eau Claire
https://jonahjustice.org/ This gets more interesting as one searches out the organizations who probably should be 501c4 organizations based on the mission and objectives. Jonah is affiliated with Wisdom. Here is there mission: "Our Neighbors, Advancing Hope, a grassroots organization, communicate with communities, seeks to bring people in the Chippewa Valley into relationship with one another to build a healthier and fairer community for us all. Since 2008, Jonah has performed the same actions of the other non-profits during the campaign season: registering voters, and getting them motivated to vote. This is a local grassroots initiative that is a holistic approach to community organizing."

The site provides a link to a project called "Living Room," which is described as a "movement for human rights and community building in the Chippewa Valley." It also mentions "Justice for All," a coalition of local organizations working towards racial justice and economic equity. The website provides resources for community organizing, including tools for outreach, advocacy, and education. It also features a calendar of events and a blog with updates on current projects and initiatives. Overall, Jonah Eau Claire is a community-based organization working towards social justice through community organizing and education.
**Sophia Waukesha**

https://www.sophiawaukesha.org/about-sophia  Here is yet another Wisdom this from their website.....SOPHIA is part of WISDOM, a state-wide network of more than 130 member congregations and 9 affiliates including SOPHIA. Our sister affiliate is MICAH in Milwaukee. Our other sister organizations are: Kenosha, RIC in Racine, ESTHER in the Fox Valley, JOSHUA in Green Bay, and JONAH in the Chippewa valley. SOPHIA supports itself through dues from member organizations, individual donations as “sustaining members,” and one fundraising event each year. SOPHIA is a 501(c)3 organization and contributions to SOPHIA are tax deductible. This is interesting as a Faith-based organization affiliated with Wisdom who in turn are affiliated with Gamaliel a Gospel-based organization.

**Freedom Inc.**

https://freedom-inc.org/

This is a Dane County organization (Madison) and works for Queen of the Southside Black and Southeast Asian Liberation. From their website.... In 2012, our Community Power Building team helped over 100 voters get to the polls. Our team also worked as poll observers, knocked on doors, and ran phone banks to answer voting questions. Many were first-time voters who had no chance to vote before.

**State Innovation Exchange (SiX)**

https://stateinnovation.org/

SiX works in close coordination with legislators, advocacy groups, and organizations to provide the tools and information legislators need to be successful. When you sign up, you will be matched with over 3,500 legislators with:

- Customized Policy Research
- Skills and issue-based training
- Convenings and strategy sessions

Programs of interest to SiX include: Agriculture and Food programs, the Reproductive Freedom Leadership Council / Progressive Governors

Although they do not have full-time staff in Wisconsin, they did...
On May 18, 2020, a coalition of Wisconsin voters and organizations filed a lawsuit for violating federal laws that protect the right to vote. The Wisconsin Department of State, which failed to properly manage the April 7 election, held amid the expansion of COVID-19, violated federal statutes and the U.S. Constitution, which protects the right to vote. The suit was filed on behalf of three registered Wisconsin voters: Rights Wisconsin, which advocates for human and legal rights on behalf of black residents, and Black Leaders Organizing for Communities (BLOC), a group of members of the Milwaukee Black community in voting and the police. The case later turned over in the WI Supreme Court.

**BLOC Black Leaders Organizing for Communities**
https://www.blocbybloc.org/
This from their website.
We work to ensure a high quality of life and access to opportunities for the black community in Milwaukee and throughout Wisconsin. Sign our act of solidarity with those who are working to bring about justice in Milwaukee. They are an ActBlue affiliated organization, the only one incorporated into ActBlue.

2020 Election, focused on Black voter registration, getting out to the vote, education in the Black neighborhoods of Milwaukee.

**Super Market Legends**
https://www.legendsvote.org/
Immersed into the Hispanic and black election process in the Milwaukee area, the same, registration, education, get out the vote operations, each in the other organizations do.

From their website -- We go to supermarkets to register citizens to vote. We go to the people - fairs, festivals, churches, high schools, street corners, farmers' markets

**Voces de la Frontera**
https://vdlf.org
Very active in Wisconsin. This is a national organization that focuses on immigration, environmental justice, and economic development.
Democracy Works
https://www.democracy.works/

Democracy Works is a software developer that provides "TurboVoter" to ensure no one misses an election. Connected to Facebook with an API, information to voters everywhere through Facebook. Software for election information. We work with election officials to build new tools, share ideas, and support them in serving voters. BALLOT SCOUT brings confidence to the system, making voting by mail a seamless and reliable process. It allows election offices to add intelligent mail barcodes to mail ballots so voters track every ballot with the same ease as an Amazon package. Ballot Scout brings transparency, accountability, and confidence to the process.

Democracy Project

This organization is affiliated both with the Bush clan and Joe Biden. It is a 501C3 organization. Their issues:

- Authoritarian Reach
- Democracy During Pandemic
- Technology and Democracy
- Democracies in Decline
- Promoting U.S. Leadership
- Election Integrity
- Equality and Human Rights
- Media Freedom
- Government Accountability & Transparency
- Strengthening Civil Society
- Freedom of Assembly
- Freedom of Expression
- Religious Freedom

Election Protection (Common Cause)
One Wisconsin Now
https://onewisconsinnow.org/

A left leaning news organization that espouses the value of the Democratic Party and left-leaning movements.

Voter Participation Center
https://www.voterparticipation.org/

A national organization VPC uses commercial and public data to identify people who are eligible to vote but who need to register.

VPC works with local election officials as well as national, state and local partners to help people register to vote and cast their ballots.

VPC has registered more people by mail than any other organization. The organization rigorously tests and measures its program and is considered one of the most effective in country.

Center for Voter Information
https://www.centerforvoterinformation.org/

A national 501C3 organization the focuses on absentee voting, early voting, and encourage people to vote. They seem to be affiliate loosely with ACLU and Vote411.org.

Rock the Vote, Wisconsin
https://www.rockthecvote.org/how-to-vote/wisconsin/

Rock the Vote is a non-profit 501C3 progressive-aligned organization whose stated mission is "to engage and build the political power of the American people". The organization was founded in 1990 by Virgin Records America Co-Chairman, then President of the Student Action Network to Vote, and encouraged young people to vote.

Primarily involved in educating the young voter to get out and vote, Rock the Vote organizes activities that increase voter registration and voting in the young people. Primarily the college towns in WI, Green Bay, Eau Claire, Madison, LaCross,
Vote at Home Institute
https://voteathome.org/

A national 501c3 organization that was very active in the Wisconsin elections in 2016. Though they learned in WI, they were closely aligned with CTCL and worked very closely with the city administrations in Green Bay, Madison, Kenosha, Racine and Milwaukee. They supplied the majority of the volunteers, literally ran the election process and assisted CTCL in managing the election office.

The League of Women Voters
https://my.lwv.org/wisconsin

is very involved with Voces. The LWVs register new citizens at the polls as soon as they are sworn in as citizens. To the unsuspecting voter it must seem like they are a part of the federal program. They also get these new people to sign up for monthly bulletins via the internet thereby collecting names and email addresses which are then funneled to Voces whose office is in the AFL-CIO building in Milwaukee.

Souls To The Polls
https://soulstothepollsmke.org/

Souls to the Polls is a program of Pastors United Community Advocates (P.U.C.A.), a 501c3 organization located in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. All contributions are tax deductible under the non-profit umbrella and fiscal sponsorship of Pastors United Community Advocates, Inc. and therefore qualify for corporate matching gift programs. As such, Souls to the Polls brings in resources through the churches in the underserved parts of Milwaukee working to convince eligible citizens to register and ultimately to vote.

Leaders Igniting Transformation
https://www.litwi.org/

Leaders igniting transformation (LIT) is a 501C4 black and brown-led organization. Founded in 2017 LIT organizes young people to build independent black and brown political power, racial and economic justice. They engage in values-based issues action, publice policit advocacy and leadership development.
professional research, voter engagement, and political lobbying to advance and shape the public and political debate around health care, economic justice and consumer protection. Every year, Citizen Action generates stories, mobilizes thousands of citizens to participate in political advocacy, and hundreds of thousands of voters.

The Peoples Revolution
https://www.tpr-mke.com/

The Peoples Revolution (TPR) believes that all lives cannot matter.

We fight for a world that provides safety and accountability for Black and Brown people. We fight for a world where we can all trust and confide in those tasked with representing us. We fight for the families of those slain by law enforcement and oppression. We demand justice and accountability. Our goals and beliefs are reflected in the Demands and we call on all levels of government to adopt these demands. Milwaukeeans, Wisconsinites, Americans, and Freedom Fighters across the country join our fight for justice and accountability.
Behind Biden’s 2020 Victory

An examination of the 2020 electorate, based on what voters

By Ruth Igielnik, Scott Keeter and Hannah Hartig
Steph Smith drops off her ballot for the 2020 presidential election on Nov. 3 in Rollinsville, Ky. (Lynne Sladky/AP Photo)

How we did this

The 2020 presidential election was historic in many ways. Amid a global pandemic and unprecedented changes in how Americans voted, voter turnout rose 7 percentage points over 2016, resulting in a total of 66% of U.S. adult citizens casting a ballot in the election. Joe Biden defeated Donald Trump 306-232 in the Electoral College with a 7-point margin in the popular vote. While Biden’s popular vote differential was an improvement over Hillary Clinton’s 2016 2-point advantage, it was not big enough to overcome congressional Democrats’ 9-point advantage over Republicans in votes for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Validated voters, defined

Members of Pew Research Center’s nationally representative American Trends Panel were matched to public voting records from three national commercial voter files in an attempt to find a record for voting in the 2020 election. Validated voters are citizens who told us in a post-election survey that they voted in the 2020 general election and have a record for voting in a commercial voter file. Nonvoters are citizens who were not found to have a record of voting in any of the voter files or told us they did not vote.

A new analysis of validated 2020 voters from Pew Research Center’s American Trends Panel examines change and continuity in the electorate, both of which contributed to Biden’s victory. It looks at how new voters and voters who turned out in 2020 are similar to or different from other members of the electorate.
residential candidate support among some key groups between 2016 and 2020. Suburban voters and independents. On balance, these shifts helped Biden more than Trump.

Overall, one-in-four 2020 voters (25%) had not voted in 2016. About a quarter of these (6% of all 2020 voters) showed up two years later – in 2018 – to cast ballots in the highest-turnout midterm election in decades. Those who voted in 2018 but not in 2016 backed Biden over Trump in the 2020 election by about two-to-one (62% to 36%).

Both Trump and Biden were able to bring new voters into the political process in 2020. The 19% of 2020 voters who did not vote in 2016 or 2018 split roughly evenly between the two candidates (49% Biden vs. 47% Trump). However, as with voters overall, there was a substantial age divide within this group. Among those under age 30, 56% of 2020 but not in either of the two previous elections, Biden led 59% to 33% among new or irregular voters ages 30 and older by 55% to 42%. You made up an outsized share of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voters who voted in 2018 but not 2020 in 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of 2020 validated voters who voted for ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 and 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016, not 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018, not 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on 8,592 (2016), 8,405 (2018) and 9,668 (2020) voters who provided their 2020 vote choice in a post-election survey. Those citizens who said they voted in a post-election survey and had commercial voter files. For panelists who did not participate in the 2016 and 2018, measures of turnout were included from subsamples and profile surveys in 2018 and 2020. See Methodology for details.

Source: Surveys of U.S. adults conducted Nov. 29-Dec. 12, 2016; Nov. 7-16, 2018; Aug. 3-16, 2020; and Nov. 12-17, 2020.
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5% of Republicans who voted third-party in 2016 and voted in 2020 supported Trump in 2020, but 18% backed Biden. Among the 5% third-party in 2016 and voted in 2020, just 8% supported Trump for Biden.

Here are some of the other key findings from the analysis:

- **Biden made gains with suburban voters.** In 2020, Clinton’s vote share with suburban voters: 45% supported Clinton, 54% for Biden in 2020. This shift was also seen among White voters: Trump narrowly won White suburban voters by 4 points in 2020, losing this group by 16 points in 2016 (54%-38%). At the same time, the vote share among rural voters. In 2016, Trump won 59% of the rural vote, but that number that rose to 65% in 2020.

- **Trump made gains among Hispanic voters.** Even though the majority of Hispanic voters in 2020, Trump made gains nationwide. There was a wide educational divide among Hispanic voters, with substantially better with those without a college degree that those with at least a four-year degree. 41% of those without a college degree voted for Trump, compared to 30% of Hispanic voters (41% vs. 30%).

- **Apart from the small shift among Hispanic voters, whose electoral coalition looked much like Hillary Clinton’s. Black Hispanic and Asian voters and those of other races contributed four-in-ten of his votes.** Black voters remained overwhelmingly Democratic Party, voting 92%-8% for Biden.

- **Biden made gains with men, while Trump improved among women:** The gender gap in the 2020 election was narrower than it had been in 2016, both because of gains Trump made among men and because of gains Biden made among women. Women were almost evenly divided between Trump and Biden, 54%-46%. Trump won men by 11 points. Trump won a slightly larger margin over Biden among women (54% to 46%).
votes of 33%. But Trump’s share of the vote among this group – 42% of the total electorate this year – was nearly identical to his in 2016 (65%).

- Biden grew his support with some religious groups while losing it with others. Both Trump and Biden held onto or gained with large majorities of their traditional religious coalitions. Trump’s strong support from evangelical Protestants ticked up (77% in 2016, 84% in 2020) while he lost more support among atheists and agnostics than did Clinton in 2016.

- After decades of constituting the majority of voters, Baby Boomers and members of the Silent Generation made up less than half of the electorate in 2020 (44%), falling below the 52% they constitute both 2016 and 2018. Gen Z and Millennial voters favored Biden by margins of about 20 points, while Gen Xers and Boomers were split in their preferences. Gen Z voters, those ages 23 and younger, made up 8% of the electorate, while Millennials and Gen Xers made up 47% of the electorate.
accurate assessment of the 2020 election, each based on somewhat different methods and data sources have unique strengths and weaknesses, meaning that specific estimates are likely to vary among the studies and no single analysis can be considered definitive.

Voting patterns in the 2020 election

The 2020 election featured continuity in the voting patterns of major demographic groups in the population, but there were a few important shifts. The gender gap in the 2020 election was narrower than it had been in 2016 as Democrats made gains among men and Republicans made gains among women. In the 2016 election, Donald Trump won men by 11 percentage points (52% to 41%) while Hillary Clinton won women by 15 percentage points (54% to 39%). In the 2018 election, Democrats substantially narrowed the gender gap in women’s voting (50% of men voted for Democratic candidates, 48% for Republican candidates) and maintained an 18-point lead among women. In the 2020 election, men again voted nearly evenly (50% Trump, 48% Biden), while Biden’s advantage narrowed to 12 points among women (55% to 44%).

The gender gap narrowed among White voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of validated voters who reported voting for each candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly, as Biden increased his level of support among White men relative to Clinton’s in 2016, Trump gained among White women, further narrowing the gender gap among White voters. In 2016, the gender gap was 30 points (62% to 32%). That gap narrowed to a 17-point margin (53% to 40%). White women, a group sometimes categorized as swing voters, nearly evenly in 2016 (47% for Trump to 45% for Clinton), favored Biden (46%).

Biden received the support of 92% of Black voters, nearly the same as in 2016 and Democratic candidates for the U.S. House received in 2020.

While Biden took a 59% majority of the Hispanic vote, Trump (with 25%) significantly over the level of support Republican candidates for the U.S. House received in 2018 (25%). To be sure, Hispanic voters are not a monolith; they are divided within the Hispanic electorate.

### As In 2016 and 2018, wide educational differences among voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of validated voters who reported voting for each candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grad+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, college grad+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, some college or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, college grad+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, some college or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, college grad+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, some college or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on 3,014 (2016), 7,585 (2018) and 9,668 (2020) validated general election voters. Other than bilingual candidates, where votes were within 5 percentage points of each other, those with significantly higher than vote for Democratic candidates, See Methodology for details. White and Black adults include only those who report being of any race. Don’t know responses not shown. Insufficient sample sizes in 2016 to show.
One of the most pivotal groups in the 2016 election was White voters with a college degree, who were critical to Trump’s electoral college victory (he won them by a wide 36-point margin in 2016, 64% to 28%). Differences in candidate preferences by education were typically much smaller in 2020. In 2020, Trump won 65% of White non-college voters – near their share – even as Biden outperformed Clinton among this group (58% supported Clinton vs. 52% for Biden, up from the 28% of this group Clinton won in 2016). At the same time, White voters with a college degree or higher supported Biden by a narrower margin they had backed Clinton in 2016.

Trump’s stronghold among White men without a four-year college degree has somewhat in 2020. While he still won this group by a little more than Clinton (56% to Biden’s 31%), that 35 percentage point gap is notably smaller than in the 2016 election, when 73% of White men without a college degree supported Trump compared with 23% who supported Clinton. Meanwhile, White men with a college degree have become increasingly supportive of Democrats. They were close to evenly in 2016 (47% for Clinton, 44% for Trump) but supported Biden by a 12-point margin in 2020.

At the same time, Trump’s vote share among White women with a college degree has declined slightly between the 2016 and 2020 presidential elections. In 2016, 46% of White women supported Trump by a margin of 56% to 33%. By 2020, the margin had narrowed to 64% among this group compared with 35% supporting Biden. Among White women without a college degree, support for Biden was on par with support for Clinton in 2016 (47% for Clinton, 44% for Trump) but support for Biden was 12 points higher than Clinton in 2020.

Party and ideology

Biden and Trump benefited from similar levels of party loyalty in 2020, receiving 92% support among Republicans and Republican leaners, with Biden getting 94% among Democrats and Democratic leaners. Consistent support for each candidate were seen among Democrats (95% for Biden, 97% for Trump) and Republicans (86% for Trump, 87% for Biden) in 2020.
Biden substantially increased Democratic support among Independents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party/lean and ideology</th>
<th>Share voting for Clinton</th>
<th>Margin (Dem.-Rep.)</th>
<th>Share voting for Trump</th>
<th>Margin (Dem.-Rep.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican/lean Rep.</td>
<td>4% 39%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6% 91%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat/lean Dem.</td>
<td>89 5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95 3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>4 92</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4 95</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>94 5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97 2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent/other</td>
<td>42 43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55 40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on 3,014 (2016), 7,585 (2018) and 9,668 (2020) validated general election voters. These voters have voted in commercial voter files. Vote choice for all years is from a post-election survey. 2016 for Clinton, 2018 for Trump, 2020 for Biden. See Methodology for details. Don’t know responses not shown.
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Ideological divisions within the parties were also apparent in the election, with Trump doing better among the ideological core of their parties and Biden doing better among the ideological core of the other party. Specifically, Trump won the votes of 97% of conservative Republicans and leaners but a smaller majority (65%) of moderate or liberal Republicans who describe themselves as moderate or liberal. Biden won the votes of 77% of liberal Democrats and leaners and 91% among those who describe themselves as conservative or very conservative.

Age and generation

A yawning age gap in voter support – a pattern that emerged in previous elections for the first time since 1972 – continues to be evident, with 76% of voters 45 or older backing Biden while 59% of voters younger than 45 favored Joe Biden by 24 percentage points (Biden 59%, Trump 35%).

Perhaps reflecting the enduring impact of this long-term age gap, conservatives were also solidly in the Democratic candidate’s camp in 2020, but...
Young voters were a strong group for the Democrats, but less so for the Republicans.

% of validated voters who reported voting for each candidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share voting for</td>
<td>Margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>58% 28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>51 49</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>45 51</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>44 53</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generation (born)
Millennial/Gen Z (1981-'02)
Millennial (1981-'96) 56 31 25 67 28 39
Gen X (1965-'80) 49 43 6 55 44 11
Baby Boomer (1946-'64) 46 50 4% 49 49 0
Silent (1928-'45) 39 58 19% 42 58 16%

Notes: Based on 3,014 (2016), 7,585 (2018) and 9,688 (2020) validated general election voters who have voted in commercial voter files. Vote choice for all years is from a post-election survey. 2018 includes all single year old voters. See Methodology for details. Don’t know responses not shown. There were insufficient Gen Z adults.
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These patterns also are apparent when the lens is shifted to birth groups of voters who share birth years and perhaps formative political experiences, such as the popularity of the president at the time they were born.

Voters in the youngest adult generations today – Generation Z (ages 16 to 20) and the Millennial generation (ages 24 to 39 in 2020) – for Biden by a margin of 20 percentage points, though Trump gained 8 percentage points compared with his 2016 performance. Generation Xers, those aged 40 to 55, divided relatively evenly (51% to 48%), as did Baby Boomers. Older age groups, such as the Silent Generation, ages 75 to 92 in 2020, was Trump clearly favored. Notably, Boomers and Silents (and the very small number of voters in the Greatest Generation) made up less than half of the electorate in 2020 (43%) for the first time, and were over half in both 2016 and 2018.
Democrats gained among suburban voters in 2018 and 2020

% of validated voters who reported voting for each candidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share voting for ...</td>
<td>Margin (Dem.-Rep.)</td>
<td>Share voting for ...</td>
<td>Margin (Dem.-Rep.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on 3,014 (2016), 7,585 (2018) and 9,668 (2020) validated general election voters who have voted in commercial voter files. Vote choice for all years is from a post-election survey. 2018 candidate, See Methodology for details. Location in an urban, suburban or rural area is self-reported. Source: Surveys of U.S. adults conducted Nov. 29-Dec. 12, 2016, Nov. 7-16, 2018, and Nov. 12-18, 2020. "Behind Biden’s 2020 Victory"
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Religion

Voters in 2020 sorted along religious lines in ways consistent with past elections. Christians constituted nearly half of all voters (46%), as they do in most years. Among Christians, Protestants constituted 29% of all voters in 2020. Within the Protestant tradition, White evangelicals accounted for 19% of all voters, compared with 34% of Black Protestants. Without such broad support for his rival, Trump would have been unlikely to have won a majority of White voters (57%-43%), while Black Protestants were an overwhelmingly Democratic group (77%-23%).

White non-evangelical Protestants voted for Trump over Biden (57%-43%), while Black Protestants were an overwhelmingly Democratic group (77%-23%).
### Stable voting patterns among most religious groups

**% of validated voters who reported voting for each candidate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share voting for</strong></td>
<td><strong>Margin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinton</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trump</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White evang. Prot.</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-evang. Prot.</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Protestant</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race Protestant</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Catholic</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Catholic</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET Unaffiliated</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in particular</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Attend religious services
- Monthly or more often: 37% Clinton, 58% Trump, **21**
- Yearly or less often: 54% Clinton, 38% Trump, **16**

### Notes
- Based on 3.014 (2016), 7.585 (2018) and 9.668 validated general election voters. Validated in commercial voter files. Vote choice for all years is from a post-election survey. 2018 figures include Methodology for details. White and Black adults include only those who report being only one race. Don’t know responses not shown.

### Source
- Surveys of U.S. adults conducted Nov. 29-Dec. 12, 2016; Nov. 7-16, 2018; and Nov. 12-16, 2020. 
- "Behind Biden’s 2020 Victory" 

---

Biden, by contrast, drew strong support from religiously unaffiliated voters, agnostics, and those who say their religion is “nothing in particular.” Unaffiliated voters made up 25% of voters, which is a slightly larger share of White evangelicals (19%). But support for Biden among the unaffiliated was lopsided as Trump’s support among White evangelicals (a 45-point margin) was compared to a 69-point margin for Trump among the unaffiliated vs. a 69-point margin for Trump among the religiously unaffiliated. Without the religiously unaffiliated, Trump would have had a 9-point margin over Biden.
Democratic voting coalition in 2020 looked quite different from the Republican coalition in several respects. Overall, Biden voters were younger, more racially and ethnically diverse, and less likely to live in rural areas than Trump voters.

In 2020, 85% of voters who cast a ballot for Trump were White non-Hispanic; this compares with just 61% of Biden voters. These differences are roughly consistent with the share of White voters in each party’s coalition in 2016.

Nearly two-in-ten voters who cast a ballot for Biden in the 2020 election (19%) were Black, identical to the share of Clinton voters in 2016 who were Black. The share of Trump voters who were Black was significantly higher than the share of Trump voters who were Black in 2016.

The community profiles of Trump and Biden voters are similar in some fundamental ways to the previous two elections – but more voters...
Democratic coalition compared with the Republican coalition. And rural voters remain a significantly larger portion of the Republican electorate.

However, when comparing Clinton’s voters with Biden’s, there are some significant shifts. In 2016, about half of Clinton’s voters described their communities as suburban (48%), while 32% said they were from an urban area and 19% were from a rural area.

In 2020, suburban voters made up a majority of Biden’s coalition (55%); 28% of his voters said they lived in urban areas and 17% were from rural areas.

In 2020, 31% of Trump voters had at least a four-year college degree – similar to the share of Trump voters who had a college degree in 2016. Far more Trump voters (roughly 70% in each year) had at least some college education. The share of suburban voters who had at least some college education increased from 50% in 2016 to 53% in 2020, while urban voters rose to 52%. Rural voters’ share declined to 22% in 2020.
had at least a college degree; 53% did not have a degree.

As was the case in 2016, White voters without a four-year college degree made up a considerably larger share of GOP voters (58%) than Democratic voters (27%). At the same time, White voters with a college degree made up a larger share of Biden voters (34%) than Trump voters (27%).

In 2020, the age profiles of Democratic and Republican voters looked largely similar to 2016. Younger adults continue to make up a larger share of Democratic voters compared with Republican voters. For example, in 2020, nearly half of Biden voters (49%) were younger than 50; that compares with 39% of Trump voters in 2020.

Protestants made up a majority of those voting Republican in 2020, just as they did in 2016.
coalition, making up 34% of Trump’s voters but just 6% of Biden’s.

Catholics made up similar shares of Biden and Trump voters (19% and 22%, respectively); in 2016, Catholics made up a slightly higher share of Trump voters compared with Clinton voters (23% vs. 18%). Voters who were unaffiliated with any religious tradition (atheists, agnostics and those who describe themselves as “nothing in particular”) made up 35% of Biden voters but just 14% of Trump voters in 2020.
Catholics were about one-fifth of validated voters in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

White evangelical Protestants constituted roughly a third of candidates in the past three elections

Composition of validated voters who voted for Democratic and Republican candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White Mainline Protestant</th>
<th>White Evangelical Protestant</th>
<th>Black Protestant</th>
<th>Other Race Protestant</th>
<th>White, non-Hispanic Catholic</th>
<th>Hispanic Catholic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Democratic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White Mainline Protestant</th>
<th>White Evangelical Protestant</th>
<th>Black Protestant</th>
<th>Other Race Protestant</th>
<th>White, non-Hispanic Catholic</th>
<th>Hispanic Catholic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Republican

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White Mainline Protestant</th>
<th>White Evangelical Protestant</th>
<th>Black Protestant</th>
<th>Other Race Protestant</th>
<th>White, non-Hispanic Catholic</th>
<th>Hispanic Catholic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on 3,014 (2016), 7,585 (2018) and 9,065 validated general election voters. Validated commercial voter files. Vote chosen for all years is from a post-election survey. 2018 figures indicate Methodology for details. White and Black adults include only those who report being only one race. Don’t know responses not shown.
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Voting methods in the 2020 presidential election

The 2020 election brought a huge change in how Americans cast their ballots. As some states
result, a record number of voters said they cast their ballots this way (46%). And smaller shares of voters said they either voted in person on Election Day (27%) or in person before Election Day (27%).

A majority of absentee voters said they had previously voted this way before the 2020 election (56%). Still, a sizable share (43%) said the November election was the first time they had cast an absentee or mail ballot.

Sizable shares of voters across racial and ethnic subgroups cast absentee or mail-in ballots in the 2020 election – though there are some differences in voting methods when comparing across groups. White voters were most likely to say they voted in person on Election Day (30%). Comparably smaller shares of Black (20%) and Hispanic voters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of validated voters who said they voted by</th>
<th>In person, Election Day</th>
<th>In person, early</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among those who voted by mail or absentee, % who say

Notes: Based on 9,668 validated general election respondents to have voted in commercial voter files. Method of data collection: Election survey. See Methodology for details.
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Hispanic voters and 25% of White voters).

Voters ages 65 and older stand out in their voting behavior: 55% say they voted absentee or by mail in the 2020 election – 13 percentage points higher than the share of adults under 65 who cast a ballot by mail.

Urban and suburban voters were considerably more likely than rural voters to say they cast their ballot by mail (50% of urban and suburban vs. 35% of rural voters). In contrast, rural voters were more likely to report voting in person on Election Day.

A majority of Biden voters said they voted absentee or by mail in the 2020 election (58%). By contrast, about a third of Trump voters (32%) voted by mail. Roughly two-thirds of Trump voters (68%) said they voted in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In person, Election Day</th>
<th>In person, early</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18-29</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump voters</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biden voters</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on 9,668 validated general election voters who have voted in commercial voter files. Vote choice reports from a post-election survey. See Methodology for those who report being only one race and ethnicity. Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted Nov. 12-18, 2020. “Behind Biden’s 2020 Victory”
These shares were reversed among absentee and mail-in voters: 65% of absentee voters said they voted for Biden, compared with 33% who voted for Trump.

Preferences were more evenly divided among those who cast their ballots in person ahead of Election Day: 52% voted for Trump while 47% voted for Biden.

Voters and nonvoters

The 2020 general election featured the highest rate of voter turnout in a century, with 66% of eligible adults casting a ballot for president.

All members of the American Trends Panel who took the 2020 presidential election survey, whether they voted or not – were asked which candidate they preferred for president. Nonvoters – citizens for whom no record of turnout data was available – told us they did not vote – preferred Joe Biden over Donald Trump by 53% to 47%, a 6-point margin. Among those who did vote, the margin was 52% to 47%, a 5-point margin.

Voters were nearly evenly divided on party affiliation, with 50% identifying or leaning Democratic and 48% identifying or leaning Republican, similar to 2016. Nonvoters in 2020 were more closely divided on partisanship than 2016. Among nonvoters in 2020, 46% were Democrats or leaned Democratic, compared with 45% Republicans or leaned Republican. A majority of nonvoters were Republicans or leaned Republican. A majority of nonvoters were Democrats or Democratic leaners, compared with about four-in-ten Republicans or leaned toward the Republican Party.
Voters as a group were considerably older than nonvoters. Adults aged 65 and older made up 45% of all voters but 68% of nonvoters - nearly identical to the 66% of eligible nonvoters who voted in 2016.

But generational change in the electorate was quite apparent. Voters aged 18 to 24 (born 1997 and later) were eligible to vote in the 2016 electorate at just 5% of all voters that year. In 2020, they were 8% of the total, though their high-turnout compared with older age cohorts is reflected in the fact that 45% of eligible nonvoters. At the other end of the generational spectrum, members of the Greatest generations (born 1945 and earlier) fell from 16% of eligible nonvoters in 2016 to 8% in 2020, but their turnout rates remained among the highest.
Despite higher turnout, wide disparities by age and race in 2020

**Composition of validated voters and nonvoters (%)**

**Candidate preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voters 2016</th>
<th>Voters 2020</th>
<th>Non-voters 2016</th>
<th>Non-voters 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donald Trump</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton/ Joe Biden</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Party affiliation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voters 2016</th>
<th>Voters 2020</th>
<th>Non-voters 2016</th>
<th>Non-voters 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dem/Lean Dem</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/Lean Rep</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voters 2016</th>
<th>Voters 2020</th>
<th>Non-voters 2016</th>
<th>Non-voters 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Z (1997+)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial (1981-96)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (1965-80)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers (1946-64)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent (1928-45)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Race/ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voters 2016</th>
<th>Voters 2020</th>
<th>Non-voters 2016</th>
<th>Non-voters 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on 3,014 (2016) and 9,688 (2020) validated general election voters and 756 (2016) validated nonvoters. Validated voters are those found to have voted in commercial voter files. Nonvoters were citizens who were not found in any of the voter files. Vote choice for both years are from post-election surveys. See Methodology. Adults include those who report being only one race and are not Hispanic; Hispanics are of any race only. Don’t know responses not shown.
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As in 2016, voters in 2020 had more formal education than nonvoters.

Composition of validated voters and nonvoters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Voters 2016</th>
<th>Nonvoters 2016</th>
<th>Voters 2020</th>
<th>Nonvoters 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS or less</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-grad</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on 3,014 (2016) and 9,668 (2020) validated voters and 1,477 (2016) and 1,477 (2020) validated nonvoters. Voters were those who voted in commercial voter files. Nonvoters were those with no record of voting in any of the voter files. Vote choices were determined from surveys. See Methodology for details. Don’t know: 1%
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voters, but a slightly larger share (14%) of nonvoting citizens, and Hispanic adults were 10% of voters but 20% of nonvoting citizens. Asian Americans (a relatively small but fast-growing group in the U.S.) made up 4% of voters and an identical share of nonvoting citizens (note: nonvoters in this analysis do not include noncitizens).

Some of the largest differences between voters and nonvoters are seen on education and income. College graduates made up 39% of all voters in 2020 (about the same as in 2016) but only 17% of nonvoters. Adults with a high school education or less were 29% of all voters but half of nonvoters.
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In times of uncertainty, good decisions demand good data. Please support our research with a financial contribution.
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Electors are unconstitutionally decided by municipal clerks in Wisconsin & WEC’s assign this obligation to the WEC statute enacted by the legislature both the Wisconsin Constitution and elections law: "WEC website). "WEC administrative and enforce Wisconsin regulations agency: WEC photo."
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The receptive commission and partisan staff act academic theories for changes to WEC rules; and,
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public officials fear of that negative publicity;
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the need for control the outcome;
the left to obtain a relatively few number of votes
purple nature of the state resulting in the need for
All of these factors-
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Outline of the Rules for Radicals:
3. Opportunity for public comment on the proposed rule.

2. Submission to the Legislative Reference Bureau for an opinion on the legality of the proposed rule.

1. Publication of the proposed rule for the world to see.

Administrative rulemaking:

Usually, WEC would have to follow the three stages of a rulemaking process:

- Windmill (s) willing to risk the scrutiny of.
- Lawyer(s) adequately prepared, competent and interested.
- Find:

Courts:

- Either go to the Legislature (good option).
- The only recourse for a concerned voter.
- Laws governing elections without input.
- In practice, WEC staff attorneys make.

Consequences for voters:

The significance of the effect of the 3-3 partisan

The WEC: the illegitimate masters of elections.
1. Tell people what you want to do;

2. Ask the legislature’s lawyers if the proposed action is legal, and;

3. Give the public opportunity for comment.

Requirements for administrative rulemaking:

Designed to ask the Wisconsin Supreme Court to order WEC to follow the
In 2017, WEC had followed the law by deactivating around 250,000 voters.

[Headline: Dan O'G] which they were registered to vote

WEC refused to deactivate 234,000 voters who had self-reported moving

"Movers list" received by WEC

begins in October 2019

234,000 Phantom voters (that we know about)
3. Circuit Court Judge Mallory in Ozaukee County determined that W

count Court for failing to follow the law.

1. At some point in the intervening 18 months, WEC strategized with un

2. The media falsely and repeatedly referred to this as a "purge" of voters,

3. Iterable to disobey the law and/or groups they don't have to tell us and the strategy meetings are

4. Insufficient fear in any elected official who wanted to follow the law.

5. Generate public support for WEC and