

“The People Who Cast the Votes Don’t Decide an Election, The People Who COUNT the Votes Do.”

By [Washington's Blog](#)

Global Research, February 07, 2016

[Washington's Blog](#) 6 February 2016

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Police State & Civil Rights](#)

Stealing Elections Is Easier Than You Can Imagine

Princeton University scientists showed how easy it is to steal elections by tampering with voting machines:

Here’s a summary:

So did University of California at Santa Barbara computer scientists:

So did a documentary filmmaker, to the *shock* of an election official and poll worker:

Indeed, a computer programmer admitted under oath to creating such a vote-switching program:

Argonne National Laboratories showed that voting machines can be hacked without any programming knowledge whatsoever ... using around \$20 worth of hardware:

Many videos have also been shot showing votes being switched in real-time:

Note how this machine switches votes even after being “recalibrated”:

Vote fraud doesn’t occur just through electronic shenanigans...

Last week local Iowa poll officials were caught on video changing vote tallies:

[A quick explanation](#) of what you're watching (voter fraud):

The important problem is that the Bernie counters recounted everyone, while the Hillary counter was literally recorded telling someone else that she only added newcomers to the count she had before, and then when asked if she recounted everyone, she lied to the organizer and said "Yes". This means that if anyone left the caucus site who was supporting Bernie, then they were removed by Bernie's recounters, but any Hillary supporter who left the caucus site was treated as though they were still there for the purposes of the recount. Thus, artificial inflation of her numbers occurred unless everyone who left was a Bernie delegate, on top of the Hillary campaign surrogate lying to an election official to cover up her (negligent at best, malicious at worst) mistake.

And they left the recount up to a Yea Nay vote, which is just ridiculous.

The Des Moines Register noted ["something smells"](#) in the primaries.

Something similar happened in 2012:

The Wall Street Journal wrote in a 2008 article entitled ["Will This Election Be Stolen?"](#):

Since early voting started recently, worried voters have reported seeing their votes flipped from Barack Obama to Mr. McCain in West Virginia and Texas.

We reported in 2006:

The non-partisan and highly-respected government agency, the Government Accountability Office, [verified that the electronic voting machines used in 2004 were wide open to fraud, and that fraud likely occurred in Ohio, Iowa, Nevada, New Mexico, and other states.](#)

The [security flaws in electronic voting machines](#) are so complete that anyone can instantaneously install software which will change the vote counts. See this [New York Times' Magazine analysis](#), and also [E-Voting Machine an Easy Hack](#) from Wired Magazine.

Exit polling data shows that [there was vote fraud](#).

And [Robert F. Kennedy Jr.](#) and leading reporter [Greg Palast](#) have shown that the emperor's cronies intentionally spoiled, rejected, purged and otherwise refused to count enough ballots to take the election away from Kerry (not that I like Kerry). See also [this article](#).

And spend 10 minutes at [this website](#) and you'll realize that electronic vote fraud is not some raving conspiracy theory, but is real.

Indeed, the following headlines from the last two weeks hint at the magnitude of the fraud:

- [Ohio Election Workers Sentenced to 18 Months for Rigging 2004 Presidential Recount; Judge Says He Believes the Conspiracy Goes Higher...](#)
- [Ohio Secretary of State confirms 2004 election could have been](#)

Stolen

- [CNN gives e-voting an 'F' Grade](#)
- Black Box Voting - one of the most credible organizations investigating voting issues - has received unofficial reports that [political operatives have urged citizens NOT to ask too many questions and NOT to take photos or video of precinct caucus results, warning them that only "conspiracy theorists" would want to independently confirm the announced results.](#)

And President Carter said that the [2000 election was stolen](#).

It's not just skulduggery by one particular party ...

Sonoma State University professor and Project Censored Director Peter Phillips [noted](#) in 2005:

There is little doubt key Democrats know that votes in 2004 and earlier elections were stolen. The fact that few in Congress are complaining about fraud is an indication of the totality to which both parties accept the status quo of a money based elections system. Neither party wants to further undermine public confidence in the American "democratic" process (over 80 millions eligible voters refused to vote in 2004).... Future elections in the US will continue as an equal opportunity for both parties to maintain a national democratic charade in which money counts more than truth.

Some voting machine companies are partisan Republicans, and other partisan Democrats.

But some aren't even *American*. For example, a global internet voting company headquartered in Spain [purchased America's dominant election results reporting](#) company in 2012.

"It's All Over But the Counting. And We'll Take Care of the Counting"

Stalin said:

The people who cast the votes don't decide an election, the people who count the votes do."

Before the 2004 election, U.S. Congressman Peter King said, "The election is over. We won."

When a reporter asked, "How do you know that?", [King replied](#):

It's all over, but the counting. And we'll take care of the counting.

Indeed, both the Democrats and Republicans rig votes [at their own conventions](#).

As Mark Twain [said](#):

If voting made any difference they wouldn't let us do it.

The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)
Copyright © [Washington's Blog](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2016

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Washington's Blog](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca