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Will your November vote count if the black box eats it and there is no paper record to back it up?

INVISIBLE BALLOTS
A Temptation for Electronic Vote Fraud

NEW video documentary!
For a preview, visit www.invisibleballots.com.

Installing new computerized voting systems by the thousands, with no paper record to verify accuracy, would a voter paper receipt be sufficient for a possible recount or is offering paper receipts a ploy to make voters think that manufacturers are solving the problem when, in fact, they are not?

These and many more questions are answered by a distinguished group of experts who appear in an in-depth expose of electronic voting titled: “Invisible Ballots A Temptation for Electronic Vote Fraud”.

In this just released new documentary, Dr. David Dill, Professor of Computer Science at Stanford, Dr. Rebecca Mercuri, Research Fellow at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, Bev Harris, independent investigator and author of Black Box Voting, Dr. Avi Rubin, Technical Director of the Information Security Institute at Johns Hopkins, and Kim Alexander, Founder of the California Voter Foundation get together to discuss the little “black box” and open our eyes to the possibility that private companies, not allowing voters to inspect their software, will control elections. Voting is coming under the control of private corporations using proprietary software with little or no independent oversight. It is a shocking discovery that these companies and the people who run them are rife with corruption and insider alliances. Mysterious election upsets are increasing, and verified recounts are impossible.

Invisible Ballots, Directed by Academy Award nominated filmmaker William Gazecki and released by Reality Zone (http://www.realityzone.com/), casts serious doubt upon the integrity of the November 2004 elections – and beyond. If we are to preserve representative government, the public must learn the facts revealed in this documentary and take action quickly!

* * * *
May 19 - 25, 2004

Seattle Weekly


The feds want to know who’s been visiting the Web site of voting watchdog Bev Harris, and they’re likely to get what they want.

By: George Howland Jr.

Computer-voting watchdog Bev Harris is squaring off with federal authorities over the government's request for information about visitors to her internationally renowned Web site, www.blackboxvoting.org. While Harris is determined to resist the government's investigation, a national expert on press freedom says the Renton muckraker will almost certainly face extensive fines or jail time if she refuses to cooperate.

In the past 20 months, Harris has become America’s leading critic of electronic voting (see “Black Box Backlash,” March 10). Her reporting on the problems with new computer voting machines has been a key component in a national, grassroots movement to safeguard voting. Her astounding discoveries have resulted in important studies by distinguished computer scientists. She has been leaked thousands of pages of internal memos from Diebold Election Systems, one of the country’s leading electronic voting companies. She is frequently cited by newspapers across the country and is a guest on national and local television and radio stations. Thousands of people visit her Web site and participate in its reader forums. Now, Harris claims, the government wants our names, forum messages, and computer addresses.

Following the advice of her lawyer, Harris will not talk publicly about the government’s investigation. Seattle Weekly used postings from Harris’ Web site and interviewed other people involved with the investigation to put together this account.

The investigation began last October, when VoteHere, an electronic voting software company in Bellevue, reported that a hacker broke into its computer network. VoteHere founder and Chief Executive Officer Jim Adler says, “We didn’t think it was a big deal.” Adler confirms, however, that the FBI and the Secret Service are investigating the matter. “A crime is a crime is a crime,” he points out. Adler says there was evidence that the hacker was politically motivated and was involved somehow in the leak of internal documents at Diebold—although he will not discuss specifics, at the request of federal law enforcement agencies.

Last September, Harris was the first person to publicly post the Diebold memos, which contain a variety of embarrassing internal e-mails, on the Internet. The resulting furor produced a wave of bad publicity for the company. (On April 30, California Secretary of State Kevin Shelley banned the use of Diebold’s voting machines in four California
counties and called on the state attorney general to investigate the corporation for allegedly lying to public officials about testing and federal certification of its products.)

On blackboxvoting.org, Harris writes that in October, a month after she posted the Diebold memos, she was e-mailed a link that would take her to stolen VoteHere software. She didn’t click on the link, because she thought someone was trying to entrap her. Four months earlier, VoteHere had announced their intention to release their software for public examination. “Why would anyone in their right mind grab the stuff in some clandestine manner when it was being released into the open momentarily?” she writes.

VoteHere’s Adler says the company isn’t sure whether the hacker made off with its source code. He, too, however, expresses confusion about why somebody would steal something that was about to be publicly released.

Despite her reservations, Harris did follow up with a person who claimed to be the VoteHere hacker. She conducted a telephone interview with him but afterward felt even less sure of the veracity of his claims to have possession of the VoteHere source code. “I did not find him to be credible. It appeared to be an entrapment scheme,” she states. Harris also says the VoteHere hacker and the Diebold memo leaker are not the same person. “I am dead certain of this,” she writes.

On Jan. 9, Harris says, she had her first meeting with Secret Service agent Michael Levin about the hack. Levin would not confirm that he met with Harris, but he does acknowledge that there is an ongoing investigation and refers to Harris by her first name. Levin is the supervisor from the Secret Service for the Northwest Cyber Crime Task Force, an interagency law enforcement group that includes the FBI, the Internal Revenue Service, the Washington State Patrol, and the Seattle Police Department.

To date, Harris writes, she has had five meetings with Levin. By April 29, she was completely fed up. “This investigation no longer passes the stink test,” she writes. “I’ll tell you what it looks like to me: a fishing expedition.” Harris states that the Secret Service claims it is investigating the VoteHere hack but never spends much time on it while interviewing her. “Most of the time is spent on the Diebold memos, which they claim they are not investigating.”

Harris sounds the alarm about what the government wants her to turn over. “They want the logs of my Web site with all the forum messages and the IP [Internet protocol] addresses.” IP addresses are unique, numerical pointers to one or more computers on the Internet, making it possible to identify, or narrow the search for, a computer that has visited a given Web site. Writes Harris: “This has nothing to do with a VoteHere ‘hack’ investigation, and I have refused to turn it over.

“So, yesterday, they call me up and tell me they are going to subpoena me and put me in front of a grand jury. Well, let ’em. They still aren’t getting the list of members of blackboxvoting.org unless they seize my computer—which my attorney tells me might be what they had in mind.”
Harris also says Levin told her that he was on the same plane as her on one of the activist’s recent speaking tours. “What’s that supposed to do? Scare me?” she asks.

**Harris obviously** hopes that the information on her computer can be kept private because she considers herself a journalist. “[Y]ou can’t investigate leaks to journalists by going in and grabbing the reporter’s computer,” she writes.

But Lucy Dalglish, executive director of the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press in Washington, D.C., isn’t so confident. Harris faces two key questions, explains Dalglish. First, is she a journalist? And second, can a journalist successfully resist a subpoena from a federal grand jury? Dalglish says that federal appeals courts, including the Ninth Circuit that has jurisdiction in Washington, have defined a journalist as someone who is collecting information to disseminate it widely to the general public. Certainly Harris is doing that. That she is not an employee of a traditional news organization—and that her Web site focuses on a very specific subject, voting security—would work against her legal claim of being a journalist, Dalglish says. But she thinks Harris could overcome those issues with a good lawyer.

When it comes to a federal grand jury subpoena, however, being a journalist doesn’t give you any immunity, Dalglish says. U.S. attorneys, the federal government’s chief prosecutors, can convene grand juries to present evidence to indict someone for a crime. In a grand jury proceeding, explains FBI Supervising Special Agent Greg Fowler, who oversees the Northwest Cyber Crime Task Force, there are no judges or defense attorneys. The U.S. attorneys present evidence and call and question witnesses in front of the jury, says Fowler. The jurors do not reach a verdict of guilty or innocent, he says, but, rather, vote on whether the evidence and witnesses presented support the indictment sought by the federal prosecutor. Since the proceedings of grand juries are secret, Fowler will not comment on whether Harris will be subpoenaed, as she predicts on her Web site.

If Harris is subpoenaed, however, Dalglish says being a journalist doesn’t mean anything. “In a federal grand jury investigation, there is almost no protection,” she says. “There is nothing more difficult to quash than a federal grand jury subpoena.” Dalglish says if Harris refuses to cooperate, she will almost certainly face judicial sanctions. “This is the classic situation where you get fined or go to jail,” she says. Dalglish says that if Harris is served with a subpoena, a good attorney would try to get it tossed out for reasons of relevancy—that Harris’ records have nothing to do with the VoteHere hack—rather than claiming journalistic immunity. If that argument failed, the identities of those of us who have visited [blackboxvoting.org](http://blackboxvoting.org) might wind up in the files of federal law-enforcement authorities.

In her last public summary of the investigation, Harris wrote, “Yeah, I’m not a happy camper. Taking the pulse of our democracy nowadays, it doesn’t feel very healthy, does it?”

ghowland@seattleweekly.com
**Colorado:**
Man Charged With Forging Voter Registration Forms
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1197183/posts

**Florida/New York:**
ABC News Radio: Massive voter fraud found in Florida
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1199028/posts

**Florida/Multi states:**
If they could just stop voter fraud, Pres. Bush would win by a land slide.
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1201378/posts

**Michigan:**
Campaign workers suspected of fraud; Voter-registration problems probed (MI)
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1224716/posts

**Missouri:**
Judge grants Democrats' request to block election results
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1189738/posts

**Nevada:**
Voter Registration Fraud in Nevada
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1168938/posts

Fake voter sign-ups increasing
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1168849/posts

Nevada County Sees Surge in Fake Voter Registration
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1168427/posts

**New Mexico:**
N.M. kids getting voter ID cards
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1195535/posts

Voter ID scuffle coming to a head (more DemoRat fraud)
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1228604/posts

**North Carolina:**
State investigates voter drive
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1194637/posts

**Ohio:**
Voter Registration Swells In Major Ohio Counties (Almost all Democrat - Major Fraud
Underway)

Dead man on voter rolls sparks inquiry  
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1225358/posts

Tennessee:  
Attempted Democratic Voter Fraud in Nashville  
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1229164/posts

Wisconsin:  
Leftists refuse to do the right thing. Voter Fraud  
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1218496/posts

College student makes court appearance on voter fraud charge  
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1212216/posts

Dead man on voter rolls sparks inquiry  
http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1225358/posts

* * * *

Reprinted from NewsMax.com  
John Fund: Voter Fraud Common  
Paige McKenzie  
Monday, Oct. 4, 2004


No, we are not talking about a banana republic south of the border.

We are talking about states like California, Hawaii, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, South Dakota, Texas and – of course – Florida.

According to Wall Street Journal writer John Fund, they are among the states where voter fraud is commonplace.

For the first time, John Fund exposes how vote fraud is stealing America’s democracy in his new book “Stealing Elections – How Voter Fraud Threatens Our Democracy.” [NewsMax has copies of “Stealing Election” – get this important book before Election Day -- Click Here,]

Not only does Fund unfold just how easy it is to steal an election in America, he also reveals the damaging unintended consequences of continued so-called election reform laws.
According to Fund, “At least eight of the 19 hijackers who attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were actually able to register to vote in either Virginia or Florida while they made their deadly preparations for 9/11.” He notes other examples:

In 1990, the North Carolina Republican Party mailed postcards to hundreds of thousands of black voters telling them they would go to prison if they voted improperly.

In 1988, California Republicans in one assembly district hired “poll guards” to carry signs in Spanish and English that read: “noncitizens can’t vote.”

“[T]he most embarrassing incident involving what Democrats claimed was an effort to suppress minority turnout occurred in 1986 when the Republican National committee agreed to end a ballot security program in Louisiana. It had sent letters to voters in precincts where Republicans had gotten less than 20 percent of the vote in the 1984 election to see if they actually lived at the address shown on their registration. If the letters were returned by the post office – as 31,000 were – the names were handed over to voter registrars with a request that they be purged. A judge found that the precincts were GOP support was below 20 percent coincided almost exactly with precincts where blacks were a clear majority.”

And though Democrats in 2000 were found to have traded “smokes-for-votes” on behalf Gore-Lieberman, Fund says some Republicans in Kentucky have been known to engage in similar efforts in local races with pints of Jack Daniels.

**Democrats’ Dirty Little Secret**

Fund quotes political analyst Larry Sabato and Glenn Simpson from their book, Dirty Little Secrets: “Republican base voters are middle-class and not easily induced to commit fraud, while “the pool of people who appear to be available and more vulnerable to an invitation to participate in vote fraud tend to lean Democratic.”

Amazingly, others even justify this fact. It seems there is no end to the lengths many Democrats will go to perpetuate class warfare in promoting socialism.

* * * *

By James Moffat
October 7, 2004

Times-News
------------------------

The county’s top cop said he is going after illegal aliens who he believes have committed voter registration fraud.
Sheriff Terry Johnson told the Alamance County commissioners this week that his department will go door to door and arrest illegal aliens, specifically Hispanics, who have registered to vote using false documentation.

“We’re certainly going to pursue it,” Johnson said. “Laws are laws. I wouldn’t be here if I wasn’t (serious).”

Voter registration fraud is a Class I felony. People convicted can receive up to 15 months in jail.

According to the state Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), people can register to vote when they are “conducting official business,” such as obtaining or renewing driver’s licenses or identification cards.

Johnson contends that illegal aliens are using false documents to obtain licenses and, at the same time, registering to vote.

The sheriff said his deputies will use information from the Alamance County Board of Elections, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the DMV to investigate whether Hispanics have illegally registered to vote. Some of that information was obtained for the sheriff by County Attorney David Smith, who asked for, and received, a “sample list” of 125 Hispanics registered to vote from the Board of Elections.

Board of Elections director Kathy Holland said Smith “asked specifically for Hispanic voters” when requesting the list some time ago.

Holland said she couldn’t remember exactly when Smith asked for and received the list. Smith did not return phone calls for comment.

The list of registered voters is a public document that can be obtained by anyone. That list was recently sent to the Immigration officials by Johnson to determine whether those people were illegal aliens.

Johnson said the agency could only confirm that 38 were in the country legally. He said the rest either were born in the United States, gave false names, or are illegal aliens, which Johnson believes is the case.

Johnson also said that he has gone to some of the addresses listed by the people who are undocumented and found empty lots or abandoned homes, which he said suggests that these people are in this country illegally.

Sue Brown of the Immigration service said the agency’s Charlotte office did a check for Alamance County based on information received from the DMV office. Brown said she didn’t know who asked for the check to be done.
Brown said her agency and the local DMV have a “working relationship” and do such checks from time to time because of “the large number of people coming through getting false ID and driver’s licenses” at the Alamance County branch. According to Brown, the agency determined that of the 125 names checked, two people were permanent residents and 13 were U.S. citizens. She said the remaining 110 people weren’t in the agency’s database, but that doesn’t mean they are illegal aliens.

She said her office determines whether someone is an illegal alien through personal investigation. She said an Immigration agent would have to visit the alleged alien and investigate their paperwork to determine whether they are in the country legally.

“We do not profile and we do not look at names to determine if they are here legally or illegally,” Brown said. “That’s not the way we work.”

Spokesman Randy Jones said the sheriff’s department has received numerous calls from the local DMV office about the use of false documents to obtain driver’s licenses, as well as to register to vote.

He said that in most of those cases, the department has “dealt with a large number of Hispanics.”

“It’s not a case of singling any one (group) out, but you can’t ignore the situation,” Jones said. “We don’t pick the race of our criminals. You have to respond to what you’ve got.”

Jones said that North Carolina is notorious for its lax approach to combating fake identifications. He said illegal aliens have come “in vanfuls” from out-of-state with false documents to obtain driver’s licenses and register to vote, which can have a major impact on elections.

“North Carolina has a reputation as the place to go to get a driver’s license,” Jones said. “It is not an uncommon thing to deal with to find someone that has three, four, five driver’s licenses.

“I think that has to be a concern. I believe in the fairness of one man, one vote. I don’t think you need anything to taint elections.”

Commissioner Tim Sutton commended the sheriff for his initiative, adding that the federal and state governments have “turned their heads” from enforcing federal immigration law.

* * *
September 26, 2004

Voter Fraud: Colorado Report

Denver blogger Joshua Sharf has an extensive report on voter fraud in Colorado over at his very good View From A Height blog. Plus a nice picture of my favorite city and (hopefully one day) future hometown. Until then, can I be an adjunct member of the Rocky Mountain Alliance of Blogs? Here's an excerpt from his link-filled must-read report:

Powerline reports on potential voter fraud in Wisconsin, and blogger Sandi is doing additional investigation. It turns out that one of the organizations involved, the New Voters Project, is active here in Colorado, and much of the same potential for fraud exists here, too.

Colorado, like a number of other battleground states, has seen voter registration drives, some of which have been crooked. Back in August, a large number of voter registration forms had incorrect addresses or names. Initially, some of these discrepancies were attributed to paid signature-collectors, with obvious incentive to pump up their numbers. It turned out that the firm overseeing this drive, as well as petition-gathering drives for some local and state initiatives was under investigation for some shenanigans in other states, as well.

When three local DAs joined the Attorney General's investigation, it was revealed that the local office of the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), had hired the firm in question to conduct a voter registration drive. (That would appear to let Amendment 36 off the hook for that part of the problem.)

ACORN itself is a pretty typical liberal organization, and voter registration drives are part of their work. As is union organizing. When it looked like they got caught with their hand in the cookie jar, they rubbed their toe in the dirt, looked down at their shoes, and said that, yeah, maybe some of these petitions originated with them.

ACORN seems to be on the wrong side of the voter fraud issue nationally. They've filed a lawsuit to extend the voter registration deadline past October 4 in Florida. The "pay-for-play" excuse has, it seems, gotten them into trouble elsewhere. ACORN has also had a worker take the Fifth in an investigation in New Mexico.

Finally, a local man was indicted for forging voter registration signatures. As of yet, there have been no additional indictments. Attorney General Salazar has a reputation for being above-board, but it's unconscionable that the hasn't recused himself from an investigation where he clearly has at least a potential conflict of interest.

Two other organizations that have been pushing voter registration drives in Colorado are the aforementioned New Voters Project (more about them momentarily) and Fair Vote
Colorado. Both of these organizations are almost universally described as "non-partisan," and yet both are run by either Democratic or Naderite political operatives.

* * * *

Source:
New York Daily News
http://www.nydailynews.com/

Exposed: Scandal of double voters

With debate over the 2000 election still raging, thousands of people illegally register in both New York City and Florida, which could swing an election.

By RUSS BUETTNER DAILY NEWS STAFF WRITER

With debate over the 2000 election still raging, thousands of people illegally register in both New York City and Florida, which could swing an election. Some 46,000 New Yorkers are registered to vote in both the city and Florida, a shocking finding that exposes both states to potential abuses that could alter the outcome of elections, a Daily News investigation shows.

Registering in two places is illegal in both states, but the massive snowbird scandal goes undetected because election officials don't check rolls across state lines.

* * * *

Why Bother Voting? Lawyers Get the Final Say

A new federal law will for the first time this fall require that provisional ballots be available at every precinct nationwide for use by voters who don't find their names listed on the registration rolls. After the polls close, each provisional ballot will then be verified by hand, a process that could take days or weeks, leaving a close presidential race in doubt while partisans argue about which votes are valid.

Provisional ballots "have the potential to be the chad of 2004," Doug Chapin, director of the Election Reform Information Project, told the Associated Press. "You open yourself up to the same kind of high-stakes politicization of the process we saw in Florida in 2000."

More than 44,000 people filled out provisional ballots in Los Angeles County alone in California's March primary. Nationwide, that level of voter participation might translate into 1.5 million provisional ballots. In 2002, in a razor-thin Congressional contest decided by 121 votes, Colorado officials took 34 days to count the 2,700 provisional ballots.
Many election officials are gearing up for an administrative nightmare and praying no election in their jurisdiction will be close enough to be determined by provisional ballots. Their worries will only be compounded by a flood of litigation seeking to loosen the rules for counting such ballots. One lawsuit filed by Missouri Democrats just this week in federal district court seeks a court order declaring that the federal law on provisional ballots invalidates a Missouri statute mandating that only votes cast by a voter at his or proper local polling place count. In essence, the suit seeks to eliminate the precinct system of voting and allow anyone to vote anywhere in a county -- at least provisionally -- in a county. A federal judge yesterday granted the plaintiffs an injunction preventing the certification of results from the state's Aug. 3 primary until the case is decided.

If the Missouri plaintiffs prevail, any voter could easily vote twice (once provisionally and once by regular ballot) or even three, four or more times. Folks also would find it easier to vote in local elections they are not eligible to vote in. If so, look for even more lawsuits seeking to make provisional ballots readily available in order to create what I call "designed chaos" at the polls. Florida in 2000 may have been only a curtain-raiser for the problems we could see this fall. --John Fund

posted on Opinion Journal Best of the Web Today, August 12, 2004

* * * *
Profile: Adam Stubblefield

By Niall McKay, Contributing Writer
17 May 2004 | Security Wire Perspectives

Last year, Adam Stubblefield was driving home from his summer internship at Microsoft Research in Redmond, Wash., thinking of how to find alternative password mechanisms, when it hit him. "I realized that the shape of clouds reminded me of objects in the real world," he said.

He had read that people presented with the same inkblot over a number of months said that it reminded them of the same set of words. The same technique, Stubblefield reasoned, could be used to help people remember forgotten passwords. So the college student spent the rest of his summer proving his theory, and Microsoft filed a patent. The method, it seems, has a better than 95% success rate, and the software giant is planning to include it in future products.

Stubblefield, now a second year doctoral student at Johns Hopkins University, is one of the rising stars in the world of computer security research. At 23, he was the youngest speaker at the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy in Oakland, Calif., last week, where he presented a paper on electronic voting technology.
Computer security has always been his calling. Even as a math undergraduate at Rice University, Stubblefield interned at Wang, Xerox's PARC and AT&T. He reverse engineered MP3.com's Beamit, a digital rights management software program, as a freshman. He was part of the team that cracked SDMI digital watermarking technology and co-authored a number of academic papers on topics from Web security to IP traceback. As a senior he also took an academic paper on a theoretical hole in the cipher RC4, used for encrypting WiFi (using WEP), and created an attack. His paper has given rise to use of new ciphers such as WPA as well as WiFi hacking tools like AirSnort.

Last summer, it was Stubblefield and UC San Diego's Yosh Kohno working with and under the guidance of professors Avi Rubin of Johns Hopkins University and Dan Wallach of Rice University who produced a report detailing the security problems with Diebold's electronic voting system, which created a great deal of controversy.

"What we found was that all the voting machines used the same secret encryption key code, that the code had never been changed and that all of the developers had access to it," he said. Other problems with the technology have led states to reconsider e-voting in the upcoming presidential election.

Stubblefield dismisses conspiracy theories that surround Diebold. "In some ways it's far worse than that, they just did not know what they were doing," he said. For example, they were able to analyze the Diebold voting machine source code because the company had accidentally left it on an open FTP server.

He is uninterested in the political activism that has emerged as a result of the report. "I do not have a political point of view that I am trying to prove. I am just interested in what I can contribute from a technical point of view," he said. "What I am surprised about, though, is that unlike previous discoveries such as SDMI or WEP, where the companies changed what they were doing because of the papers published, Diebold has done little to fix these problems."

As an undergraduate, Stubblefield was one of the eight researchers that cracked SDMI technology. The researchers had taken part in the SDMI public challenge in 2001, which offered $10,000 to anybody who could crack one of four digital watermarking technologies. The team cracked them all but rather than take the money, they attempted to publish the report. The music industry sued the group, led by Princeton professor Edward Felten, which eventually was able to publish its findings.

Now Stubblefield is working on his doctorate by developing new systems for implementing security technologies. For example, he's trying to create basic building blocks so that security programmers can more easily build in features, such as encryption and authentication, into products. It's sort of an algorithmic equivalent to object-oriented programming in that it could mean programmers won't have to build these features from scratch each time they build a new application.
"As an academic, all I want to do is to make technical discoveries and publish papers," said Stubblefield. "However, these days often the first call we have to make is to university lawyers."

* * * *

California official seeks criminal probe of e-voting
Machines banned in four counties; 10 more counties must meet conditions
A voter access card is inserted into an electronic voting machine during a demonstration in Norwalk, Calif. California has decertified Accuvote-TSx touchscreen machines made by Diebold Election Systems.

The Associated Press

Updated: 9:25 p.m. ET April 30, 2004

SACRAMENTO, Calif. - The state’s top election official called for a criminal investigation of Diebold Election Systems Inc. as he banned use of the company’s newest model touchscreen voting machine, citing concerns about its security and reliability.

Friday’s ban will force up to 2 million voters in four counties, including San Diego, to use paper ballots in November, marking their choices in ovals read by optical scanners. Secretary of State Kevin Shelley asked the attorney general’s office to investigate allegations of fraud, saying Diebold had lied to state officials. A spokesman for Attorney General Bill Lockyer said prosecutors would review Shelley’s claims.

Diebold issued a statement saying it was confident in its systems and planned to work with election officials in California and throughout the nation to run a smooth election this fall.

Affects 14,000 machines

The ban immediately affects more than 14,000 AccuVote-TSx machines made by Diebold, the leading touchscreen provider. Many were used for the first time in the March primaries and suffered failures.

In 10 other counties, Shelley decertified touchscreen machines but set 23 conditions under which they still could be used. That order involved 4,000 older machines from Diebold and 24,000 from its three rivals.

Live Vote

Would you trust your vote to the Internet?
Yes.

Not today, but maybe soon.

Never.

None of the above.

Vote to see results

Live Vote
Would you trust your vote to the Internet? * 57604 responses

Yes.
24%

Not today, but maybe soon.
40%

Never.
34%

None of the above.
3%

Not a scientifically valid survey. Click to learn more.

The decision follows the recommendations of a state advisory panel, which conducted hearings earlier this month.

Made just six months before a presidential election, the decision reflects growing concern about paperless electronic voting.

A number of failures involving touchscreen machines in Georgia, Maryland and California have spurred serious questioning of the technology. As currently configured, the machines lack paper records, making recounts impossible.

“I anticipate his decision will have an immediate and widespread impact,” said Kim Alexander, president of the California Voter Foundation and a frequent critic of the machines. “California is turning away from e-voting equipment, and other states are sure to follow.”
Activists have been demanding paper printouts — required in California by 2006 — to guard against fraud, hacking and malfunction.

Diebold has been a frequent target of such groups, though most California county election officials say that problems have been overstated and that voters like the touchscreen systems first installed four years ago.

50 million voters

At least 50 million voters nationally were expected to use the ATM-like machines from Diebold and other companies in November.

California counties with 6.5 million registered voters have been at the forefront of touchscreen voting, installing more than 40 percent of the more than 100,000 machines believed to be in use nationally.

MORE ON E-VOTING

• E-voting source code released
• State officials demand paper trail
• Sparks fly in e-voting debate
• Will high-tech save or sink future elections?
• E-voting flaws risk ballot fraud
• Pentagon launches e-voting effort
• E-voting firm reports computer break-in
• Should Pentagon end experiment?
• Maryland e-voting system criticized
• Pentagon cancels Net voting
• Your views on e-voting
• More views on Internet voting

A state investigation released this month said Diebold jeopardized the outcome of the March election in California with computer glitches, last-minute changes to its systems and installations of uncertified software in its machines in 17 counties.

It specifically cited San Diego County, where 573 of 1,611 polling places failed to open on time because low battery power caused machines to malfunction.

Registrars in counties that made the switch to paperless voting said Shelley’s decision to return to paper ballots would result in chaos.

“There just isn’t time to bring this system up before November;” Kern County Registrar Ann Barnett said. “It’s absurd.”

Diebold officials, in a 28-page report rebutting many of the accusations about its performance, said the company had been singled out unfairly for problems with
electronic voting and maintained its machines are safe, secure and demonstrated 100 percent accuracy in the March election.

The company, a subsidiary of automatic teller machine maker Diebold, Inc., acknowledged it had “alienated” the secretary of state’s office and promised to redouble efforts to improve relations with counties and the state.

* * * *

2004 articles:

Legislators Wary of Electronic Voting

California official seeks criminal probe of e-voting
Machines banned in four counties; 10 more counties must meet conditions
http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/4874190/

E-voting flaws risk ballot fraud
Scientists warn of big security holes in version of software
http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/3077251/

Federal Panel Considers Challenges to Electronic Voting

Paper Ballots Not Counted in Maryland

Fla. Voting Machines Have Recount Flaw

'Reformers' Now Attack Costly Election 'Reform' of E-voting

http://www.siliconvalley.com/mld/siliconvalley/7117340.htm
Provisional Ballots Raise New Questions

Testing companies keep mum on vote machines
http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/national/187431_voting23.html

Fla. Judge Rules on Manual Vote Recounts

Consumer Report Part 1: Look at this -- the Diebold GEMS central tabulator contains a stunning security hole
http://www.blackboxvoting.org/?q=node/view/78

They Said It Couldn't Be Done
http://www.truthout.org/docs_04/091904L.shtml

Touchscreen Hack Effort Called 'Monkey Business'
http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,133214,00.html

Diebold Rep Now Runs Elections
http://www.rense.com/general57/dffil.htm

Voting problems could spawn lawsuits
http://www.verifiedvoting.org/article.php?id=2364

John Fund: Voter Fraud Common

Voter-registration forms shredded in Vegas

Voter registrations trashed