

Resolution in Support of Election Integrity

WHEREAS free and fair elections in which every vote is counted according to the voter's intent are a vital component of a representative form of democracy; and

WHEREAS constant performance auditing of both records and complex equipment is standard operating procedure for both business and research enterprises, though not currently for elections departments; and

WHEREAS there is currently no national standard for mandatory auditing of vote tabulation equipment; and

WHEREAS the notion that any private company should own voter registration data and election results data is an assault on the very meaning of public representative democracy; and

WHEREAS the 2004 gubernatorial race results were not recounted in Snohomish county because the data was proprietary, because there was no independent voter verifiable record of ballots cast, and because there were many registered complaints from voters attempting to vote for Gregoire and having their votes switched to Rossi (though there were no complaints about voters attempting to vote for Rossi and being switched to the Libertarian candidate Bennett); and

WHEREAS in 2004 tabulated complaints about machine malfunctions showed that 98% were complaints about attempting to vote for Kerry and having the vote switched to Bush; and

WHEREAS in 2006 Minnesota successfully implemented a mandatory auditing system for its optically scanned paper ballots; and

WHEREAS in the words of computer security expert David Dill "It is not enough that elections BE accurate; we have to KNOW that they are accurate, and we don't";

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the use of proprietary software be eliminated and replaced by open source software developed by a public consortium; and

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that direct electronic recording of votes (DRE) be banned nationally (though the use of touchscreens is acceptable if they are one of several possible interfaces for the production of voter verified paper ballots which are tabulated separately); and

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a mandatory system like that currently in use by Minnesota for auditing optical scanning machines by random hand counts be required nationally; and

4
5
6
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that paper ballots must be the legal ballots of record; and

THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that current systems for paper ballot duplication in the event of rejection by centralized optical scanning machines be retained, and not replaced by electronic images which, when altered, eliminate the original data.

55
56
57
58
59
60
61

Submitted to the _____ precinct caucus by _____
on _____

Approved by _____ on _____.

62
63References and additional information

64
65<http://www.freepress.org/departments/display/19/2005/1529>

66
67Among other things, the GAO confirms that:

- 68
69 1. Some electronic voting machines "did not encrypt cast ballots or system audit logs, thus
70 making it possible to alter them without detection." In other words, the GAO now confirms that
71 electronic voting machines provided an open door to flip an entire vote count. More than
72 800,000 votes were cast in Ohio on electronic voting machines, some seven times Bush's official
73 margin of victory.
74
75 2. "It is easy to alter a file defining how a ballot appears, making it possible for someone to vote
76 for one candidate and actually be recorded as voting for an entirely different candidate."
77 Numerous sworn statements and affidavits assert that this did happen in Ohio 2004.
78
79 3. "Falsifying election results without leaving any evidence of such an action by using altered
80 memory cards" can easily be done, according to the GAO.

81
82<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/HL0608/S00220.htm>

83by *Michael Collins ("Scoop" Independent Media)*

84
85A recent Zogby poll documents ground breaking information on the attitudes of American voters toward
86electronic voting. They are quite clear in the belief that the outcome of an entire election can be changed
87due to flaws in computerized voting machines. At a stunning rate of 92%, Americans insist on the right
88to watch their votes being counted. And, at an overwhelming 80%, they strongly object to the use of
89secret computer software to tabulate votes without citizen access to that software.

90
91The American public is clear in its desire for free, fair, and transparent elections. An 80%-90%
92consensus on the right to view vote counting and opposition to secrecy by voting machine vendor is both

7
8
9

93rare and remarkable in American politics. If only the public knew that these options are virtually non
94existent in today's election system.

96Most all likely voters (92%) agree that citizens have the right to view and obtain information about how
97election officials' count votes (Statement A). Just 6% feel citizens do not have this right (Statement B).

98

99Four fifths of respondents within every demographic group selected the right for citizen review and
100access, Statement A. This includes overwhelming majorities of both Kerry (92.8%) and Bush supporters
101(90.8%); independents (96.9%); Catholics (92.8%), Protestants (90.8%), Jews (87.2%), and those with
102no religious affiliation (93.3%); and two points above the average, NASCAR fans, 93.9%.

104

105http://ceimn.org/news/minnesota_performs_first_post_election_review

106

107We have a really good system in place in Minnesota. We have a 100 percent paper-ballot system. But
108even with these devices the only way to be confident in their security and reliability is to check them
109out," Hilty stated.

110

111Depending on the number of registered voters in a county, two to four precincts per jurisdiction must be
112randomly selected for auditing. Hilty said he wants to fine-tune the law during the next legislative
113session by requiring larger-population counties to audit more precincts.

114

115Congressional, presidential and gubernatorial races are examined. Local election officials and election
116judges perform the check, hand-counting the paper ballots and comparing them with the optical-scan
117tabulation results.

118

119The comparison is required to be accurate to within one-half of 1 percent and if it is not, more precincts
120are reviewed.

121

122

123**Added remarks by precinct caucus attendees**

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139