

Direct Cinema Limited
in association with
Abramorama & Mitropoulos Films
presents a
Concentric Media
production

STEALING AMERICA:

Vote by Vote

Narrated by Peter Coyote

Directed & Produced
by
Dorothy Fadiman

Production Notes
90 Minutes, Color, 35 mm

www.StealingAmericaTheMovie.com
www.StealingAmericaTheMovie.com/GetActive

PUBLIC RELATIONS
LOS ANGELES
Fredell Pogodin & Associates
Office: (323) 931 7300
Fredell Pogodin
fredell@fredellpogodin.com
Bradley Jones
Bradley@fredellpogodin.com

DISTRIBUTION:
Direct Cinema Limited
P.O. Box 10003
Santa Monica, CA 90410
Office: (310) 636 8200
Fax: (310) 636 8228
Mitchell Block
mwblock@gmail.com
Kiersten Johnson
stealingamerica@gmail.com

PUBLIC RELATIONS
NEW YORK
Falco Ink
Office: (212) 445 7100
Mobile: (917) 225 7093
Shannon Treusch
shanntreusch@falcoink.com
Steven Beeman
stevenbeeman@falcoink.com

BOOKING INFORMATION:
WEST & NATIONAL
Mitropoulos Films
Office: (310) 273 1444
Mobile: (310) 567 9336
MJ Peckos
mjpeckos@sbcglobal.net

BOOKING INFORMATION:
EAST & NATIONAL
Abramorama
Office: (914) 273 9545
Mobile: (917) 566 7175
Richard Abramowitz
richard@abramorama.com



CREDITS

PRODUCER & DIRECTOR

Dorothy Fadiman

NARRATOR

Peter Coyote

MUSIC

Laurence Rosenthal

EXECUTIVE PRODUCERS

Mitchell Block

James Fadiman

CO-PRODUCERS

Bruce O'Dell

Carla Henry

VIDEOGRAPHY

Matthew Luotto & Rick Keller

PRINCIPAL EDITORS

Katie Larkin

Matthew Luotto

Xuan Vu

Ekta Bansal Bhargava

CONSULTING EDITORS

Pam Wise, A.C.E.

Kristin Atwell

ASSISTANT EDITORS

Roopa Parameswaran & Joanne Dorgan

MOTION GRAPHICS

Digital Turbulence

Douglas DeVore & Wendy Van Wazer

Laura Green & Matthew Luotto

ADDITIONAL VIDEOGRAPHY

Fletcher Holmes, Mike Kash, Jim Heddle,
Steve Longstreth, Andy Dillon, David Frenkel
William Brandon Jourdan, Domenica Catalano

ASSOCIATE PRODUCERS

Katie Larkin
Robert Carrillo Cohen
James Q. Jacobs, Theron Horton, Jo Killen

ASSISTANTS to the PRODUCER
Kristen Schultz Oliver & Laura Green

FIELD PRODUCERS
Kat L'Estrange, Marty Ward
Rick Keller, Matthew Segal, Kate Barney

ARCHIVAL TV FOOTAGE
Lisa Rein & Pete Nicholls

ADDITIONAL FOOTAGE
“ORWELL ROLLS in his GRAVE” - Robert Kane Pappas
Kerry to Bush Animation - www.boomchicago.nl
Suzanne Patzer, Jamia Shepherd, Pat Leahan
Jeremy Robins, James Seligman, Judy Rhee
Catherine Murphy, Matt Ruskin, Katya Miller

NARRATION RECORDING
Rob Dickson

POST-PRODUCTION SOUND
OUTPOST Studios
Re-recording Mixer & Sound Design - Dave Nelson
Dialogue Editor - Miik Dinko

MUSIC SCORING MIXER
Dan Alvarez

MUSIC CONSULTANT
Lars Hidde

ADDITIONAL DIGITAL POST-PRODUCTION
R & R Studios
Robert Strong & Jeff Chang

ADDITIONAL EDITING
Steve Longstreth, Robert Carrillo Cohen
Robert Strong, Philip Safarik, Laura Green
Ralph King, Byron Deming, Davinder Mahal

RESEARCH

Carla Henry, Jo Killen
Victoria Parks, Jay McGowan
Mary Anne Saucier

SPECIAL THANKS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Marvin S. Putnam
O'Melveny & Myers, LLP
Kiersten Leigh Johnson
Peter De Conceicao
Elizabeth Anne Springett

Employing first-person accounts, extensive research and telling clips gleaned from the nightly news, Emmy Award-winning and Academy Award-nominated social issue filmmaker Dorothy Fadiman shines a spotlight on the gritty reality of the last decade's most egregious incidents of U.S. electoral insecurity.

SYNOPSIS

**For more than 20 years, exit polls accurately predicted U.S. election results.
Over the last 10 years, that reliability has progressively disappeared.
What's going on?**

The last two presidential elections both came down to a relatively small number of votes, and in both elections the integrity of the voting process has been called into question. With the upcoming election looking to be similarly close, the time has come to ask the questions: what happened in 2000 and 2004; what has changed since; and what can be done to ensure a fair and honest tabulation of votes in 2008?

STEALING AMERICA: *Vote by Vote* brings together behind-the-scenes perspectives from the U.S. presidential election of 2004 – plus startling stories from key races in 1996, 2000, 2002 and 2006. Unbiased and nonpartisan, the film sheds light on a decade of vote counts that don't match votes cast – uncounted ballots, vote switching, under-votes and many other examples of election totals that warrant serious investigation.

Throughout **STEALING AMERICA**, we hear from voters who experienced a wide range of problems, including those whose votes flipped from one candidate to another and those whose polls didn't have enough machines to serve the number of voters. Investigative journalists describe how their reportage on election fraud was sidelined. First-person citizen testimonies speak of waiting in line nine hours to vote. We hear how polling experts' requests for essential information – such as precinct voting data necessary to examine irregularities – had been rejected, while ballots were being systematically destroyed, making audits impossible.

In an effort to create the least biased and most balanced picture of this contentious issue, filmmaker Dorothy Fadiman has called upon experts from across the political spectrum, including:

- **Bob Hagan** – Ohio State Senator and first-hand witness to on-screen vote switching.
- **Paul Craig Roberts** -- Economist and former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Reagan and sometimes called the “Father of Reaganomics.” He is a former editor and columnist for the *Wall Street Journal*, *Business Week* and Scripps Howard News Service, and is at present a nationally syndicated columnist for Creators Syndicate.
- **Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.** – Activist, author, environmental lawyer and co-host of *Ring of Fire* on the Air America Radio network.
- **Charles Lewis** – Investigative journalist and former *60 Minutes* producer. Founder, Center for Public Integrity.
- **Bruce O' Dell** and **Chuck Herrin** – Fortune 100 company computer security analysts.
- **Greg Palast** – BBC investigative journalist whose reportage on the issue made the front page in U.K. and Europe, but was suppressed in the U.S.
- **Dr. Avi Rubin** – Director of the Information Security Institute at Johns Hopkins University.
- **Ion Sancho** – Leon County Supervisor of Elections. Appointed by the Florida Supreme Court to count the votes in the disputed 2000 presidential election, Sancho blazed a trail in proving that it is possible to "hack" into voting machines and change the totals.
- **Dr. Jonathan Simon** – Data analyst, who has been focusing on exit poll discrepancies.
- **John Zogby** – International polling authority.
- **Dr. Victoria Lovegren** - Senior-level data architect and systems analyst Case Western Reserve

STEALING AMERICA unveils patterns of anomalies at every level of the electoral process. Controversial partnerships perpetuate a secretive environment, as relevant facts and figures remain hidden from view. As a result, most Americans have no real sense of the threat to free and fair elections. As seemingly unrelated pieces of the puzzle come together, a chilling picture emerges of widespread, artfully crafted "glitches" that, in the final tallies, have the capacity to alter election results.

STEALING AMERICA: WHO IS WHO



Kim Akins

Kim Akins is currently acting as an administrative hearing officer for the Mahoning County, Ohio, Child Support Enforcement Agency. She earned her law degree from the University of Akron in 1989, and is a politically active, card-carrying member of the ACLU.



Libby Anker

Libby Anker begins a tenure track position at George Washington University in the fall of 2008. The focus of her research is American democracy. She completed her PhD in Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley in 2007. She subsequently served as the Carol G. Lederer Postdoctoral Fellow at the Pembroke Center at Brown University.



John Boyd

John W. Boyd has been a practicing lawyer since 1973, specializing in civil rights, election law, employment law and complex commercial litigation, including trials, appeals and class actions. He has had extensive involvement in election-related litigation, including ballot access, voter identification, redistricting and voting machine challenges.



Stephen Colbert

Stephen Colbert is an Emmy and Peabody award-winning comedian, satirist, actor and writer. He is best known for his work on Comedy Central's *The Daily Show* and his own *Colbert Report*, as well as for his coinage of the word "truthiness."















Clint Curtis







Clinton Eugene "Clint" Curtis became a computer programmer in 1985 and has been responsible for successful deployments of database, prototype and document management systems for a number of businesses and other organizations. These include: NASA, Department of Human Services (Washington DC), Florida Department of Transportation, Florida Department of Law Enforcement, Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission, Florida School Food Service and Florida State Technology Office.














Since June 2003, Matthew Damschroder has served as the Director of the Franklin County Board of Elections as its Director. Prior to his service with the board, Matthew was Executive Director of the Franklin County Republican Party. He is a native of Columbus, Ohio.

<p>Matthew Damschroder</p>	
 <p>Bob Fitrakis</p>	<p>Bob Fitrakis is the Executive Director of the Columbus Institute for Contemporary Journalism (CICJ) and a Political Science professor at Columbus State Community College and CICJ. He served as an Election Protection attorney on November 2, 2004, in Franklin County, Ohio, and called the first public hearings on voter suppression and election irregularities. He has published the <i>Free Press</i>, a progressive alternative journal since 1992. www.freepress.org</p>
 <p>Reverend Susan Frederick-Gray</p>	<p>The Reverend Susan Frederick-Gray received her Master of Divinity degree from Harvard Divinity and was ordained in June 2002. Following many years as the Minister of the First Unitarian Universalist Church of Youngstown, Ohio, she now lives in Arizona where serves as the Minister of the Unitarian Universalist Congregation in Phoenix.</p>
 <p>Brad Friedman</p>	<p>Brad Friedman is an Investigative Blogger and Managing Editor of the website www.BradBlog.com, where he reports extensively on election irregularities. He is the co-founder of VelvetRevolution.us, an umbrella organization of citizen groups addressing issues from Election Reform to Media Reform. He writes for <i>Huffington Post</i>, <i>Mother Jones</i> and <i>Hustler</i>. His radio program can be found at: www.BradShow.com</p>
 <p>Bob Hagan</p>	<p>Bob Hagan was first elected to office in 1986 as an Ohio State Representative. He served as an Ohio State Senator from 1998 - 2006 and was recently re-elected to the Ohio House of Representatives. Prior to holding office, Hagan worked as a locomotive engineer for CSX Transportation Inc., where he still works when not in session.</p>
 <p>Chuck Herrin</p>	<p>Chuck Herrin, CISSP, CISA, MCSE 2000, CEH, is an IT Security Consultant whose client list includes many of the Fortune 500 companies. His specialties include penetration testing and IT auditing. He enjoys giving “Hands-on Hacking” demonstrations which highlight how easy gaining access to resources can be. When he’s not causing blue screens on his test lab computers, he is working on his Ph D, which he swears he will finish someday soon.</p>
	<p>Chris Hood has been working in the arena of government technology for many years. In the late 1970s, he was involved in the development of aftermarket emission control and EPA compliance. He later worked as a consultant for Diebold Election Systems, helping the company promote its new electronic voting machines in Georgia in 2002. Since that experience, he has been a strong advocate of paper voting.</p>

Chris Hood	
	<p>Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. is an activist and author who is widely recognized as the country's most prominent environmental attorney, working tirelessly to safeguard the environment and public health. His op-ed columns appear regularly in <i>The New York Times</i> and other major newspapers. He is a co-host, with Mike Papantonio, of <i>Ring of Fire</i> on the Air America Radio network. www.ringoffireradio.com</p>
Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.	
	<p>Bob Koehler is a Chicago-based journalist whose weekly column on politics is nationally syndicated by Tribune Media Services. Calling his work “part political brawl, part secular prayer,” his column, which has appeared in hundreds of mainstream newspapers, is a strong critique of mainstream understandings of war, poverty, social inequity, environmental degradation and the state of our democracy. www.commonwonders.com</p>
Bob Koehler	
	<p>Lynn Landes is a freelance journalist who writes about politics, health, and the environment. She is also the publisher of <i>The Landes Report</i>. She is a leading researcher and analyst on voting integrity issues. In 2004, she filed a federal lawsuit in which she challenged the use of voting machines and absentee ballots in the city of Philadelphia. www.thelandesreport.com/report/VotingSecurity.htm</p>
Lynn Landes	
	<p>Pat Leahan is Co-Director of the Las Vegas (New Mexico) Peace & Justice Center, which uses the Civil Rights Movement’s model of grassroots organizing. She has been involved since the early days of the election integrity movement, helping to bring paper ballot legislation to New Mexico. Leahan maintains a commitment to peace and justice and feels called to this as her life’s work. She also teaches part-time in the Department of Behavioral Sciences at New Mexico Highlands University. www.lvpeacecenter.org</p>
Pat Leahan	
	<p>Glorianne Leck taught for over 30 years as a Professor of Education at Youngstown (Ohio) State University. During the 2004 Presidential election, Leck was an elected precinct committee person working in the inner city of Youngstown, Ohio.</p>
Glorianne Leck	
	<p>Charles Lewis is an investigative journalist. In late 1988, he quit a successful career as a producer for the CBS News program <i>60 Minutes</i> and began the Center for Public Integrity, a nonprofit, nonpartisan watchdog organization in Washington that investigates political influence, corruption and other ethics-related issues. He is currently president and CEO of the Fund for Independence in Journalism in Washington. www.tfij.org</p>
Charles Lewis	

 <p>Victoria Lovegren</p>	<p>Dr. Victoria Lovegren is a senior-level data architect, systems and business analyst, educator and decision-science specialist with extensive background in operations management, and over 32 years of experience in the field. Dr. Lovegren is also a democracy, election-integrity and media-reform activist. She is founder of Ohio Vigilance and a board member of Election Defense Alliance.</p>
 <p>Bruce O'Dell</p>	<p>Bruce O'Dell is an information technology consultant with more than 25 years experience focused on the security and design of large-scale computer systems for Fortune 100 clients in the financial services industry. He applies his technical expertise to his work as an election integrity activist. O'Dell is an advocate of citizen-run elections using hand-counted paper ballots. He is currently affiliated with the Election Defense Alliance. www.electiondefensealliance.org</p>
 <p>Greg Palast</p>	<p>Greg Palast, an investigative journalist, is the author of the <i>New York Times</i> bestseller, <i>Armed Madhouse</i>. Palast's stories appear regularly on BBC television and in the U.K. <i>Guardian</i>. His reports election irregularities in 2004, the spike of the FBI investigations of the bin Ladens before September 11 and the secret State Department documents planning the seizure of Iraq's oil fields have won him a record six "Project Censored Awards" for reporting the news American media doesn't want you to hear. www.gregpalast.com</p>
 <p>Paul Craig Roberts</p>	<p>Paul Craig Roberts, Ph D, has had careers in government and journalism. He was appointed as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury by President Reagan. He was an associate editor at the <i>Wall Street Journal</i>, and columnist for <i>Business Week</i>, the Scripps Howard News Service and for Creators Syndicate in Los Angeles. His academic appointments include Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University.</p>
 <p>Lida Rodriguez-Taseff</p>	<p>Lida Rodriguez-Taseff is a lawyer and activist. A partner at the international law firm of Duane Morris LLP, her voting work includes co-founding and chairing the Miami-Dade Election Reform Coalition, and directing the Advancement Project's Right to Vote Public Education Initiative. She has written and presented extensively in the area of voting system reform in law journals.</p>
 <p>Dr. Aviel D. Rubin</p>	<p>Dr. Aviel D. Rubin is Professor of Computer Science and Technical Director of the Information Security Institute at Johns Hopkins University. Professor Rubin directs the NSF-funded ACCURATE center for correct, usable, reliable, auditable and transparent elections. A co-founder of Independent Security Evaluators (securityevaluators.com), he is the author of <i>Brave New Ballot</i> (Random House, 2006). www.avirubin.com</p>

 <p data-bbox="256 436 378 470">Ion Sancho</p>	<p data-bbox="493 195 1403 407">Ion Sancho is a State Certified Supervisor of Elections. In the 2000 Presidential recount, Sancho was chosen to lead the Florida hand count of ballots in dispute in Miami-Dade County. Sancho has been on National Public Radio, is quoted in the <i>New York Times</i>, the <i>Washington Post</i>, <i>St. Petersburg Times</i> and appears in the documentary <i>Hacking Democracy</i>. Sancho is noted for facilitating a voting security experiment, in which a hacker successfully hacked into Sancho's county's Diebold voting machines.</p> <p data-bbox="493 407 1403 436">www.leoncountyfl.gov/elect/?page=General%20Information/MeetTheSupervisor.asp</p>
 <p data-bbox="228 716 407 741">Antonio Sanford</p>	<p data-bbox="493 474 1403 653">Antonio Sanford currently works for the Winning Against Violent Environments (WAVE) Conflict Resolution Program. He works with other counselors to provide a safe place for students to talk when they are in conflict. In the summer of 2004, Antonio joined a non-partisan effort to register potential voters in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, in order to do his part to re-energize and engage people in their future. www.disputeresolution.ohio.gov/schools/w.a.v.e.htm</p>
 <p data-bbox="237 987 399 1012">Matthew Segal</p>	<p data-bbox="493 745 1403 924">Matthew Segal is the founder and executive director of the Student Association for Voter Empowerment (SAVE), a student-led, non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to removing access barriers and increasing civic education for young people. He is also a senior fellow at the Roosevelt Institution -- the nation's first student-run think-tank. Segal is currently a senior at Kenyon College Ohio, majoring in Sociology. www.savevoting.org/news.html</p>
 <p data-bbox="237 1257 407 1283">Jonathan Simon</p>	<p data-bbox="493 1016 1403 1257">Jonathan Simon, a graduate of Harvard College and New York University School of Law, is a member of the Bar of Massachusetts. As a result of his prior experience as a political survey research analyst for Peter D. Hart Research Associates in Washington, Dr. Simon became an early advocate for an exit poll-based electoral "burglar alarm" system, independent of media and corporate control, to detect computerized vote shifting in Election 2004. He is the co-founder of Election Defense Alliance, a national coordinating body for citizen electoral integrity efforts. www.ElectionDefenseAlliance.org</p>
 <p data-bbox="245 1528 391 1554">Jeanne Smith</p>	<p data-bbox="493 1287 1403 1377">Jeanne Smith is hard at work and enjoying life at the age of 71. She is the Office Manager at the <i>Buckeye Review</i>, a newspaper that serves the African American community in the Youngstown, Ohio area.</p>
 <p data-bbox="224 1799 412 1824">Robert Steinback</p>	<p data-bbox="493 1558 1403 1713">Robert L. Steinback joined the staff of <i>The Miami Herald</i> in 1983. In 2002, he became an editorial columnist for the <i>Herald's</i> Op-Ed page. In 2006, he created an independently syndicated column, "The World's Local Columnist." With this column, Steinback brings the local-columnist's style to events around the globe. He also continues to write for the <i>Herald</i>. www.robertsteinback.com/index2.html</p>

 <p>Jon Stewart</p>	<p>Jon Stewart is a comedian, satirist, actor, writer, pundit and producer. He is best known as the host of Comedy Central's <i>The Daily Show</i>, as well as his political satire.</p>
 <p>Charles Traylor</p>	<p>Charles E. Traylor is the host of the urban radio talk show <i>Front Street</i>. The focus is political, economic and social issues confronting the African-American community. In addition to being a radio personality, Traylor is the founder and developer of Generation to Generation: Breaking the Cycle of Violence. He is a motivational speaker, workshop presenter, and certified violence prevention educator.</p>
 <p>Harvey Wasserman</p>	<p>Harvey Wasserman is author or co-author of a dozen books, including <i>Solartopia! Our Green Powered Earth</i> and, with Bob Fittrakis, <i>How the GOP Stole America's 2004 Election</i>. Wasserman appears on radio and TV shows nationwide, including <i>Democracy Now!</i>, <i>Lou Dobbs</i> and <i>Columbus On the Record</i>. He is Senior Editor of the <i>Columbus Free Press</i> and Senior Advisor to Greenpeace USA. www.harveywasserman.com</p>
 <p>Deanna Zandt</p>	<p>Deanna Zandt is a media technologist and consultant to progressive media organizations including AlterNet, Hightower Lowdown and The Media Consortium. She works with groups to create and implement effective web strategies toward organizational goals of civic engagement and empowerment. She is also a member of the Brooklyn-based Not An Alternative political art collective. www.deannazandt.com/services/</p>
 <p>John Zogby</p>	<p>John Zogby is one of America's premier pollsters. Since 1996, he has polled for Reuters News Agency. In addition, from 2000 to 2004, he polled for NBC News. Zogby frequently appears on nightly network news programs and is a regular political commentator for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the BBC. He is also a Senior Advisor at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. www.zogby.com</p>

Q & A with Director/ Producer Dorothy Fadiman

STEALING AMERICA required lifting the debris from the truth to reveal the light beneath...a light which can help to rekindle the spirit of democracy through fair, clean elections. —Dorothy Fadiman

Q: What attracts you to documentary filmmaking?

A: I am keenly aware that film as a medium, including documentary film, holds the potential to open people's eyes, taking them beyond their usual ways of seeing the world. As a filmmaker, I use this opportunity (as carefully as I can) to introduce audiences to new realities. With **STEALING AMERICA**, for example, I learned that most Americans think elections are basically fair. After watching this film, audience members will discover more than they might have ever imagined about voter disenfranchisement and the fact that voting machines are vulnerable to manipulation. Hearing these stories told in the first-person by those who suffered through them, viewers will learn about and experience the shadow side of our current electoral process.

Q: What inspired you to make STEALING AMERICA?

A: I was working at the polls as a volunteer in Florida on Election Day, 2004. I kept hearing about citizens who voted for one candidate, then watched in astonishment as another name lit up on the electronic screen. Throughout Election Day, I witnessed voters reporting this problem to election observers at the polls and on voter hotlines. I was struck by the frustration I observed, fueled by an increasing sense of suspicion as voters realized they could not trust the voting process. Right then and there, I decided to make a film about the impact of this particular phenomenon. These voters were feeling left out of the democratic system—literally disenfranchised—by the way these machines were (mis)behaving. As victims of this vote switching “malfunction,” voting citizens had no idea how their votes would be counted once they were cast.

Initially, I planned to make a film only about people's reactions to the vote-flipping phenomenon in Florida. Soon after I returned to California and began preproduction, I learned that the phenomenon was happening not just in Florida, but in precincts across the country. I spent many days filming in Mahoning County, Ohio, where 20-30 machines were flipping votes throughout election. These interviews and observations led to my growing awareness about the lack of computer security and the vulnerability of our voting machines.

Making **STEALING AMERICA** became a mission. Why? It can all be distilled into the words with which I open the film: *"The right to vote...is the primary right by which other rights are protected"* —Thomas Paine

Q: Can you give us an example of a particularly challenging situation that you encountered during the making of this film?

A: There is always the question as to whether approaching someone for an interview about a personal experience will be regarded as an intrusion or an opportunity for that person to tell their story. I faced this question in deciding whether or not to interview Ohio State Senator Bob Hagan, whose vote flipped from one candidate to another while he was voting. State Senator Hagan confided this odd event privately to one of his close friends, who then told me. I had to debate letting him know that I knew, since he had not yet "gone public" and had only shared his experience privately. I decided to call him and told him I knew his vote had flipped. Luckily, he was relieved and eager to talk. Bob said to me, "Thank you! I have been wanting to talk to someone in the media about this since Election Day two years ago...but didn't have the opportunity before now."

Q: How did you capture the frustration people were feeling on Election Day?

A: I needed to go to people on the ground. Election volunteers from Ohio, for example, described the ways that they fought for voters' rights at the polls. They spoke passionately about how they demanded more machines to serve the huge crowds. People stood in line, waiting for many hours to vote. As the volunteers give the details of

their experiences, I hope that the viewer will feel the human drama their fellow citizens faced as they tried to break through organizational and political barriers to defend voters and voice their own complaints.

When I show conflict in a film—internal or external—I try to do it without editorializing. I let the people tell the story from their own experiences. I don't over-dramatize the conflict, or make the narrator try to tell the audience what to feel. I want the viewer to decide.

A Citizen's Guide to Voting Technology

Bruce O'Dell

Fortune 100 Computer Security Analyst and

Co-Producer of STEALING AMERICA: *Vote by Vote*

Excerpt. The entire article can be found at www.StealingAmericaTheMovie.com/GetActive

Q: There are a lot of academics and experts that say voting software is perfectly secure. What basis do you have for questioning their judgment?

A: I've made a career of helping my clients protect billions of dollars of other people's money from thieves, hackers and embezzlers, and I design very large-scale computer systems with extraordinary requirements for security and integrity. At American Express, I led a project to provide customer access to transactions from financial institutions throughout North America. I've served as the technical leader of a project to replace the access control software at one of the twenty biggest companies in America. And – unlike some of my academic and professional colleagues, who consult for or provide software to voting technology vendors or their clients – I have never had any financial interest in promoting e-voting technology.

Q: Why are you questioning the honesty of the people who create and program voting machines and who run our elections?

A: I'm not questioning anyone's honesty—but human nature is what human nature is. There's ample room for insider misconduct in any organization. Surprisingly enough, the most severe security risks in any organization are from insiders. Despite extraordinary security measures, banks and financial institutions continue to be ripped off by trusted insiders who understand exactly where the weaknesses are in the system. According to Dan Verton's recent book *Identity Thieves*, insiders accounted for approximately 70% of the \$3.4 billion that banks lost to internal and external fraud and hacker incidents in 2004.

Q: What could possibly motivate so-called “malicious insiders” at the voting equipment companies to risk getting caught?

A: Our elections determine those leaders who command the world's only superpower military, set the agenda for federal law enforcement and who control the world's largest checkbook: our federal budget. By the “Willy Sutton” rule, voting systems are truly “where the money's at.” Common sense tells me that constant, ruthless and highly sophisticated attempts by insiders to subvert voting software must be assumed to be currently underway, given such a valuable target.

Yet when it comes to voting systems, the presumption currently seems to be that attacks by malicious insiders are unthinkable. In the wake of a report of what was (at the time) “the worst security vulnerability ever found in a voting system,” David Bear, a representative of Diebold Election Systems, was quoted as follows (New York Times, May 12, 2006):

For there to be a problem here, you're basically assuming a premise where you have some evil and nefarious election officials who would sneak in and introduce a piece of software... I don't believe these evil elections people exist.

Imagine the reaction of a CEO or CFO upon hearing a company representative selling cash management software say that their clients do not need to worry about reports of a major security flaw in their software, because he doubted that any “evil bankers” existed. Heads would roll.

Q: Before it spun off its voting equipment division, Diebold manufactured both ATMs and electronic voting machines. Isn't casting your ballot on an electronic voting machine just as secure as taking cash from an ATM?

A: That's a common misconception – but in terms of security, ATM devices and electronic voting machines actually have almost nothing in common. It all comes down to one simple consideration: on the one hand, votes must be anonymous; while on the other hand, electronic financial transactions must be based on strong proof of identity.

Electronic financial transactions are as secure as they are – where embezzlement is the exception and not the rule – simply because you must first prove your identity to all the parties involved in any ATM transaction. Voting is an anonymous transaction. Electronic voting machines cannot apply to voting transactions any of the identity-based financial auditing mechanisms universally used by ATM machines. If they did, the secrecy of your ballot would disappear.

Q: I'm not sure I understand – can you give a concrete example why ATMs and electronic voting machines are so different?

A: Just imagine what would happen if an election is run using e-voting equipment that applies the same security standards as banks do to ATMs. You sign on, enter your PIN number, and then cast your “ATM ballot.” Your name is immediately sent to the computers owned by each candidate you vote for, and your name and ballot choices also go to your county and state election officials. You receive a printed receipt listing your ballot selections that is yours to take home with you. When the polls close, there's little doubt about who won the “ATM” election; every candidate would have a complete a list of all the voters who voted for him or her. You would even receive a statement from your county election office listing all your ballot choices as officially recorded. Since ATM-style security measures can't be applied in real world elections, voting by computer is extraordinarily risky.

Q: There's got to be some kind of process that election administrators use to double-check the accuracy of the voting machines after an election.

A: In contrast to banks that always audit all of their transactions, in the real world only a relative few states routinely audit any of their paper ballot records (if they still have any) to independently verify the accuracy of the machine tallies. Those few states that check their paper ballot records, only do so for a few percent of their precincts. If current “best practices” in American election administration were applied to the financial services industry – for example, if there were a bank that chose to independently audit only a few percent of its accounts, or simply trusted that its accounts were all accurate without any independent audit at all – its customers would flee in panic, regulators would shut it down, and its Board of Directors would face possible jail time.

Q: But you make it sound like there are no safeguards in place. Aren't voting machines certified by independent inspectors and subject to strict testing to make sure they are accurate?

A: The computer industry as a whole does not do a good job when it comes to building security into software products. But both practically and theoretically, it is impossible through testing to determine that any computer system has no flaws – much less, to rule out the existence of secret back-door functions to be triggered on a future date. After all, all computers have clocks and can tell time, and there are a vast number of ways to program them to behave differently when being tested than when deployed in the field during an election.

Q: How does the way Las Vegas protects electronic gambling equipment compare to how we protect electronic voting equipment?

A: Nevada performs elaborate, stringent and intrusive ongoing independent random inspections of the hardware and software of the actual electronic gambling equipment in use at all casinos. In stark contrast, the details of our electronic vote tallying systems are considered by their manufacturers to be “trade secrets” and as such are legally shielded from independent inspection. No voting system has ever been examined and tested in any jurisdiction in America with anything approaching comparable rigor, and if these manufacturers continue to have their way, none ever will. Despite all the stringent measures Nevada takes, insiders at the gaming equipment vendors and at the casinos have successfully compromised computerized gambling machines. Even though successful manipulation of election equipment yields far greater financial returns, those who suggest that electronic election manipulation by insiders is possibly underway are dismissed as “conspiracy theorists.”

Q: But what if someone could inspect the voting machine software? Wouldn't an inspection of this kind find problems or even deter people from manipulating election equipment?

A: The source code is just a document. Source code, which is readable by humans, becomes translated into a “binary” version that is no longer human readable – but can be run by a computer. So I cannot tell simply by reading the official source code what binary logic is actually installed and running on any particular voting device in the field. “Source code inspection” actually misleads the public, making it seem as if IT professionals have superhuman powers to “know” what is actually running in a particular device in the field during an election – when of course, we do not.

Q: That's paranoid. Surely no one could ever subvert voting machines or voting software on a scale sufficient to change the outcome of elections without word leaking out? There must be many people involved in such an operation!

A: Actually, you wouldn't need very many people at all. Election administrators have hands-on access to memory cards and central tabulators. Even after the devices are tested in readiness for an upcoming election, local election officials have a surprising degree of cozy hands-on access to voting equipment. In fact, all over the country, voting machines are frequently brought home by poll workers for "storage" prior to the election. Voting equipment vendors allege that their equipment has tamper-proof seals, while in reality, it takes only minutes using household tools to gain sufficient access to voting equipment to permanently and in practice undetectably alter the software. Or, assume the employees at the voting equipment vendors are as trustworthy on average as the employees in any other corporation. All you would need is a small handful of people with the right level of access to the software distribution process. Alter the master copy of the software – any component, of any of the software, from the operating system on up – and that change can eventually get copied to all the vendor's voting machines.

Q: Why do you really think that someone could – or even would – take such an enormous risk for uncertain results?

A: The risks are not so enormous, given the culture of American politics. As **STEALING AMERICA** reveals, voting systems are "presumed accurate" by politicians, the public and the media. Any electronic vote tallying system – even one with some kind of paper trail – is never fully audited unless a candidate challenges the result. If the official result is not particularly close, there is absolutely no political will to challenge it. In other words: the bolder, the better. And when recounts do occur, all too often, the fox is auditing the hen house with plenty of time to hide the bloody feathers.

For the first time in history, computerized election equipment has made possible an extraordinarily dangerous feedback loop. After all, you simply can't take down the American Republic by force of arms; a conventional violent coup won't work, but one with "manufactured consent" that appears to be reflecting the will of the people certainly will. An undetected series of gradually-increasing deceptive election results over time leads to the manufactured illusion of a shift in the underlying voting patterns of the electorate. Eventually, the manufactured reality becomes true insofar as we can perceive it. Exit polls and increasingly even the selection criteria for public opinion polls, are calibrated to "official" election results.

Q: Is there any kind of voting technology that can be made secure?

A: There was a remarkable article published by the Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility in 2001, citing work by the Caltech-MIT Voting Project, indicating that no form of voting technology ever invented is more accurate than people counting paper ballots, one at a time, by hand. If there is a superior alternative solution to any problem that does not involve computer automation, it is unethical for information technology professionals to advocate use of computers.

Q: But isn't it true that hand-counted paper ballots are just as vulnerable as machines, if not more so?

A: Paper-based processes are not perfectly secure, of course. But some of us certainly think we've figured out how to audit and safeguard paper-based systems, to an acceptable degree of public and commercial confidence, over the last few centuries. Here's a quick reality check: if you agree that it is impossible to effectively audit and safeguard paper, stop by your local bank and help yourself to the cash on the way out. Or if you're in Washington, drop in at the White House and pick up your own copy of the President's Daily Brief; I've heard it's fascinating reading.

The bizarre belief that it is impossible to run fair elections with hand-counted paper must come as a surprise to the citizens of Canada, New Zealand, Germany, Iraq... and so on, all of whom not only conduct their elections on paper, but also manage to double-check the outcome with an acceptable level of public satisfaction with the results. If you do not believe me, Google the phrase "Disputed Canadian Election."

Q: Don't we need computerized voting equipment to accommodate the needs of visually or mobility impaired voters?

A: You don't need computers to enable visually or mobility-impaired voters to cast ballots. For example, Wisconsin allows the use of the non-computerized VotePAD ballot marking device.

Q: But we've invested billions of dollars in advanced computerized voting technology. You can't seriously be suggesting we get rid of all of it?

A: I say technology professionals have an obligation to honestly advise the public whenever the most appropriate choice is not to use computers. Ireland and the Netherlands also recently purchased computerized voting equipment – and both countries are now throwing it all out in favor of a return to hand-counted paper ballots.

Q: Sure, hand counting paper ballots works in small countries, but isn't it impractical to count paper ballots by hand in a country as big as the U.S.?

A: The size of the country is irrelevant. A bigger country just means there are more counters working in parallel. The average American precinct has about 500 to 700 votes to count. Larger precincts can have multiple counting teams. This is hardly a problem that cries out for a computer.

Q: Do you really think the American people are up to the challenge? Almost half of us don't even bother to vote. Wouldn't the paper ballot process wind up just as bad or even worse than what we now have?

A: I, for one, don't believe that the people of countries like Canada, Ireland, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands (or Iraq, for that matter) have any special talents or civic virtues that enable them – but not us – to run elections on paper to a high level of public trust and confidence. I strongly believe that with the appropriate procedural checks and balances, we Americans can indeed gather together every couple of years and collectively count all the way up to 500 or so, several times, in public – without any computers to “help” us. I trust American citizens to safeguard the integrity of our Republic.

The Filmmakers

Dorothy Fadiman, Producer/Director

Dorothy Fadiman has been producing media with a focus on social justice and human rights since 1976. Her film subjects have ranged from progressive education in *WHY DO THESE KIDS LOVE SCHOOL?* (produced with KTEH-TV) and progressive change for women in some of the least developed villages of India in *WOMAN by WOMAN: New Hope for the Villages of India* (produced with KQED-TV); to a three-film series on reproductive issues and a five-film series on AIDS in Ethiopia including *From RISK to ACTION: Women and HIV/AIDS in Ethiopia*.

Fadiman has won more than 50 major awards, including an Emmy for her 1995 production *FROM DANGER to DIGNITY: The Fight for Safe Abortion*, and an Oscar nomination for Best Short Subject, as well as the Gold Medal from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for her 1992 production *WHEN ABORTION WAS ILLEGAL: Untold Stories*. Her films have been broadcast on PBS, and have been screened in many international venues. Fadiman's new book, *PRODUCING with PASSION: Making Films That Make a Difference* was released in June, 2008.

Peter Coyote, Narrator

Peter Coyote is an Emmy award-winning narrator of over 120 documentaries, including *ENRON: The Smartest Guys in the Room*. An accomplished actor, Coyote has appeared in more than 90 films, including major roles in *E.T.* and *Erin Brockovich*. From 1975 to 1983, Coyote was a member and then Chair of the California Arts Council. He is also a distinguished writer and the author of a memoir, *Sleeping Where I Fall*. He is also songwriter, guitarist and singer.

Mitchell W. Block, Executive Producer

Mitchell W. Block has been a director, producer, executive producer and distributor of outstanding shorts and documentary films since the early 1970s. Most recently, he was an executive producer of the "PBS television event" CARRIER, a 10-hour documentary series and companion feature film which he conceived and co-created. His distribution company, Direct Cinema Limited, has handled more than 60 Academy Award nominees and winners, including *Murder on a Sunday Morning* (2001), *Common Threads: Stories from the Quilt* (1989) and *Ten Year Lunch: The Wit and Legend of the Algonquin Round Table* (1987).

In 2000, Block was an executive producer of the Academy award-winning documentary *Big Mama* for HBO. He has written numerous articles on independent film production and distribution and is a columnist on producing for *Release Print* (published by the Film Arts Foundation) and is a regular contributor to *International Documentary Magazine*. Additionally, he has been an adjunct professor in the Peter Stark Producing Program at USC for the last 29 years.

James Fadiman, Executive Producer

James Fadiman's film work includes a series of educational films for KQED-TV and two productions for PBS. He is a co-founder of the Institute for Transpersonal Psychology, where he currently teaches. He is the President of Tomorrow's Energy Corporation, and in addition, he consults with European groups interested in combining psychology, media, and business. His books include *Unlimit Your Life* and *Personality and Personal Growth*.

Laurence Rosenthal, Composer

Laurence Rosenthal began his career as a composer in the U.S. Air Force Documentary Film Squadron. Following his tour of duty, he transitioned to composing for Broadway Theater, where Leonard Bernstein, the New York Philharmonic, and other orchestras premiered his symphonic compositions. He

began composing for motion pictures in the 1950s, and has been nominated for an Academy Award for *Becket* and *The Man of La Mancha* and has won seven Emmys over the course of his career. In 2006, he was awarded the ASCAP Lifetime Achievement Award.

Bruce O'Dell, Co-Producer

Bruce O'Dell is an information technology consultant with more than 25 years of experience focusing on the security and design of large-scale computer systems for Fortune 100 clients in the financial services industry. He applies his technical expertise to his work as an election integrity activist. He is an advocate of citizen-run elections using hand-counted paper ballots, and is currently affiliated with the Election Defense Alliance. Bruce's contributions to the film have evolved over the many years it took to create *STEALING AMERICA*, from being an on-camera interview expert-subject to providing an enormous amount of effort advising the filmmakers on the technical issues of this complex subject, including fact checking, researching and contributing to the film's factual content. In appreciation of his volunteered efforts, he was given a credit of Co-Producer. He has received no financial compensation for his generous contributions.

Carla Henry, Co-Producer

Carla Henry became interested in the election integrity movement after traveling to New Mexico in 2004 to serve as one of the 6000 swing state attorney precinct monitors for the Kerry-Bush presidential contest. Upon returning to the San Francisco Bay area, she searched for a creative project that would help effect the changes needed to ensure that every citizen's vote is counted as cast. She signed on with Concentric Media and has focused on research, fact verification and script development.

Katie Larkin, Editor / Associate Producer

Katie Larkin began working in the film industry as an intern at Robert De Niro's Tribeca Productions in New York City, and went on to produce and direct her own independent short about the heroin problem in the medieval town of Perugia, Italy. She has spent time freelance editing and assistant editing for various companies including Lightworks - KPI and Embassy Row Factual. Currently, she is working as a junior producer at Superfad, a motion graphics company in New York. She received her B.A. in Political Science and Italian literature from McGill University in Canada.

Matthew Luotto, Videographer, Editor

Matthew Luotto has spent the last eight years filming documentaries on a variety of human rights and social justice issues. He traveled to Addis Ababa to co-produce, shoot and edit a five-part series on HIV/AIDS in Ethiopia. Other projects include travels to Nicaragua to co-produce a film on the non-profit collaborative, Potters for Peace, as well as producing and directing "Lomami, An Artist's Way," a contemporary artist's retrospective in Paris. Luotto earned his B.A. in film and digital media from the University of California at Santa Cruz.

Rick Keller, Videographer

Rick Keller is currently a photojournalist with ABC6/Fox28 in Columbus, Ohio. Consequently, Keller has been witness to some of the most remarkable events in our political landscape, including meeting various presidential candidates and other political figures such as Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton and John McCain.

Xuan Vu, Editor

Xuan Vu is a documentary filmmaker whose core motivation is to give a voice to those who otherwise would not be heard. A graduate of Boston University with a Master's degree in Documentary Filmmaking and East West Philosophy, she is now a senior editor on the *STEALING AMERICA* production team. Her past film projects include a narrative documentary about a stage troupe of

elementary school children who put on musical plays dealing with social issues, such as rejection, bullying and loneliness.

Ekta Bansal Bhargava, Editor

Ekta Bansal Bhargava is a journalist from India. She began her work with Concentric as the Outreach Coordinator. With Fadiman's encouragement, she graduated to the position of editor. Bhargava is currently working on a project of her own exploring "women in the Bay Area," and with a non-profit organization which trains and supports community organizers.

Robert Carrillo Cohen, Associate Producer

Robert Carrillo Cohen is a film producer whose work includes the Emmy nominated HBO documentary *Hacking Democracy*. He is the director of the grassroots group Campaign for Election Protection. An early pioneer in game theory on the Internet, he created CoreWave, the first complete playable version of Herman Hesse's Nobel Prize winning novel *The Glass Bead Game*. His work as a producer is based on a life long interest in bridging the worlds of science and spirituality.

James Q. Jacobs, Associate Producer

James Q. Jacobs is an academic instructor. His interest in election integrity began with the Florida 2000 race. In 2004, disinformation in online discussions led him to investigate the Ohio Presidential election and, consequently, to conduct precinct-level analysis of the Cuyahoga County (Ohio) results and to develop statistical methods to quantify miscounted voting. He has published seminal analyses on the 2004 Presidential Election Results - Spreadsheets with analysis, summaries and charts for various states and exit polling. <http://jqjacobs.net/politics/spreadsheets.html>

Theron Horton, Associate Producer

Theron Horton has been instrumental in the development and production of many election integrity projects. He conducted Media Development for a Voter Registration List and Voting System Audit of the State of New Mexico's Office of the Secretary of State; he participated in a Process and Numeric Audit of the 2008 New Hampshire Presidential Primary; he wrote the article "Undervote Rates Plummet in Minority Precincts When Paper Ballots are Used," in association with Ellen Theisen of VotersUnite; and was a founding Member and Field Organizer for Voter Action New Mexico.

Concentric Media

Concentric Media is an independent video and digital production company based in Northern California with a focus on films that document issues of social justice. Founded by Dorothy Fadiman in 1978, Concentric Media has produced documentaries on various human rights issues, including the historic struggle for reproductive freedom in the United States, the ongoing efforts in Ethiopia to address the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and the need to add progressive values and courses to our schools and efforts to strengthen women's rights in India. Most recently, films have focused on election integrity. Concentric Media is a non-profit organization with 501(c)(3) status, sustained through grassroots fundraising, foundation grants and small donations from hundreds of individual donors.

STEALING AMERICA: *Vote by Vote*
Grassroots Campaign
Project Description

STEALING AMERICA's Grassroots Campaign is an election protection campaign in support of and in coordination with the summer 2008 debut of the documentary film *STEALING AMERICA: Vote By Vote*.

The Grassroots Campaign is designed to inform and to inspire groups and individual citizens by defining four specific election protection roles that they can take on, within their own communities. The four roles accommodate a range of audience commitment, providing an appealing and engaging framework to enable voters to participate as much as they can, or to step up to the next level.

The Grassroots Campaign roles are **Voter, Messenger, Advocate** and **Guardian**.

"... I am a VOTER"

Profile of a VOTER: Someone who can take concrete actions *now* to protect their rights.

Ask: What are my rights as a voter are where I vote?

Ask: how can I protect my vote?

Actions to protect my vote:

Confirm registration and affiliation, confirm vote dates, request to vote on paper.

Check the calendar of voter protection activities.

Register and confirm registration. Affiliate with party, if desired.

Know candidates and issues.

Re-confirm registration within 30 days of election.

Vote on paper when you can.

File complaints detailing any voting problems.

"... I am a MESSENGER"

Profile of a MESSENGER: Get the word out!

Actions to protect the vote:

All of the above, plus: ensuring that family and friends have their information on voter registration. Work on GOTV (getting out the vote).

Facilitate voting for family and friends.

Educate family and friends about candidates and issues.

Inform family and friends about registration and affiliation deadlines and requirements.

GOTV (get out the vote), translate for non-English voters, encourage use paper ballots, help voters report irregularities.

Celebrate neighborhood participation.

"... I am an ADVOCATE"

Profile of an ADVOCATE: An advocate for election integrity works on an on-going basis to improve all aspects of elections.

Challenges for Advocates: Under current forms of unverifiable voting, elected officials have chosen to privatize elections by purchasing unverifiable machinery with secret software. Advocates work to restore public transparency and accountability to the election process.

Actions to protect the vote:

An advocate for election integrity can become involved in many areas of elections. One key task is to develop and educate candidates who will work to restore trust and faith in election outcomes.

Insert yourself in the election process and form allegiances with key players like legislators and election officials.

Educate your legislators by becoming a citizen lobbyist. Testify at legislative hearings.

Monitor the activities of the secretary of state's office and testify at public hearings.

Request and **review** public records related to election activities. **Monitor** polling place issues by assisting in election problem call centers.

Perform citizen post-election auditing.

With time and commitment, an advocate may become an expert in legal actions related to election integrity. The Grassroots Campaign website www.StealingAmericaTheMovie.com/GetActive will include a calendar that gives critical dates to monitor the actions of election officials and take appropriate actions.

"... I am a GUARDIAN"

Definition of a GUARDIAN: Protector of elections

Takes action to protect the election.

Knows ballot protocols and voting systems.

Actions to Protect the Election:

All of the above, plus works as election judge, poll watcher, audit worker, election observer and canvass board member.

Familiarize yourself with electoral process and voting system.

Guard against disenfranchisement of eligible voters.

Volunteer to be an election worker.

Verify results are posted at the polling place.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The big picture goal of the grassroots campaign is to utilize screenings of STEALING AMERICA: *Vote by Vote* to engage citizens in a common effort to protect the integrity of the vote in the 2008 General Election.

As STEALING AMERICA: *Vote by Vote* is shown in each market nationwide, national and local organizers will help identify local threats to election integrity, and develop possible mitigations for the Grassroots Campaign to promote that are specific to that location.

For each planned screening, the grassroots campaign will consist of three project phases: **Pre-event** organizing; **Opening night** film screening event and related activities; and **Post-event** organizing. The pre-event phase will be coordinated with the STEALING AMERICA: *Vote by Vote* theatrical distribution and publicity teams on one hand and local activists on the other to plan for the film screening. At the screening, grassroots activists will provide handouts and flyers on how to get engaged. Post-event through Election Day, activities will be planned locally and nationally, coordinated on the ground and

through the grassroots web site. After the screening the campaign will shift into a higher gear in the run-up to the election, culminating in GOTV and election monitoring efforts.

PRE-EVENT DEVELOPMENT

The Pre-Event runs from May 1st through to the film screening. The team is preparing, researching, planning and developing the project scope, target artifacts, and methods to finalize requirements to meet the campaign's objectives.

The success of this phase will be come with an identified and engaged potential pool of voters large enough to protect the vote in that jurisdiction. The SAVBV grassroots team will create local partnerships with the Election Integrity movement, affinity groups and others; develop informational handouts and the film website, and plan for opening night's presentation.

FILM SCREENING + EVENTS

Each premiere film screening will benefit from both the grassroots and traditional campaign efforts. The grassroots, theatrical distribution and publicity teams will coordinate their support of the various types of showings. Day-of events may include activities in addition to the screening itself. For example, a local election integrity group may sponsor a conference or meeting in tandem with the theatrical screening. Depending on the venue, cast or crew of the film may also appear at the showing. Grassroots activists will ensure that handouts, fliers and other outreach information is available at the event venue, and where possible, is distributed by on-site volunteers who are able to answer questions.

POST-EVENT DEVELOPMENT

The post-event phase will be a time for ongoing support, monitoring and assessment of the success in protecting as many votes as possible.

PROJECT OFFERINGS

The Grassroots Campaign's project offerings in the Post-Event phase will deliver expertise in the areas of election protection, election integrity, voting rights. This includes advice on organizing around election issues, guidance on introducing election issues as a supplementary piece to organizing in a variety of community groups, and options for grassroots organizing with the film as the central messenger.

PEOPLE

The grassroots team will make available subject experts for local media, fund raising and private screenings. We will make use of local experts and continue to build new networks.

PRODUCTS

The signature products of the campaign will include the *STEALING AMERICA: Vote by Vote* film and the website: www.StealingAmericaTheMovie.com/GetActive

THE FILM

- The film is the grassroots campaign's main organizing tool. We anticipate distribution of promotional film clips across our target markets in viral and peer-to-peer email and web campaigns.
- The film will be used in private screenings as a local catalyst event. These showings will be highly targeted to the market and may include fund raising for additional local campaigns.
- The film will be distributed by DVD, as permitted, for use in house party and “library” organizing.

- The film will be distributed to target organizations within the EP, EI movements and other affinity organizations including religious groups and institutions.
- The film will be offered for screenings at high traffic events not necessarily related to voting or elections.
- The film will be offered to high schools and colleges with on-site expertise if desired.
- The film (clips) will be shown at city/county council meetings on PEG channels.
- The film (and press kit) will be distributed to the 15,000 media representatives descending on cities for political conventions.
- The film will be used to bring together local organizations' representatives to discuss and develop their synergy.

THE WEBSITE www.StealingAmericaTheMovie.com/GetActive

- The website will offer total support for the film.
- The landing page will also lead into a whole web portal with resources to get informed, spread the word and take action. Voters will be able to seamlessly access the full Election Protection web portal that will support the four role/identity commitment/action structure.
- Proposed: The website will provide links and resources for election integrity actions all in one place and provide the voter with tools for voter registration and registration confirmation as one file for their easy use.

TACTICS AND STRATEGIES FOR OVERCOMING THREATS WITH MITIGATION

ISSUE: PHOTO ID REQUIREMENTS

OVERVIEW: In May 2008 the Supreme Court ruled that Indiana photo identification requirement was constitutional bringing to three the number of states to demand photo ID at the polls (Indiana, Georgia and Florida). Those in favor of the photo ID requirement say, "We need to show photo ID to fly. Why shouldn't we have to show a photo ID to vote." The difference is that flying is a privilege. Voting is the right of every citizen, ages 18 and over.

THREAT: Disenfranchisement of one percent of the eligible voters. In states that require photo ID, voters are turned away from the polls for not having proper ID or they vote provisionally, whereupon it is later determined if their vote is counted or not. In previous elections, most notably Ohio, hundreds of thousands of provisional ballots were not counted.

MITIGATION: Oppose photo ID requirements; know the current ID requirements.

ISSUE: OBSTACLES TO REGISTERING VOTERS

OVERVIEW: unnecessary bureaucratic layers deter Citizen involvement. Among the disincentives are official training requirements and strict fines for not submitting forms within mandated timeframes. Some states disallow eligible voters who fail to register at least 30 days before an election. Other states allow same-day voter registration.

THREAT: Stunting the natural growth of the franchise.

MITIGATION: Prevent rules from being made that dissuade citizen participation in voter registration drives. Work for streamlined voter registration requirements.

ISSUE: ONLINE REGISTRATIONS

OVERVIEW: While online voter registration can help expand the franchise, the problem is that current technology is neither reliable nor secure enough to ensure that only eligible citizens are able to register. Standards and laws that would allow adequate technology are not in place.

THREAT: Incongruous state and county voter databases make online registration vulnerable to being lost, and vulnerable to registering ineligible voters.

MITIGATION: Oppose online registration until there is public ownership of voter registration technology and improved security standards for maintaining voter files. Ask why security standards can't be raised to the level of online banking and online gambling websites.

ISSUE: CAGING

OVERVIEW: Caging is a voter suppression tactic used by political campaigns; e.g., sending mail to a targeted group of voters with instructions to sign and return an acknowledgment card. The campaign then creates a list of those whose mail was returned undelivered and challenges the right of those citizens to vote — on the grounds that the voter does not live at the registered address.

THREAT: Disenfranchisement of targeted groups to swing an election.

MITIGATION: Active members of the US Armed Forces, felons, college students, Hispanic voters, and renters need to know their rights. Support anti-caging laws that include stiff penalties for the practice of caging.

ISSUE: ELIGIBILITY CHALLENGES

OVERVIEW: Eligibility requirements are established by the states and tend to change from election to election. Legislative efforts to reduce eligibility have been the bulwark of the disenfranchisement movement, which seeks to discourage targeted groups from participating in elections. In some states residency requirements, photo ID requirements, proof of citizenship requirements and criminal background checks create unnecessary bureaucratic hassles for eligible voters.

THREAT: Eligible voters are disenfranchised by disinformation campaigns or simply misinformed election workers.

MITIGATION: Assert your right to vote and be prepared to stand your ground even seeking legal help to insure your vote will count. Take written documentation of your voter registration to the polls.

ISSUE: VOTER ROLL PURGING

OVERVIEW: Many of us first learned about the practice of purging voter rolls after the revelation that voting technology companies removed the names of eligible voters in Florida because they had similar names to convicted felons. Other purge criteria include removing "inactive voters", and voters presumed to be dead or otherwise forcibly relocated. Computerized purges of eligible voters from databases have been prone to error and purposeful manipulation.

THREAT: Denying eligible voters their lawful right to vote.

MITIGATION: Demand public oversight of the management of your state's voter file; support candidates who defend the participation of vulnerable groups of voters.

ISSUE: UNACCOUNTABLE ELECTED OFFICIALS

OVERVIEW: Voters share the all-too-common experience of supporting a candidate for his or her pledge to be responsive to constituents, only to discover that much of the business of their newly elected or re-elected representative is conducted behind closed doors with little to no public access.

THREAT: Secret meetings where rules, laws and private contracts are devised to unfairly influence elections.

MITIGATION: Demand open records and sunshine laws. Legislative committee hearings and full sessions need to be recorded and archived in mp3 format accessible to the public.

ISSUE: UNDER-INFORMED AND COMPROMISED MEDIA

OVERVIEW: Few and far between are investigative journalists who are afforded long-term projects. Fewer still are those who study the mechanics of our election. Add the financial liabilities that publishers and broadcasters absorb to prove in an airtight case of fraud, not to mention the possibility of legal suits against them. Add the power and the influence of advertisers.

THREAT: Poor coverage or no coverage of vital issues at stake in how our elections are run. The public mind is swayed in favor of private interest groups.

MITIGATION: Cultivate relationships with trust-worthy reporters who cover electoral matters. Keep them informed of changes and vulnerabilities to publicly-run elections.

ISSUE: PRIVATE ELECTION SYSTEM VENDORS

OVERVIEW: The Help America Vote Act requires polling places to have either direct recording electronic equipment (DREs) or enhanced voter education to accommodate the disabled community. Major private election systems vendors helped draft the HAVA legislation, and then stood by to provide the equipment, the training, and the personnel to run our elections. Private vendors have assumed powers traditionally consigned to the people their elected representatives like programming voting systems and tabulating votes.

THREAT: High-cost, low-accountability elections.

MITIGATION: Review contracts with vendors. Recommend modifications. Recommend phase out. Recommend cancellation of contracts; recommend legal suits to prove breach of contract by the vendor. (See *qui tam* and false claims suits.)

ISSUE: PAPER BALLOTS VS. PAPER TRAIL

OVERVIEW: The difference between voting on a paper ballot and voting with a paper trail is that the paper ballot is the official record of voter intent, while the paper trail is only a record of the accuracy of your vote as it was recorded by the DRE. There is also the difference between the durability and readability of the paper. Paper trails are often left on low-quality receipts, which have been shown to be unwieldy when hand-counting.

THREAT: The proliferation of DRE-generated paper trails over the use of paper ballots increases the use of privately owned and operated electronic voting equipment.

MITIGATION: Hand-mark your votes on a paper ballot. Oppose paperless elections, and remind election officials that hand-marked paper is still the gold standard for deriving voter intent around the world.

ISSUE: KNOW YOUR VOTE SYSTEM

OVERVIEW: The type of voting systems in your county can affect the outcome of elections. The exclusive use of DRE's could cause long lines, as they tend to be slower than the use of paper ballots. Citizens would then be discouraged from voting. Paper ballots tend to have fewer problems with long

lines being created.

THREAT: Voters will be discouraged from voting if there are long lines.

MITIGATION: Work for the use of paper ballots at the polling sites in your state and county. If early voting is available, vote early if you can vote on a paper ballot at early voting sites.

ISSUE: PROPORTIONAL ALLOCATION OF EQUIPMENT

OVERVIEW: Long-lines at polling places in major elections are often due to inadequate allocation of electronic voting equipment. In some cases, like in Ohio 2004, disproportionate allocation of equipment in affluent communities made voting quick and easy, while inner city and college voters had wait-times of three, four, five, six hours!

THREAT: Wait times that prevent working class and time-impaired citizens from voting on Election Day.

MITIGATION: Vote early. Vote on paper. Query election officials about allocation of equipment and their plans for reducing wait-times on Election Day.

ISSUE: OFFICIAL SOURCES VS. UNOFFICIAL SOURCES

OVERVIEW: Both official sources and unofficial sources can be wrong about important information that effects the right to vote. Incorrect information is often given to citizens about the location of polling sites or the dates when voting can be done. This information can come as fliers on doors, post cards in the mail or phone calls.

THREAT: Misinformation and disinformation that misleads and disenfranchises voters.

MITIGATION: Fact checks and get multi-source confirmation of important voter information.

ISSUE: PROVISIONAL BALLOTS

OVERVIEW: Provisional Ballots are used when a citizen's name does not appear on the voter rolls at a polling site. The citizen is then given a ballot that is "set aside" until eligibility is determined by county election officials. Often these provisional ballots are not counted. Errors in the voter databases can exacerbate this problem and create many more provisional voters than would normally be expected.

THREAT: Uncounted votes and inaccurate election results.

MITIGATION: Check voter registration status and check with election officials to find the correct polling location. Take proof of voter registration and the proper ID to the polls. Call after the election to verify that your ballot has been accepted for counting.

ISSUE: MAIL-IN BALLOTS

OVERVIEW: Many cash-strapped states and counties try to institute a mandatory mail-in ballot to save money on running precinct-polling places. Mandatory mail-in ballots compromise the secret ballot. Union hall voting night, post-church service voting and kitchen table family voting, where the intimidation factor might be huge, could become commonplace. Vote buying would be easier. Mail ballot voting could be easier for rural voters; however, many rural voters like the social nature of voting in person at the polling place.

THREAT: Low-income voters, infrequent voters, new residents, and transient populations do not receive a ballot and do not vote. Election results are vulnerable to large tabulation errors or manipulation.

MITIGATION: Verify Acceptance of Ballots and Signature; defend Election Day voting at the precinct polling places and the posting of precinct results at the polling site on election night. Counting at the polling site decentralizes human errors.

ISSUE: RELIABILITY OF ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEMS

OVERVIEW: Parallel with the rise of electronic voting systems has been the growing numbers of reports of inaccurate vote counts, losing votes, gaining more votes than demographically possible, misreading votes, even switching votes. Margins of error between official vote totals and exit polls have grown beyond established norms. Whereas exit-polling data had been widely accepted as a statistically accurate measure of the outcome of a given election, currently implausible disparities are often left unexplained by major media that sponsor exit polls. Voting machines also break down with unacceptable frequency.

THREAT: The potential for broad-based vote fraud is masked by less stringent accuracy requirements.

MITIGATION: Vote on paper whenever possible. Demand the posting of precinct poll results and decentralized tabulation of vote counts to reduce the risk of large errors. Demand effective audits of elections, not just spot checks.