

Three Striking Examples of Voting Machine Election Fraud

2002 "Diebold" Elections: GOP gained control of Senate with 5 big upsets. One of those overturned Senate seats was in Georgia, where Diebold paperless DRE machines were installed for the first time in every polling site in the state. In that election Sen. Max Cleland (D) went down to defeat in an 11% reversal from the pre-election tracking polls, and the Democratic Senator, Sonny Purdue, lost in a 16-percent reversal. A majority of the state legislative seats also turned party, ending a 150-year history of Democratic majority control and transforming Georgia into a GOP-dominated state overnight. Exit polls were never released because Batelle Corp., the national military contractor charged with running the exit polls, claimed an inability to correctly operate their computers.

2004 Exit Poll "Red Shift": Election results defied pre-election tracking and exit polls, favoring GOP unidirectionally against statistical probability in all the most critical locations most required for GOP victory. Bush outperformed Exit Poll expectations in 10 of 10 battleground states: (odds: 2000:1) and in 44 of 50 states overall (odds: 63 million:1). [See appendix B of Freeman's book, "Was the 2004 Presidential Election Stolen?"]

Nature of 2004 Exit Poll Discrepancy: Disparity was greater in battleground states than in non-battleground states, was greater yet in the most critical battleground states; and in states with Republican governors, and where there were concentrations of African American voters, in all cases being places where Election Day problems were reported and where E-voting machines counted the votes. In hand-counted paper ballot (HCPB) election districts there was no discrepancy between exit polls and official results; but where machines counted the votes, there was an average 7 percentage point disparity nationwide (almost 10 million votes).

Election Fraud Attacks Expected in 2008

- Improper and illegal voter registration purging (already long underway and documented)
- Voter suppression "dirty tricks"
- Intensive voter "challenging" in states that allow it, zealous issuing of provisional ballots (often never counted)
- Delay, diversion, and substitution of absentee ballots (nearly half the vote in some states such as CA)
- "Denial of service" (insufficient voting machines and high machine failure rates causing voting bottlenecks)
- "Man in the middle" attacks altering vote data as it is secretly redirected through partisan servers (IL, CO, KY)
- DRE machine fraud: vote "hopping", vote transfer by ratio, "accidental" vote erasure or failure to record
- Programmable op scan "read errors" in certain ballot positions, and other ballot definition file manipulations
- Central tabulator machine fraud, altering vote totals/ratios after ballots are cast and while they are totaled
- "Improved" protocol for media exit poll calls for total quarantine of polling data, integrating polling with rigging.
- Chain of custody lapses if and when a recount is triggered

Voter Registration Purging

Massive selective purging is going on and already apparent. The CBS Nightly News for Oct. 3, 2008 reported findings from a new study by the non-partisan Brennan Center for Justice on "voter purges." This report noted 10,000 voters purged in Mississippi, 21,000 in Louisiana and "to top it off, another new study discovered 19 states are ignoring federal law (the National Voter Registration Act), banning systematic purges within 90 days of a federal election."

Among those 19, are a number of battleground states. The report lists: Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Texas and Washington, as places where massive purges have recently taken place.

Locations Where Votes Are Most at Risk

The swing states: OH, PA, MO, NM, FL, VA, CO, MI, WI, etc. -- and particularly those states with all paperless-DRE machines (PA) and large urban population centers with a controlling share of the state's votes (e.g. Philadelphia and Pittsburg to take the example of PA).

A razor-thin victory in the Electoral College is simple to arrange by voting machine fraud, but achieving an apparent popular vote victory will require an unprecedented level of fraud because there appears to be a 20-million-vote gap between the two major-party presidential candidates. Votes will be stolen wherever conditions of high opportunity and low scrutiny coexist. Fraud will likely be found wherever:

- E-voting vendor technicians conduct the elections (many places)
- there is a partisan election administration (e.g., AZ's secretary of state is the McCain campaign state chair)
- machine vulnerabilities are high (paperless DREs, or Op Scans with no or poor audit provisions)
- and wherever there is a remotely competitive House or Senate contest.