
I. Truth in Elections

SCHILLER INSTITUTE

International Investigative Commission on Truth in Elections

November 28, 2020, Noon to 3:45 PM

The full video of the Commission meeting is available [here](#).

Schiller Institute Commission Hearing on Massive U.S. Election Fraud

by Dennis Small

Nov. 28—The Schiller Institute today convened an International Investigative Commission on Truth in Elections, consisting of a panel of jurists from the U.S., Mexico, Dominican Republic, and Argentina. Expert testimony before the Commission was presented by National Security Agency whistleblower and former technical director William Binney; LaRouche associate Harley Schlanger of the Schiller Institute; former chief of the Army Criminal Law Division, Office of the Judge Advocate General at the Pentagon, Col. Richard Black (ret.); Pennsylvania State Senator Mario Scavello; Shelby County, Tennessee Election Commissioner Bennie Smith; and Pennsylvania GOP Committeewoman, Leah Hoopes.

The hearings were conducted with simultaneous interpretation in Spanish, and have been broadcast live over YouTube to thousands of listeners in the United States and abroad. Select media were also present and were able to ask questions.

The call to convene the hearing stated:

The ongoing electoral process in the United States is a matter of great international attention and concern. This is not a partisan issue. Some of the participants are, in their own political views, pro-Trump; some are anti-Trump. But what brings them together is a far greater issue: a concern over the universal importance of truth in elections, and the need to hold the United

States to the same high standard as its own Constitution demands. The reports will address both irregularities in that electoral process as well as cyber capabilities that are known to exist and which have been used in foreign countries in recent years, and which may have been used inside the United States for the first time in 2020.

The hearings did just that, as the reader will see in the excerpts presented below. In addition to the direct testimony provided by the witnesses, detailed documentation was made available from the Michigan and Georgia court filings by Attorney Sidney Powell. The witnesses were questioned at length by the panel of four international jurists:

- Marino Elsevyf (Dominican Republic): professor of Constitutional and Criminal Law at the University of Santo Domingo, with 41 years of experience as a practicing attorney; member of the 1995 Martin Luther King International Tribunal

- Dr. Simón Levy (Mexico): Doctor of Law from the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM); former Under-Secretary of Tourism of Mexico (2018-2019); Master of Laws Degree from Renmin University in China

- Juan Francisco Soto (Argentina): Constitutional attorney; former professor of Constitutional Law at the University of Buenos Aires; legal counsel to Yacyreá Bi-

national Entity (Paraguayan-Argentinian Yacyretá Dam)

- David Meiswinkle (United States): Criminal defense attorney in the state of New Jersey, where he overturned a primary election based on vote fraud; U.S. Army veteran and former police officer.

A Rapporteur from the panel of jurists is now preparing a report summarizing the hearing and the panel's findings, which will be made public shortly and presented before an international audience at the December 12-13 Schiller Institute conference, "The World after the U.S. Election: Creating A World Based on Reason." Readers can register [here](#) for that conference.

Moderator Jason Ross of the Schiller Institute concluded the nearly four hours of powerful presentations as follows:

On the massive evidence of vote fraud in the November 3 election, in terms of the outcome of this hearing we had today, we have heard all manner of testimony about the context in which this election took place, a context involving threats of a military coup, of years of lies about Russiagate creating a climate of hostility against the results of the last election, the 2016 election, and we've gotten some idea of the broader world context that all of this occurs in.

To understand that an outcome of an election is something that we can trust and accept, even if it doesn't go the way we want, well, that demands transparency. And we've heard so many

ways that that transparency simply did not exist, it was made impossible, and the potentials for fraud were engendered by that.

Regarding the legal suits, I encourage everybody: Read the filings. If you think, "where's the evidence?" There's plenty of it. You can go ahead and read those Georgia and Michigan filings—unless Facebook or Twitter has blocked links to them again. You can see the affidavits, the evidence that's been submitted with them, you can have a look at it, yourself. We've linked it all on the Schiller Institute website. (See both the full Hearing and the links [here](#).)

If you live in Pennsylvania, Arizona, Michigan, for example, you can get in touch with your state legislators and urge them to consider whether it's appropriate for them to use their legislative power to redefine the appointment of electors in this election.

So, really, who benefits from having such non-transparent elections? What would be the goal in creating a system where, here we are, fifty years after putting a man on the Moon, and we can't run an election that offers results that can be accepted and trusted and believed by so many people in the United States?

I encourage you, personally, to investigate this, look through the evidence, and take appropriate actions based on what you come to discover. And that's certainly what we'll be doing.