



**Quit Smoking Now**  
The original all-natural CigArrest. Try a free 30 day supply today!  
[www.cigarrest.com](http://www.cigarrest.com)

Vote Machine, how might I hack thee?

# Vote Machine, how might I hack thee?

## Let me count the ways!

### With Proof of Stolen Election 2004

THE FIX IS IN!

The vote swapping software is already operational in the early voting. We are hearing from Broward county in Florida that vote swapping is already going on in the early voting:

[http://www.theregister.co.uk/2006/10/31/florida\\_terminals\\_dont\\_cooperate/](http://www.theregister.co.uk/2006/10/31/florida_terminals_dont_cooperate/)

From Jefferson County, Florida:

[tp://www.kfdm.com/engine.pl?station=kfdm&id=17343&template=breakout\\_dayportvideo.shtml&dateformat=%25M%20%25e,%25Y](http://www.kfdm.com/engine.pl?station=kfdm&id=17343&template=breakout_dayportvideo.shtml&dateformat=%25M%20%25e,%25Y)

And Jesus! These incidents are popping up EVERYWHERE. And NOWHERE is there a report of the votes being switched to anything but republican!

<http://www.votersunite.org/electionproblems.asp>

So if you think that they are not going to steal the 2006 elections, think again. After getting away with stealing two presidential elections, stealing this one is supposed to be a snap for them. And think about this: The republicans have GOT to steal the election to keep the Democrats from getting subpoena power and exposing everything from the stolen election to torture to NSA illegal activities, etc.

**SO DO SOMETHING!**

The sites below have details on various things the army of citizens can do. Here are my priorities and a couple extra suggestions.

The single most important thing: **VOTE!**

Wee need the voter turnout to be so big that it will be obvious to everybody when they steal it.

VIDEOTAPE YOUR VOTE:

When you go to vote, ask them if there are any machines that are switching votes. If they say yes, wait for that machine and videotape it. Florida's Broward and Jefferson counties, cities San Antonio and Dallas were reporting problems in early voting.

A single tape of a switched vote is more powerful than a thousand affidavits. Hundreds of tapes, and we've got them.

<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2006/10/30/72956/952>

REPORT VOTING INCIDENTS

Election Protection has a hotline to report voting incidents. The number is:

**1-866-OUR-VOTE**

As a statistician, I will be looking for correlations between voting machine problems and skewed election results. In 2004, most folks did not know about election protection, so data were very sparse. Your reports will help forensic statisticians like me to connect the statistical dots with enough data to be statistically significant.



My own two bits is:

Set up a table to collect names and contact information of the voters who want to protect their vote. You should get name, address, email, phone, and the one or two of the voting choices you want to track.

The idea is that if they push the vote totals too much at any one voting site (precinct if you can cover it with friends), it no longer is an issue of statistics or polls or whatever. If you have 250 signatures of folks that voted for candidate x, and the reported total is 220, you have proof of fraud. Contact your candidate to spring for the Xeroxing of the forms. But even a bunch of big chief notebooks would be fine.

And be vocal when you are there. Let folks know how important it is to verify their vote. (Maybe have literature ready for inquiring minds?)

Ok, this guy collected the various sites in one place. All kinds of other ideas.:

<http://www.democrats.com/Make-Them-Steal-Your-Vote>

And the renowned Black Box voting has a great activists guide:

<http://www.blackboxvoting.org/toolkit.html>

Here is a list of things to do from dailyKOS that includes instructions on a "parallel vote".

<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2006/10/21/23202/907>

Ok, here we go for the fun stuff:

Qualifications: My name is Greg Black. I am a statistical analyst by training and trade. I have 25 years of experience analyzing complex statistical data. I have also run a small PC diagnostic and repair business for some years, so I know a little bit about what goes on inside these machines. And finally, I have programmed in a number of computer languages from COBOL to C++, so I know a bit about programming as well.

It is my considered, responsible, and researched position as a scientist and a statistician that:

1. The evidence I have collected proves, beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt, that massive amounts of outright voter fraud occurred and that the results of the 2004 presidential election of the United States of America were manipulated.

2. The presidential vote has been systematically altered by vote swapping software and manipulation of vote totals to install G. W. Bush as the President of the United States, against the wishes of the voting citizens.

### Three Questions

The three questions about the stolen election of 2004 now apply. To any that believe the issue is worth considering, contemplate these questions:

- **Could an election be stolen here in the USA?**
- **Do we have smoking guns?**
- **What is the proof?**

### Could it happen here in the USA?

As a patriotic American, I would have said no, it cannot happen here. But there is a sad thing about facts. They are what they are, and no amount of belief can make them not facts.

The fact is that every independent organization that has looked at this issue comes to the same conclusion, that the electronic voting machines are wide open to being hacked.

The GAO describes that machines can record votes for the wrong candidate, that access to a single machine allowed access to all machines of that type, and that it was possible to alter both individual votes and entire vote counts easily.  
<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05956.pdf>

These machines are so vulnerable that "a single person could change the results of an election". So, it does not take a huge conspiracy, or even a group of people to steal the election. All it takes is a single person with single person can change the election results.

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/27/AR2006062701451\\_pf.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/27/AR2006062701451_pf.html)

And here is the actual report:

<http://www.brennancenter.org/programs/downloads/SecurityExecSum7-3.pdf>

So, when I first looked at this between November 5, 2004 and Mid-December, 2004, I knew that the election had been stolen by a combination of vote-swapping software and outright changing the vote totals. The anecdotal evidence combined with the statistical evidence was simply overwhelming.

But how? How could it be done? I knew it had been, but I wondered how?

So, I EXPRESSLY FORBID ANY OF YOU TO USE THE KNOWLEDGE TO ACTUALLY HACK THE MACHINES! THAT IS WRONG!

### Mr. Nefarious

But say you were a Nefarious Ner'Do'Wel who did not care about anything but power and greed, and you were willing to kill democracy to get what you want? We patriots have a hard time understanding that but the evidence is overwhelming that these foul creatures do exist.

So, lets go from hard to easy.

## Vote Machine, how Might I Hack Thee? Let me count the ways.

So, where would Mr. Loki Nefarious start?

Actually the easiest way, and one that has to be mentioned is to have the hacked software installed at the factory. This is not an idle speculation. The voting machine companies claim that the programming they use is "proprietary", and that they do not have to show us the voters how they work. As the Daily Show described it, you vote, your vote goes into the machine where "things happen". And that is all we get to know as taxpayers and citizens.

<http://www.slate.com/id/2086455/>

And, after you have sold the machines, and they have been ostensibly inspected, you can go buy and install a "patch" to help your Republican buddies. And ALL of the voting machine companies are tied to republicans. And is it not by accident that felon Senator Bob Ney made sure there was no paper trail like there was in 2000.

[http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/story/11717105/robert\\_f\\_kennedy\\_jr\\_will\\_the\\_next\\_election\\_be\\_hacked/1](http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/story/11717105/robert_f_kennedy_jr_will_the_next_election_be_hacked/1)

Even slot machines are regulated more than our vote machines.

[http://www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj\\_home/2006/Mar-27-Mon-2006/news/6527933.html](http://www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj_home/2006/Mar-27-Mon-2006/news/6527933.html)

And here they show you that not only can you hack the machine if left alone for 1 minute, but you can upload a VIRUS that will infect all the other vote machines in similar nefarious ways. Oh, and don't worry about the key you need. Any mini-bar key from a hotel will open the lock:

<http://www.brennancenter.org/programs/downloads/SecurityExecSum7-3.pdf>

And the easiest way of all to steal the election, just change the vote totals on the central machine. We also know that the software for all of this is based on the Microsoft Windows operating system, and by simply altering an ACCESS database, you can change voter totals at will.

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/mason/stories/HL0307/S00065.htm>

And here is a fun demonstration with a serious discussion of the issues involved after.

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/mason/stories/HL0307/S00198.htm>

<http://www.dcn2000.com/~neural/Voting/VotingFraudExample.html>

Blackbox voting has shown it can be hacked by inserting a pre-loaded memory card. About security, one expert exclaims: "It's not that they left the door open. *there is no door*. This system is 'open for business.'"

<http://www.bbvforums.org/cgi-bin/forums/board-auth.cgi?file=/1954/5921.html>

Also, Open Voting consortium has found that the entire operating system of the Diebold machines can be changed with a simple switch on the motherboard.

[http://openvotingfoundation.org/tiki-index.php?page\\_ref\\_id=1](http://openvotingfoundation.org/tiki-index.php?page_ref_id=1)

Then they talk about the voting machines that have wi-fi cards installed. Yep, think about that. Here you have a voting machine with a wi-fi card which connects it to the internet. And this guy confirms my fears as to what that means.

All you need to do to hack these machines is cruise down the street with a laptop with wi-fi, and find the IP address of the machine. That's right. Any computer science major with said laptop can hack the election, and then install a virus if he wanted.

This guy that gives a real good overview of the myriad of vulnerabilities from a theoretical level.

<http://www.arstechnica.com/articles/culture/evoting.ars>

Oh, and did I tell you that these machines run a primitive version of windows that is vulnerable to all 75,000 known Windows vulnerabilities. (Bless you BradBlog!) That's right, 75,000 ways to hack the machines.

Not only does BradBlog have that, he has posted the 200 page report on Diebold security problems in its entirety to his site. Mr Nefarious is getting happier all the time.

<http://www.bradblog.com/?p=3731>

Security? We don't need no stinking security! Here are step by step instructions on how to get past the security.

<http://www.equalccw.com/dieboldtestnotes.html>

A few keystrokes in ACCESS software, and you get to change election. Here are step by step instructions on how to change the vote totals using ACCESS. Remember, Diebold has two sets of access files (like two sets of books in accounting?), so Mr. Nefarious has to change both sets of books. Here are step by step instructions.

<http://www.chuckherrin.com/hackthevotedemo.htm>

Here is a description of the Diebold internal vote tally systems, complete with another set of instructions on hacking the access databases.

<http://www.equalccw.com/dieboldtestnotes.html>

Here is a research project where the intent was to simulate the hacking of the vote. This is interesting from the theoretical standpoint.

<http://www.cs.rice.edu/~dwallach/pub/hackavote2004.pdf>

And you definitely want to read the historic Hursti reports on hacking. I liked it when he had the vote machine ask "Are we having fun yet?"

<http://www.blackboxvoting.org/BBVreport.pdf>

<http://www.blackboxvoting.org/BBVtsxstudy-suppl.pdf>

<http://www.blackboxvoting.org/BBVtsxstudy.pdf>

Ok, until Friday when blackboxvoting.org published this, my favorite hack was driving around with a wi-fi laptop. But this is just too sweet! All you have to do to hack the Sequa is push a yellow button in the back, and you can vote as many times as you want.

<http://www.bbforums.org/cgi-bin/forums/board-auth.cgi?file=/1954/44823.html>

The Diebold machine is the poster child of insecure voting systems because they have been shown to be hackable in a number of different ways.

Here are some words that we should all bear in mind from Newsweek.

"If Diebold had set out to build a system as insecure as they possibly could, this would be it" says Avi Rubin, a Johns Hopkins University computer-science professor and elections-security expert.

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/12888600/site/newsweek>

But, of course, building an inherently hackable machine was exactly what Diebold intended to do. And you can't tell me a company that builds ATMs does not know how to do security.

Diebold makes ATM's. Yet the machines they built are not even password protected, can be hacked at least a dozen ways from sideways. These machines are less secure than slot machines. AND, there is no way that a company that makes ATM's can say they don't know any better. These machines were designed to be hacked.

[http://www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj\\_home/2006/Mar-27-Mon-2006/news/6527933.html](http://www.reviewjournal.com/lvrj_home/2006/Mar-27-Mon-2006/news/6527933.html)

Conclusion: It is not only possible, but actually easy to hack these voting machines in a variety of ways.

A SINGLE PERSON CAN STEAL THE ELECTION. See, this was the part that bothered me about the stolen election 2004. I thought it would take a massive number of people and that somebody would come forward. But now we know that a very small group, yea, even a single person can hack the election and steal it. Odds are particularly troubling to me. Does anybody else out there have a problem with our voting machines being wi-fi equipped?

A quick note: everything in the data here were known back in November and December of 2004. The reason that you never heard it was that the corporate media had and still has a blackout on the entire issue of the stolen election 2004.

I am limiting my data from here down to what was known at the time in order to demonstrate that you cannot trust the corporate media to tell you about the government that they own.

### **Do we have smoking guns?**

#### **Smoking Gun #1 Computer "glitches"**

The first set of smoking guns are the computer "glitches".

Let me make something immediately clear. As a computer programmer that has programmed in a number of languages from COBOL to C++, I can assure you that computers do not do things that they are not told to do.

Computers do fail, get bad spots on the hard disc and such. However, to believe that a computer is going to do something other than what it was told to do is by a programmer ludicrous. Remember that. Computers do not do anything without being told to do it.

A large number of people in all of the swing state reported seeing their votes change from Kerry to Bush right in front of their eyes! (Do we hear a similarity to the McKinney race here?).

In Broward County, Florida, the machines would choose Bush when you touched the Kerry button. I call this the "thug" configuration because the machine doesn't care if you know it stole your vote.

<https://voteprotect.org/index.php?display=EIRMapCounty&state=Florida&cat=02&tab=ED04&county=Broward>

AND, I must point out that every single idiosyncratic, unexplained computer "glitch" that happened in the election was in one direction: benefiting G. W. Bush.

If these immense number of flaws, problems, etc. were truly random "glitches", you would expect a 50-50 split in the total effects of the "glitch". Instead, what you have is that EVERY SINGLE COMPUTER "GLITCH" that happened WAS IN THE DIRECTION OF BENEFITTING G. W. BUSH! As a statistician, it is pretty hard to swallow that purely random events went 100% in one direction.

So, here is a short list of computer "glitches" for a sampling of the types of problems that occurred in 2004. I give only a sampling here, as anybody with a net connection can find thousands of pages of similar incidents. (At the end of this site will be a list of other websites that were and are prominent in keeping this issue alive.)

[Back to the top.](#)

### **Smoking gun #2 - More votes than voters**

In this section, I am going to give a short list of some of the impossible numbers, like more votes than registered voters, more absentee votes than ballots, etc.

So here is a short list of impossible numbers. Note that this is just a sampling.

Congressman (John Conyers), of the House Committee on the Judiciary, has detailed a number of questions about voter fraud to Ohio Secretary of State Blackwell. He has yet to see a response. Here is the letter:

[http://www.house.gov/judiciary\\_democrats/ohblackwelltr12204.pdf](http://www.house.gov/judiciary_democrats/ohblackwelltr12204.pdf)

In his letter, he describes, among other things:

Precinct in Perry County: with fewer than 400 voters reporting 489 votes.

Precinct in Lexington County: with 350 voters reporting 434 votes.

Precinct in Monroe Township: with 266 voters reporting 393 votes.

Perry County has an incredibly high level of voter registration (91%). Of those, there is an extremely high percentage of registered voters with no voting activity before, and no signature on file. Of that group, an incredible 3100 registered on a single day in 1977!

There is a pattern of extremely high numbers of votes for third party candidates in democratic precincts.

Franklin County had 638 voters and they recorded a whopping 4,258 votes for Bush when they had only.

Representative Conyers was too polite to point it out in his letter, but Franklin county reported 4,258 for bush and 260 for Kerry. That's pretty good turnout for Bush from 638 voters. Here is the MSNBC story about it:

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6418513/>

And, my personal favorite, how about a machine that reports a NEGATIVE 25 million votes for Kerry. That's right, a negative 25 million votes.

<http://mediamatters.org/items/200411120011>

Not all of the above numbers show a pro-Bush lean, but they do demonstrate the impossibility factor pretty well.

[Back to the top.](#)

My conclusion in 2004 was: I believe that what we are seeing is a variety of voter fraud strategies, ranging from changing individual votes on the machines to simply changing the vote totals on the central machine. The fact is the GOP got greedy. They not only wanted to steal the election at the Electoral College level, they wanted to change the vote totals enough so that it appeared that Bush actually got a majority. The GOP's operatives simply got greedy.

Add to that the normal amount of human error that occurs in these situations. If you have hundreds of people who are installing and setting parameters on vote switching software, you will come up with glitches like the impossible numbers above. Some people are just going to set it up wrong (I mean, 25 million negative votes? Someone screwed up that vote switching installation big time!)

Not to mention Broward County, FL, where the voters could actually see their votes being switched. This is an example where the person configuring the software forgot to turn off the display command in the software, allowing the voters to actually witness their votes being switched.

**Smoking Gun #3:** Ok, so here is a guy who has a sworn affidavit that he wrote the vote switching software for Republican Representative Feeny:

<http://www.elitestv.com/pub/2004/Dec/EEN41b5f8f70cbf8.html>

**Smoking Gun #4:** Here, Bev Harris of Black Box Voting describes a county in Florida that attempted to give her a set of election tapes that were run on November 15th while throwing out the original signed tapes from November 2nd. If you don't have anything to hide, what are you covering up? Sure enough, there were differences between the two data sets:

<http://www.commondreams.org/views04/1118-22.htm>

And, Diebold has installed three different sets of "books" and has installed backdoors in the software to allow machines to be hacked:

<http://whatreallyhappened.com/biggerthanwatergate.html>

Here are a couple of reports detailing the money that paid for fake technicians to rig voting machines:

[http://www.onlinejournal.com/Special\\_Reports/112504Madsen/112504madsen.html](http://www.onlinejournal.com/Special_Reports/112504Madsen/112504madsen.html)

[http://www.onlinejournal.com/Special\\_Reports/120104Madsen/120104madsen.html](http://www.onlinejournal.com/Special_Reports/120104Madsen/120104madsen.html)

So, we have vote changing software, and easily hacked vote totals at the central tabulators. We also have vast evidence that

vote totals have been changed.

[Back to the top.](#)

So, when they try to say it was just a glitch, remember that. When they say it's "just a minor glitch, and it didn't affect the election," remember that 100% of the "glitches" were in one direction, for Bush. Also remember that the "glitches" are where somebody screwed up the vote swapping/vote shaving software enough for the effects to be noticeable. What about all of the machines where the vote swapping software was configured right? All we have is weird things like democratic precincts going for Bush.

### **THE VOTE FAIRY?**

Ok, if it was not nefarious vote switching software or vote total changing software or people, I have another theory.

There was a Vote Fairy that came down and performed the impossible, like more votes than voters and such. Hey, it's as believable as a computer performing a function it was not called upon to do.

### **STATISTICALLY IMPROBABLE NUMBERS**

In this section, I will describe a number of studies of voting patterns that simply do not make statistical sense, like majority democrat counties going for Bush, turnout statistics in democratic counties/precincts being incredibly low, while republican turnout is incredibly high, etc.

Here is one of the main problems, a bunch of democratic counties all of a sudden voting for Bush. Here in an election year where the main thrust of the Democratic Party candidate is "I'm not Bush!", and the main mover for democrats is not pro-Kerry, but anti-Bush. Yet in these democratic county strongholds, Bush is getting up to 74% of the vote! I don't believe that, do you?

A couple of examples from

In Lafayette County, 83% of voters are Democrats, but Diebold said 74% of the county voted for Bush.

In Liberty County, 88% of voters are Democrats, but Diebold said 64% voted for Bush.

Here are the sites:

<http://www.solarbus.org/election/articles/summary-anonymous.html>

<http://www.freezerbox.com/archive/article.asp?id=321>

Here is where two precincts were co-located, and if you voted on the wrong machine, you ended up casting a vote for the wrong person. Incredibly high votes for libertarian and constitution parties resulted. These were votes probably intended for Kerry:

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory?id=320643&CMP=OTC-RSSFeeds0312>

Here is an analysis of turnout where the official turnout reported looks way too high in Bush precincts (too high to believe) and incredibly low in Kerry precincts. This site has very good data.

<http://www.freepress.org/departments/display/19/2004/979>

You will find an analysis of voting patterns which demonstrates weird patterns. 30 precincts with unbelievably low turnout: and some precincts in Miami with 97, 98% turnout:

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/mason/stories/WO0412/S00167.htm>

And this is JUST A SAMPLE. See my favorite links on the stolen election 2004 at the bottom to find a 797 page book detailing the enormous amount of evidence that proves that the election was stolen.

[Back to the top.](#)

So, we know it can be done. What evidence do we have that it was done other than the incredibly unbelievable vote totals themselves?

### **What is the proof?**

Exit polls are all of a sudden wrong!

The exit polling data is all of a sudden wrong for the first time in decades.

Yes, those pesky exit polls. A little about political polling: This is a science, not an art. The methodology of stratified sampling and weighting that is done has been refined for decades. All polling is done with a scientific precision where there is a possible margin of error of +/- 4%.

The three thresholds of statistical significance that we use in social sciences are 5%, 1%, and when you really have a strong relationship, 0.1%. So, to be considered "true" in social sciences, you must have a relationship that is statistically significant at 5% (5 out of 100) to 0.1% (1 out of 1000). A social science researcher that gets a 0.1% significance feels like he has hit the jackpot, statistically speaking.

With these polls, the standard of error is plus or minus 4%. To be statistically significantly wrong here is to say that reality is more different than the 4% margin of error.

International observers of elections who observe elections in other countries (like Ukraine) use exit polls to judge whether or not the election has been stolen after the ballots were cast. When they see official results that are vastly different than the election exit polls, like recently in Ukraine, they know that the results were high jacked.

Now, according to the corporate media, the polling data is all of a sudden wrong.

So, at this point, we have two competing hypotheses.

1. The scientific exit polls were right, the official vote totals were manipulated, and Kerry was, in fact elected president.

2. The scientific exit polls were wrong for the first time in decades, and the official vote totals are correct.

Well, having read through how easy it is to hack the machines, and mountains of evidence that they were hacked, I have to lean towards the first hypothesis. I have far more trust in scientific exit polls than I do in machines that report more votes than voters.

But back to those exit polls that were ostensibly wrong for the first time in decades.

But the polls are only wrong here in the USA!

Not only that, but exactly where the polls went wrong is very telling.

The exit polls were correct for any non swing state presidential race, and all the swing state Senate races

The "wrong" exit poll results occurred only in swing states, and there the polls were wrong only for the presidential race.

That's right. The only places where the exit polls were wrong were in the swing states. And here it gets real good. The only two areas where the exit polls in the state went for one candidate and the official vote differed were:

You guessed it, Florida and Ohio.

Losing either of these states tosses the race to Kerry, so the voter fraud is absolutely necessary to succeed in these two states in order to steal the presidency.

And it appears that widespread voter fraud did occur in these states.

Here are the comparisons, state by state, of the poll results compared to the reported vote totals. Note especially the third graphic, a table of presidential results for the swing states. Note that Florida and Ohio are the two states that went for Kerry in the exit polls and went for Bush in the reported vote.

<http://www.oilempire.us/exitpolls.html>

And here is another analysis of the exit poll data:

[http://residentbush.com/Aftermath-2004\\_Elsis.html](http://residentbush.com/Aftermath-2004_Elsis.html)

The media financed exit poll data from 2004 still has not been released to statisticians to look at. What, I wonder, might the media be hiding? Could it be that they are hiding their own duplicity in aiding the stealing of the election? As a statistician and scientist, I guarantee I would have my fingers in that exit poll data immediately, as would scientists from all over earth. The cover up of the stolen election could no longer be maintained.

It is statistically impossible for the exit polls to be off by the amounts that the reported vote totals would imply. Looking at New Hampshire (polls are off by 16%) and Minnesota (polls off by 7%) alone would provide enough statistical evidence that something is very wrong. Combining the amount of error in the polls for all swing states produces such an incredible low probability of the polls being wrong that the only conclusion is that the vote totals were changed after the voting stopped.

Looking only at Florida and Ohio, and the unrealistic vote numbers makes this particularly strange.

Remember the three levels of statistical significance that range from 5 out of 100 to, if you have a really strong relationship, 1 out of 1000? What do you figure is the likelihood that the Ohio and Florida exit polls could be off as much as they supposedly were?

1 in 662,000.

That's right; 1 in 662,000. This is so statistically significant that the number to describe it is enormous.

See:

<http://www.madison.com/tct/news/stories/index.php?ntid=20483&ntpid=1>

And, although it is oriented more to the statisticians among us, this researcher explains exactly how the probability is ascertained. According to this researcher (and others who have run the numbers), the chances that Florida, Pennsylvania, and Ohio exit polls could have been off as much as they were is 1 in 250,000,000. That's right, one in 250 million.

<http://truthout.org/unexplainedexitpoll.pdf>

There is no other reasonable, logical, and statistically sound explanation for these "erroneous" exit polls than that the official vote totals were changed, and do not reflect the true vote that occurred in the swing states.

If you assume the opposite, that the polls were somehow faked or purposely done wrong, what, I wonder, would be the motivation? The theory here is that mainstream corporate media paid for the pollsters to purposely get it wrong in order to discourage Republicans from going to the polls and thereby help Kerry win. Is a Kerry win going to benefit the corporate media in some way that Bush would not?

The answer is no. Kerry has gone on record against allowing any further consolidation of the media industry, and favors making the media "more diverse".

<http://www.thenation.com/thebeat/index.mhtml?bid=1&pid=1671>

The Democratic Party is also on record against allowing any more media consolidation:

<http://nopc.atares-dev.com/yabbse/index.php?board=2;action=display;threadid=8457>

In contrast, Bush appointees to the FCC attempted to loosen the rules and allow more media consolidation. They were blocked by Congress after hundreds of thousands of people protested the new rules (including major conservative groups like the National Rifle Association):

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A63628-2003Nov19&notFound=true>

So, the argument is that the media conglomerates are going to pay the polling firm to purposely slant the polls toward Kerry in

order to help him get elected, even though he is directly opposed to the policies that they want, and Bush has pushed to give them exactly what they want.

This theory makes absolutely no sense. The corporate media has been pressing for rules to allow them to own ever more increasing amounts of media, and the Republican Party has been solidly behind them. Bush's appointees to the FCC attempted to pass rules allowing even more consolidation, but were beat back by literally hundreds of thousands of negative comments, and some valiant Congressmen and Congresswomen.

So, the corporate media is going to have the polls faked so they can put in the man that is directly against their interests? I don't think so.

And the motivation for the other theory, that voter fraud occurred? Pretty clear here, it is to put your man in the white house.

So which do you believe: faked exit polls (and only in selected races and states, paid for by corporations who want the opposite result), or faked vote totals from Republican officials that worked on Bush's campaign.

### **Conclusion**

I am sorry to say this, but I believe beyond the shadow of a doubt the election was stolen. And I firmly believe they will do it again tomorrow, November 7, 2006. When the citizens rise up, Bush is prepared:

[Back to the top.](#)

For those of you who linked to my only other web page ever entitled "Protest Stolen Election 2004" that was published on WhatReallyHappened.com in December 2004, please re-link to this page. It has almost all of the data that I gathered in November and December of 2004, PLUS a whole new section on how they stole the election.

### **My favorite Stolen Election Sites:**

First off, a couple of books:

[Did George W. Bush Steal America's 2004 Election](#) by Fitrikis, Rosenfeld, and Wasserman is an excellent reference, full of anecdotal evidence, official letters and memos, original statistical studies, This book is absolutely wonderful.

[Fooled Again: How the Right stole the 2004 election and Why they will steal the next one too.](#) By Miller. I'm sorry, but I couldn't get through this. He rumples around too much and takes too long to get to the point. However, it is entertaining reading unless you are in a hurry.

Ok, sites:

Without a doubt, What Really Happened.com vote fraud archives is my favorite. Around 85% of what I have here came from them (Full Disclosure means I must say they posted my website called "Protest Stolen Election 2004" in late December, 2004.)

[http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/archives/cat\\_vote\\_fraud.html](http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/archives/cat_vote_fraud.html)

Here is black box voting.org, with Bev Harris, who has worked up some deliciously wonderful demonstrations.

<http://www.blackboxvoting.org/>

Election Protection folks:

ElectionProtection.org

Jeez, AI can't forget Bradblog:

Bradblog.com

[http://www.opednews.com/kefer\\_111504\\_readings.htm](http://www.opednews.com/kefer_111504_readings.htm)

<http://www.freepress.org/departments/display/19/2005/1318>

[www.CommonDreams.org](http://www.CommonDreams.org)

[www.Truthout.org](http://www.Truthout.org)

Greg Palast wrote a book called The Best Democracy Money Can Buy, and articles on the stolen election BEFORE it was stolen:

<http://www.thedubya-report.com/palast-democracy.html>

[www.tompaine.com/articles/kerry\\_won.php](http://www.tompaine.com/articles/kerry_won.php)

### **Here are my favorite write-ups of the issue:**

The Silent Scream of Numbers

The 2004 election was stolen — will someone please tell the media?

<http://commonwonders.com/archives/col290.htm>

No Paper Trail Left Behind: the Theft of the 2004 Presidential Election\*

By Dennis Loo, Ph.D.

[http://www.projectcensored.org/newsflash/voter\\_fraud.html](http://www.projectcensored.org/newsflash/voter_fraud.html)

Voting Fraud in the 2004 Presidential Election

## Article by Will Pitt

<http://ideamouth.com/voterfraud.htm>

### LIST OF OTHER USEFUL SITES:

Votergate 30 minute movie:

<http://www.votermarch.org/>

Olberman

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6210240/>

Look at the second blog entry; he mentions lots of what you need, including a link to this:

Pinpointing precincts with errors

<http://uscountvotes.org/>

<http://democracymeansyou.blogspot.com/2004/11/demand-recounts-now.html>

<http://www.commondreams.org/headlines04/1106-30.htm>

This is what I found

<http://enight.dos.state.fl.us/>

Shows the Florida data

Bob Fritakis at Free Press

Found here:

<http://www.freepress.org/columns/display/3/2004/985>

<http://www.oilempire.us/exitpolls.html>

Search on election fraud 2004

How to organize protests:

<http://www.commondreams.org/views04/1129-26.htm>

It looks like there is a judge in Ohio who is not inclined to let third parties carry a challenge on their own. That is why it is more important than ever to tell Mr. Kerry what we the people want him to do. Here is a one click page where you can send your personal message to him, the DNC and the GAO, all at the same time

<http://www.thepen.us/e-fraud.html>

We know we are having an impact because the GAO is ready to launch an investigation based on the people who have appealed to them already. Now is the time to crank it up to the next level. Please post this link everywhere you can to everyone you know.

News Update from Citizens for Legitimate Government November 25, 2004 --

<http://www.legitgov.org/>

[http://www.legitgov.org/index.html#breaking\\_news](http://www.legitgov.org/index.html#breaking_news)

Wyoming: 106% Turnout of Registered Voters in 2004 General Elections --According to the 'Profile of Wyoming's Voters - Voter Registration and Voter Turnout' on the Wyoming Secretary of State's website, Wyoming had a turnout of 106% registered voters on November 2, 2004.

Wyoming had 232,396 registered voters - 62% of eligible voters for the 2004 General Elections; turnout of registered voters was 245,789, or 106% of registered voters.

<http://www.freezerbox.com/archive/article.asp?id=321>

You will find 250 links (!!!!) here:

[http://www.linkcrusader.com/vote\\_machines.htm](http://www.linkcrusader.com/vote_machines.htm)

You will also find bunches of links here:

<http://www.pamrotella.com/polhist/elections2004.html>

<http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/04votefraud.html>

<http://vote2004.eriposte.com/>

<http://stolenelection2004.com/>

<http://vote2004.eriposte.com/swingstates/ohio.htm>

[http://www.tompaine.com/articles/kerry\\_won.php](http://www.tompaine.com/articles/kerry_won.php)

<http://www.betterworldlinks.org/book109h.htm>

<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6210240/>

[http://www.opednews.com/keefe\\_111504\\_readings.htm](http://www.opednews.com/keefe_111504_readings.htm)

<http://www.electoral-vote.com>

<http://www.openvotingconsortium.org/>

<http://democracymeansyou.blogspot.com/2004/11/demand-recounts-now.html>

<http://www.freepress.org/columns/display/3/2004/983>

[Back to the top.](#)

**ALMOST UNLIMITED PERMISSION TO USE:**

I give ANYBODY permission to reprint or reuse this information, post it to another site, etc. as long as long as you do not change any of my writing. In fact, post this everywhere you can find that will take it.

I make these claims with the assistance and encouragement of my fellow patriot, [Lee Ann Innmon](#) of [Dillo Web Designs](#), whose services I whole-heartedly endorse as the only individual or corporate entity I trust to present my views to the public in general.

[Back to the top.](#)

Web page design and maintenance done *By:* [Dillo Web Designs](#)™ If you notice a link that does not work correctly or any other issue on this site, PLEASE contact [Lee Ann](#), the webmaster for this site.

[EMAIL THIS PAGE TO A FRIEND](#)