Bet on a Bet but Not on a Ballot

By Richard Morin Washington Post Thursday, March 16, 2006

It's easier to rig an electronic voting machine than a Las Vegas slot machine, says University of Pennsylvania visiting professor Steve Freeman.

That's because Vegas slots are better monitored and regulated than America's voting machines, Freeman writes in a book out in July that argues, among other things, that President Bush may owe his last win to an unfair vote count.


The Stanford Political Communication Lab experiments are serious research studies, designed to test real hypotheses on important issues in political science, sociology and psychology.

We'll wait to read "Was the 2004 Presidential Election Stolen? Exit Polls, Election Fraud, and the Official Count" before making a judgment about that. But Freeman has assembled comparisons that suggest Americans protect their vices more than they guard their voting rights, according to data he presented at an October meeting of the American Statistical Association chapter in Philadelphia.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/graphic/2006/03/16/GR2006031600213.html washingtonpost.com > Nation

How To Steal an Election

It's easier to rig an electronic voting machine than a Las Vegas slot machine, says University of Pennsylvania visiting professor Steve Freeman. That's because Vegas slots are better monitored and regulated than America's voting machines, Freeman writes in a book out in July that argues, among other things, that President Bush may owe his 2004 win to an unfair vote count. We'll wait to read his book before making a judgment about that. But Freeman has assembled comparisons that suggest Americans protect their vices more than they guard their rights, according to data he presented at an October meeting of the American Statistical Association in Philadelphia.




LAS VEGAS SLOTS

ELECTRONIC VOTING MACHINES



State of Nevada has access to all software. Illegal to use software that is not on file. Software is a trade secret.



State gaming inspectors show up unannounced at casinos to compare computer chips with those on file. If there is a discrepancy, the machine is shut down and investigated. No checks are required. Election officials have no chip to compare with the one found in the machine.



Manufacturers subjected to background checks. Employees are investigated for criminal records. Citizens have no way of knowing, for example, whether programmers have been convicted of fraud.



By a public agency at arm's length from manufacturers. Public questions invited. By for-profit companies chosen and paid by the manufacturers. No public information on how the testing is done.



Casino must contact the Gaming Control Board, which has investigators on call round the clock. They can open up machines to inspect internal mechanisms and records of recent gambling outcomes. In most cases, a voter's only recourse is to call a number at the board of elections that may or may not work to lodge a complaint that may or may not be investigated.

GRAPHIC: The Washington Post - March 16, 2006

FAIR USE NOTICE

This site contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of political, democracy, scientific, and social justice issues. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to:

http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.