

# Chapter 8

# Black Box Voting

Ballot Tampering in the 21st Century

by Bev Harris

with  
David Allen

Edited by  
Lex Alexander

Cover Art by  
Brad Guigar

SOME RIGHTS RESERVED



**This work is licensed under a Creative Commons License with the following additional provisos:**

- 1) You must place the text: *"If you would like to support the author and publisher of this work, please go to [www.blackboxvoting.com/support.html](http://www.blackboxvoting.com/support.html)"* on the same page as the download, or on the first or last page on which the PNG images appear.
- 2) The notice: *"This book is available for purchase in paperback from Plan Nine Publishing, [www.plan9.org](http://www.plan9.org)."* Must appear on the download page or on the first or last page of the PNG images.

**If you have any questions about this license or posting our work to your own web site, call Plan Nine Publishing at 336.454.7766**

## 8

### Who's Minding the Store? A free press? Public officials? Anyone?

"Our citizens may be deceived for awhile, and have been deceived; but as long as the presses can be protected, we may trust to them for light."<sup>1</sup>

—Thomas Jefferson to Archibald Stuart. 1799.

\* \* \* \* \*

Has the free press been reined in by corporate interests? Certainly not, I would have told you a year ago. You just have to make sure that you give them something newsworthy. Journalists are seekers of the truth, a balanced truth — this I still believe.

Managing editors understand that our government will become corrupt without critics, and that an honest and fearless press is the only method available to our citizenry to get at the truth — a year ago, I believed that they had such an understanding. But having seen the reluctance of some of our most important editors to consider issues of vested interests and electronic voting security, I have to say that mainstream press support for investigative reporting now barely has a pulse.

More insidious than failure to cover important stories as soon as they come out is this: Some members of the press now use their own failure to cover an issue as justification that the issue must therefore not have merit. "If what you say is true, why hasn't it been in the *New York Times*?"

Well I don't know. You'll have to ask the *New York Times* — in the meantime, I have a tape recording I'd like you to take a look at, a document you should see, some internal memos that someone should examine.

“The press [is] the only tocsin of a nation. [When it] is completely silenced ... all means of a general effort [are] taken away.”<sup>2</sup>

—Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Cooper, November 29, 1802

Our press is far from “completely silenced,” but its voice in matters of great importance has become, at the very least, muffled.

Investigative reporter Greg Palast did an important investigation into the illegal purge of over 50,000 citizens, who were not felons, from the Florida voter roles.<sup>3</sup> If your name was Bob Andersen of Miami, and Robert Anderson of Dallas was convicted of a felony, and you are black, there was a nasty likelihood that you would not be allowed to vote in Florida.

Explosive stuff. Proven stuff. Stuff that should be on the CNN news crawler, especially since these wronged voters, even after the case was proven, did *not* get their right to vote back in November 2002. Documented, confessed-to, photocopied facts that were validated in a court of law, but unfortunately, facts that were not covered at all by most news outlets.

One reason: Early on, some reporters called the office of Governor Jeb Bush and asked whether Florida had purged voters whose rights had been restored in other states, and Jeb’s office told them it wasn’t so. That was a lie, and documents proved it to be a lie, and an important part of the news story was, in fact, the uttering of that lie, but here’s what happened: Reporters decided not to report the story at all, justifying their decision not to cover it by pointing to the lie, without checking to see if it was the truth. After all, it was a statement from the office of the governor.

That is not what our founding fathers had in mind when they envisioned the critical role that a free press must play to protect democracy. “No government ought to be without censors,” said Thomas Jefferson, “and where the press is free, no one ever will...it would be undignified and criminal to pamper the former [the government] and persecute the latter [its critics].”<sup>4</sup>

But in today’s media age, a Nebraska senator can have his votes counted by a company that he chaired and still partially owns, but even while he is actively running for office, the Nebraska press will not inform Nebraska citizens of his conflict of interest (the lone exception: Lincoln TV *Channel 8 News*).

***This is huge...  
Why is it in a  
NEW ZEALAND  
paper?  
— Sagan***

*Atlanta Journal-Constitution* reporter Jim Galloway told me he felt that it was more important to write about a state flag controversy than to inform Georgia voters that an illegal program modification had been made to 22,000 voting machines right before an election.<sup>5</sup>

CNN, Fox News, MSNBC, ABC, CBS and NBC were unable to tear themselves away from promising us weapons of mass destruction in Iraq (a story that turned out to be false) in order to spend 30 seconds asking a single question about the integrity of our voting system, even after a Stanford computer science professor and more than one thousand computer security experts insisted that it could not be trusted.

When Diebold, with machines in 37 states, left its voting system out on the Web for six years (free for the hacking), not a single editor from the *Wall Street Journal* or *USA Today* or *Newsweek* magazine bothered to assign anyone to look at the files so they could form an opinion as to the importance of this security gaffe.

It wasn't because they didn't know. In my media database I have 451,000 editors and producers, and I have sent over 100,000 bulletins directly to the appropriate editors and producers, in which I offered documents, cited sources and listed phone numbers of many experts to call. Everyone got the material — investigative, political, government, high tech, national news journalists — many have been receiving regular updates since October 2002. Not only has most of the press done a poor job (or at least a delayed one) of informing American citizens about this issue; most reporters have not even looked at the documents to assess the credibility of this story.

So much for the mainstream news media minding the store. If you want to know where the free press is nowadays, here it is:

Alastair Thompson was a reporter for many years before starting his Internet news site, *Scoop Media* ([www.scoop.co.nz](http://www.scoop.co.nz)) — which was launched out of a garden shed in Wellington, New Zealand and immediately won the New Zealand Internet Awards for “Best Online Writing” and “Best Content.” Yeah, I know: It's just New Zealand, and only the Internet.

Thompson didn't wait for the *New York Times*. He broke the story of the Diebold security problems on February 10, 2003,<sup>6</sup> just 18 days after the FTP Web

site was discovered. Thompson covered the “rob-georgia” story, about last-minute program modifications on 22,000 Georgia voting machines, on February 13.<sup>7</sup> New Zealand’s *Scoop Media* has consistently outpaced the U.S. media on the voting story, and ended up becoming part of the story itself when it published a worldwide link to all 40,000 Diebold files on July 8, 2003.<sup>8</sup>

Since the story broke, some good work has been done. Van Smith of *The Baltimore City Paper* published a detailed statistical analysis of anomalies in the November 2002 Georgia election,<sup>9</sup> even though he was working for a local paper in Baltimore, because he realized it was important. Maryland was planning to buy the same machines.

*Salon.com* has been writing about concerns with electronic voting for some time now, and Salon’s tech writer, Farhad Manjoo,<sup>10</sup> has written several accurate and groundbreaking investigative stories.

Rachel Konrad of *The A.P.* has been covering this issue since an odd decision in Santa Clara County, California. Under great pressure from Silicon Valley computer experts, Santa Clara officials opted, grudgingly, for a “pilot project” in the future, aimed at just a few voters.<sup>11</sup> The county had been offered an option for voter-verified paper ballots by all of the major vendors at *no extra charge*, but they turned it down.

*WiredNews.com* has been tenacious about investigating and reporting this story and broke the story about the Diebold memos that you’ll learn more about later.<sup>12</sup>

Julie Carr-Smyth of the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* wrote an astonishing report on voting machine vested interests; she discovered a visit by Diebold CEO Wally O’Dell, a member of the George W. Bush “Pioneers and Rangers,” to Bush’s ranch in Crawford, Texas — followed days later, by a letter in which O’Dell promised to “deliver the votes” for Bush in 2004.<sup>13</sup>

Erika D. Smith of the *Akron Beacon Journal* obtained a surprising revelation from Diebold’s Mark Radke, who admitted that the new Diebold TSx machines,

***“Does Palast have  
this?” Conason?  
Begala? Jimmy  
Breslin? Hunter  
Thompson?  
The Duke of Earl?  
Hell, I’m ready to send  
out a distress signal to  
the Thunderbirds!  
— dedalus***

to be sold in late 2003, will substitute wireless communication of votes for land-line modems. Radke all but admitted the system could be hacked when he made this startling (and cavalier) admission: “But even if that burst of election data were intercepted, all the hacker would get are unofficial results.”<sup>14</sup> (Um, Mr. Radke? Hacking can put data in as well as take data out.)

If you want to find the free press nowadays, look to these folks, who prove we do have one, though it may not be quite where you’ve been looking for it. And if you really want to locate the free press, don a pair of hip boots and get one of those caver’s hats with a light on it, wade into the Internet, shove the crud aside and you’ll find some of the best investigative reporting ever.

Given the abundance of leads, the wealth of information on this topic, and its importance, this issue has largely been ignored. Is the paucity of news coverage because reporters have just now learned of the vulnerabilities of electronic voting? Is it because electronic voting is new?

Not exactly. The first major article about electronic voting appeared in *The New Yorker* fifteen years ago, by investigative reporter Ronnie Dugger.<sup>15</sup> He wrote of many of the same concerns you are reading about in this book — but no one paid much attention.

Though not covered in the mainstream press until late 2003, word of the Diebold FTP site spread through the Internet as soon as New Zealand’s *Scoop Media* broke the news in February. And this, you see, is why true freedom of the press is so important: It informs the citizenry, and galvanizes us to engage in the scrutiny that is our duty. Thank goodness for the Internet, for without it this story would never have been fully exposed.

Despite a virtual blackout by major media outlets for nearly a year, ordinary people, like you, many of whom had never done any activism in their lives, made decisions to get involved in this issue.

***This is an outrage,  
will the national press  
ever do what a 4th  
estate is supposed to  
do? Do we live in a  
free country or not?  
—Annagull***

**Who’s minding the store: I guess WE are**

Efforts made by just a handful of people have gotten us to this point, where problems with voting

machines are at last reaching public consciousness. Drs. Rebecca Mercuri and Peter Neumann have put forth truly Herculean efforts, toiling nearly in the dark for fourteen years, while newspapers often chose to print press releases about how much “fun” it is to vote on machines instead of examining the more difficult subject matter brought to light by these computer scientists.

***Never doubt that a small  
group of thoughtful,  
committed citizens can  
change the world.  
Indeed, it's the only thing  
that ever does.  
— Margaret Mead***

When news of the 22,000 illicit patches broke loose, a small contingent of Georgians decided to do something about it. I’m going to refer to them simply as “Georgia activists” because recently they asked me not to call them out by name. Those who have been following this issue closely will know who these individuals are; their efforts have been nothing short of heroic. But citizens in Georgia soon discovered that asking questions about our voting system is like trying to walk up the down escalator.

### **How many patches were done in Georgia?**

When I began taking inventory of the Diebold FTP site, I found another folder called “Georgia062802.zip,” which appeared to be a patch targeted for Georgia dated June 28, 2002. Another file, called “clockfix” modified Diebold’s specialized Windows CE operating system in some undefined way.

Here’s the thing about software patches: When you change software to correct a problem, the procedure is to assign a bug number. You test it. You document everything. You append a new number to the end of the release. Then it has to be approved. Writing up a fix, sticking it on the Internet, and then running around putting it on voting machines is not how it’s done.

***“Time to call out the  
geek militia ...  
Forget the militia,  
call out the whole  
damn geek army!”  
— AdamFSmith***

One of the Georgia activists hunted down the law and fired it off to me.

RULES OF OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE ELECTION DIVISION  
CHAPTER 590-8-1  
**CERTIFICATION OF VOTING SYSTEMS<sup>16</sup>**

590-8-1-.01 Certification of Voting Systems.

- 11. Any modification to the hardware, firmware, or software of an existing system which has completed Qualification, Certification, or Acceptance testing in accordance with these Rules will invalidate the State certification** unless it can be shown that the change does not affect the overall flow of program control or the manner in which the ballots are interpreted and the vote data are processed, and the change falls into one or more of the following classifications:
- (i) It is made for the purpose of correcting a defect, **and test documentation is provided** which verifies that the installation of the hardware change or corrected **code does not result in any consequence other than the elimination of the defect.**
  - (ii) It is made for the purpose of enhancing the utility of the system or adding additional audit or report generating capability.
  - (iii) It is made for the purpose of enabling interaction with other general purpose or approved equipment or computer programs and databases, **and procedural and test documentation is provided** which verifies that such interaction does not involve or adversely affect vote counting and data storage.
  - (iv) It is made for the purpose of enabling operation on a different processor or of utilizing additional or different peripheral devices, and the software is unaltered in structure and function.

Georgia citizens have a right to be incensed. The state didn't bother to check what their voting system was doing when it counted their votes in the 2002 Georgia general election. This was a violation of the law, and Georgia taxpayers now realize that their votes may have been thrown out the window.

Suggestion: Why not contact the Carter Center? This organization, under the auspices of former President Jimmy Carter, seeks to prevent and resolve conflicts, protect freedom and enhance democracy. One of the Georgia activists

jumped on this, but the Carter Center told her that, according to its charter, it can only monitor elections *outside* the United States.

A Georgia computer programmer contacted Lieutenant Governor Mark Taylor's office, which told her to send information, so she did, handing over a generous explanation about what was wrong with this picture, including the unprotected FTP Web site, rob-georgia, the Georgia law and the people driving all over the state administering unexamined program modifications before the election. But after that e-mail, they quit taking her calls.

Georgia activists began calling on local and state representatives, trying to get them to listen to the issues with electronic voting machines. They found that legislators were not enthusiastic about discussing computer security issues and usually were willing to give up no more than three minutes in the hallway, between sessions, to listen to concerns.

Now here we have an election chock-full of statistical anomalies, with who knows who uploading (or replacing) files on an open web site, and instructions to replace the voting program with something else, right before an election. Citizens were upset, but officials would not respond to them.

I spoke with Ben Betz, from People for the American Way, about the Georgia situation; he was referred to me by one of the activists. His group decided not to pursue the issue.

Georgia activists made several attempts to meet with Secretary of State Cathy Cox but were allowed to speak with only with Assistant Director of Elections, Michael Barnes, who was less than helpful. They met with Tom Murphy, a former Speaker of the House in the Georgia legislature. "He knows where all the bones are buried," confided a self-appointed helper named Chris Hagin.

***Ya!!! I never  
liked  
democracy  
anyway!  
Choose my  
leaders for me!  
— Skewthat\****

***“Is there an attorney in  
this group?” Would it be  
feasable to have a class  
action lawsuit on behalf  
of Georgia voters?  
Perhaps a violation of  
civil rights suit?  
— MrHinkyDink\****

---

\* Internet culture allows people to dish out political opinions under "screen names." The screen names, as well as the comments, can be entertaining.

Tom Murphy called upon Cox to meet with the activists, but she didn't; instead, Barnes told them (on March 6) that Cox would be booked up "until July."

What about the American Civil Liberties Union? Activists met with ACLU attorney C. Cooper Knowles, but he told them he couldn't take on electronic voting machines because he had fought against the punch cards. ACLU attorney Laughlin McDonald, director of the Voting Rights Project, apparently couldn't see how a case could be formed, saying "Where's the harm?" ("Harm" is a legal requirement needed for some types of lawsuits.)

Concern among citizens continued to grow. In New York, author Mark Crispin Miller asked what he could do to help. One of Miller's contacts, Denis Wright, lives in Georgia and began joining the agitation to have someone — anyone — look into irregularities with Georgia's voting system.

Wright filed a formal request to produce Georgia documents, which yielded this odd response to his simple query about the certification documents — you know, the ones that prove that we should just trust our votes to their secrecy:

From: Denis Wright  
To: Kara Sinkule  
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2003 9:33 AM

Hi Kara. Hope you are doing well.

I need some more help, please. I am hoping that I can get hard copies of the following documents, per the Freedom of Information Act:

1. According to state law, **any changes in the voting machine software (GEMS and Windows) require documentation in writing**. I would like to get copies of any such documentation.
2. **A copy of the actual certification letter from the lab** (certifying the version of the software which was used on election day) as well as any related memos, letters, etc...

\* \* \* \* \*

From: "Tatum, Clifford" <ctatum@sos.state.ga.us>  
Date: Tue Mar 25, 2003 11:39:40 AM US/Eastern  
Subject: Open Records Request

Dear Mr. Wright:

Our office has received your request under the Georgia Open Records Act, O.C.G.A. § 50-18-70 regarding electronic voting information...

In response to your first category, we have determined that **no records exist regarding a change to software** used by the voting system.

In response to your second category, we have determined that **no records exist in the Secretary of State's office regarding a certification letter from the lab certifying the version of software used on Election Day**. Please be advised that any records of this type may have been submitted to the Georgia Technology Authority (GTA) in response to the Request for Proposal that was issued by GTA. Accordingly, a request for this type of information should be submitted to Gary Powell with GTA for response. By copy of this letter, I am advising Mr. Powell of your potential request...

Sincerely,

Clifford D. Tatum  
Assistant Director of Legal Affairs  
Election Division

## **What have we learned so far?**

Uncertified program modifications present a serious risk to election security.

### **Georgia requires certification and reports for program modifications**

- Rules of Office of the Secretary of State Election Division Chapter 590-8-1, Certification of Voting Systems, 11<sup>16</sup>

### **Diebold knew Georgia required recertification for modifications**

- Diebold internal document: "Certification Requirement Summary"<sup>17</sup>

### **Officials admit modifications were made to Georgia voting machines**

- Assistant Director of Elections Michael Barnes
- Chris Riggall, Press Secretary for Cathy Cox
- Kara Sinkule, Press Secretary for Cathy Cox
- Dr. Brit Williams, NASED Voting Systems Board Technical Committee

## **Officials admit that Georgia program modifications were not certified**

- Michael Barnes
- Dr. Britain Williams

## **Officials admit there is no documentation for the program modifications**

- Clifford Tatum<sup>18</sup>

## **Then, one official reverses himself and claims uncertified patches are impossible in Georgia**

• Dr. Britain Williams: In response to my discussion of the Georgia program modifications on the BlackBoxVoting.com web site, Dr. Williams writes:

"This comment ["A patch to the underlying operation system - Windows - can slip through without scrutiny."] **assumes that the State of Georgia allows changes and/or upgrades to the Microsoft operating system. This is not the case.**

" ...This specific version of the operating system and the election software undergoes ITA\* testing and State Certification (*sic*) testing. The State Certification is for this specific version of the Microsoft operating system and the Diebold election system. **After State Certification any change to either the Microsoft operating system or the Diebold election system voids the State Certification.**

"If a change to either the Microsoft operating system or the Diebold election system becomes desirable or necessary, **this change voids the State Certification.** The revised system then must then go back through the entire ITA Qualification and State Certification."<sup>19</sup>

## **Next, two officials say no one downloaded anything from the FTP site**

- Michael Barnes:

"That FTP site did not affect us in any way shape or form because we did not do any file transferring from it. None of the servers ever connected so no one could have transferred files from it. No files were transferred relating to state elections."<sup>20</sup>

- Dr. Britain Williams

"This [the Diebold FTP site] would have had absolutely no effect on the election system as implemented in Georgia. The State does

---

\*ITA: Independent Testing Authority

not obtain its election system code from an FTP site or even from Diebold...The ITA, not the vendor and certainly not an open FTP site, provides the KSU [Kennesaw State University] Election Center with the source code, the object code, and various related files. "19

### **Then, Diebold officials decided that modifications were not done at all**

• *Salon.com*: Joseph Richardson, a spokesman for Diebold, denied that a patch had been applied to the Georgia machines: "We have analyzed that situation and have no indication of that happening at all," he said.<sup>21</sup>

• Interview with Joseph Richardson:<sup>22</sup>

**Harris:** "Did you say, when interviewed by Salon.com, in reference to whether patches were put on machines in Georgia, "We have analyzed that situation and have no indication of that happening at all."

**Richardson:** "Well, that is what I said at the time, however, we have continued to investigate the matter and ... (very, very long pause) Yes that is what I said to Salon.com."

**Harris:** "Do you stand by that now?"

**Richardson:** "We have continued to look into the matter."

**Harris:** "As you have continued to investigate this, do you have any new information as to whether patches were put on in Georgia?"

**Richardson:** "No."

**Harris:** "Has anyone thought to just call them up and ask? The Secretary of State's office?"

**Richardson:** "I can't say."

**Harris:** "What was the rob-georgia file? Who is responsible for it?"

**Richardson:** "I'm not privy to that information."

**Harris:** "Who would be able to answer that question?"

**Richardson:** "I can't tell you."

After this not very helpful exchange, I found myself back to my original question: *Who or what is "rob-georgia?"*

## **And then...**

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 2003

From: "Rob Behler"

Hi Bev;

I read your recent article about Diebold Elections systems. Just wanted to let you know that I am the Rob in Georgia that they claimed they didn't [*sic*] know about.

Thanks,

Rob Behler

*And again, blessed are the whistle blowers.  
They may save this democracy yet.  
— concerned citizen*

## Chapter 8 footnotes

- 1 – Thomas Jefferson to Archibald Stuart. 1799
- 2 – Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Cooper, Nov 29, 1802
- 3 – *The Best Democracy Money Can Buy*, by Greg Palast (Pluto Press)
- 4 – Thomas Jefferson to George Washington, 1792
- 5 – Phone conversation between Bev Harris and Jim Galloway, March 2003
- 6 – *Scoop Media*, 10 Feb 2003; “System Integrity Flaw Found at Diebold Election Systems”  
<http://www.scoop.co.nz/mason/stories/HL0302/S00052.htm>
- 7 – *Scoop Media*, 13 Feb 2003; “Georgia’s Last Minute 2002 Election Machine Fix”  
<http://www.scoop.co.nz/mason/stories/HL0302/S00095.htm>
- 8 – *Scoop Media*, 8 Jul 2003; “Sludge Report #154: Bigger than Watergate”  
<http://www.scoop.co.nz/mason/stories/HL0307/S00064.htm>
- 9 – *Baltimore City Paper*, 11 Dec. 2002; “Computerized Balloting is Taking Over Elections In Maryland—But Can We Trust the Results?”
- 10 – *Salon.com*, 5 Nov. 2002, “Voting into the void: New touch-screen voting machines may look spiffy, but some experts say they can’t be trusted”; 20 Feb. 2003 “Hacking Democracy”; 23 Sept. 2003 “An open invitation to election fraud”
- 11 – *Associated Press*, 25 Feb. 2003 “Silicon Valley Wary of Voting Machine”
- 12 – *Wired News*, 7 Aug. 2003, “New security woes for e-vote firm”
- 13 – *The Plain Dealer*, 28 Aug. 2003 “Voting machine controversy Head of firm seeking Ohio contract committed to Bush victory ”
- 14 – *The Beacon Journal*, 15 Aug. 2003 “E-Voting Becomes Touchy Topic” by Erika D. Smith
- 15 – *The New Yorker*, 7 Nov. 1988 “Annals of Democracy: Counting Votes” by Ronnie Dugger
- 16 – Rules of Office of the Secretary of State Election Division Chapter 590-8-1, Certification of Voting Systems
- 17 – Diebold internal document: “Certification Requirement Summary” Governing entity: Georgia
- 18 – Open Records Request, 25 Mar 2003, Response to Open Records Request from Denis Wright by Clifford Tatum, Assistant Director of Legal Affairs, Georgia Election Division
- 19 – “Security in the Georgia Voting System,” 23 Apr. 2003, by Britain J. Williams, Ph. D.
- 20 – Bev Harris interview with Michael Barnes, 11 Feb. 2003
- 21 – *Salon.com*, 20 Feb. 2003 “Hacking Democracy” by Farhad Manjoo
- 22 – Bev Harris interview with Diebold spokesman Joe Richardson, 26 Feb. 2003