

# Trump Loses 5000 Votes Ahead of Recount in WI, Why an Honest Recount is Impossible

Ralph Lopez (*ralphlopez*)

17 Followers

107 Hubs



*Workers beginning a ballot count in a German election.*

As Green Party candidate Jill Stein, now joined by the Clinton campaign, presses ahead with efforts to recount the votes in the critical swing states of Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, critical weaknesses in the American election system - if it can be called that - are being exposed.

One is that, in most US jurisdictions, American election procedures are largely opaque, and require great trust in election officials and anyone with access to the ballots or the vote counting process. This can be difficult when, for example, in Sauk County, Wisconsin, enthusiasm for the presidential election was so great that, in one city, Baraboo, November 8th showed 121% turnout, according to a report by Richard Hayes Phillips of

the Election Defense Alliance. That's 8,390 ballots cast in a city of 6,923 registered voters. Across Sauk County, initial figures were that 34,323 people had voted for a presidential candidate of their choice. The problem is, according to the same set of numbers, only 31,838 people had cast ballots.

These kinds of problems illustrate why many people have no confidence in the US election system, which is more accurately a hodge-podge of systems, few of them good. In Wisconsin, paper ballots are largely counted by machine, possibly followed by a hand recount such as Stein has requested. The larger problem is, a hand recount won't determine beyond the shadow of a doubt who really won.

When questioned about the discrepancies, Wisconsin election officials blamed calculator errors, when the totals from electronic vote-counting machines were added up. For a typical county, this might involve dozens of numbers, but not hundreds or thousands. Whether or not one finds this explanation credible, the fact remains that in most of America, in contrast to most other advanced industrialized nations, the opportunity for a vote count which can be broadly agreed upon as fair and honest is lost on election night.

Elections may be one of the few areas where high-tech is less advanced, and low-tech is more advanced, in terms of the desired end result. The desired result is elections which all sides are likely to accept as fair, no matter how much they hate each other. This is what Hillary Clinton and her supporters were alluding to when they lambasted Trump for not saying he would abide by the election results. That was before she lost.

In the process of Wisconsin's revision of the numbers, Donald Trump now has 5,000 fewer votes than he did before, 22,177 votes more than Clinton. On the day after the election he had 27,257. Nearly 20% of the gap has been erased before any recount even begins.

But because of what we call our voting system in America, it is unlikely both sides will agree on the results of a hand recount of the paper ballots. One side or another will claim something untoward happened behind closed doors, while the ballots were out of sight. Election theft has been around a long time, even when everything was paper ballots. The method of counting those ballots, and who does it and who can watch, is the foundation of confidence in the system.

This is why much of the rest of the world has settled on one principle: Paper ballots that are counted by hand at the place of polling, in front of everyone, as soon as the doors close. At the start of the voting day, the bottom of the box is shown to observers to show it is empty.

Computer scientists such as Alex Halderman, who was reported as giving the Clinton campaign the idea of a recount in the first place, is the first to agree. Halderman has said:

"I know I may sound like a Luddite for saying so, but most election security experts are with me on this: paper ballots are the best available technology for casting votes."

The election integrity community has agreed that paper ballots, counted on election night at the polling place, provides the least opportunity for evildoers to tamper one way or another with the ballots. It is the way the rest of the politically civilized world does it, such as Germany, where all electronic voting systems have been banned. Many towns in New Hampshire hand-count paper ballots, with happy results and few lawyers and lawsuits over the years (SEE VIDEO BELOW.)

According to the report released by Election Justice USA, on vast irregularities in the 2016 Democratic primaries indicating Sanders may have actually won the nomination, such a system is the standard in Germany, Canada, France, Ireland, Italy, Denmark, Finland, and 53 other countries.

In public counting, a member of each party witnesses the marks on the ballot, and perhaps a neutral citizen observer. Members of the public may stand "outside the rail" to observe. If space is short, the proceedings can be transmitted by CCTV to larger rooms.

The argument, sometimes heard, that hand-counting is not feasible for bigger cities is nonsense. Germany has big cities. A large city is nothing more than a collection of thousands of precincts, but precincts are all roughly the same size across the country, about a thousand voters on average. Washington DC has the largest precinct, about 2700 voters. All precincts use about the same number of polls workers. 1,000 or 2,000 votes is easily manageable in a night by a standard polling station staff of six to ten people, consisting of officials and volunteers.

Election integrity activists know it takes a little longer to do it this way than to press a button and run numbers on a machine. But isn't confidence in the system worth the extra time?

Now it turns out that there are questions not just about presidential election results, but congressional results too. In Florida some statisticians have advised Bernie Sanders protege Tim Canova to ask for a recount in his race against Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, former chair of the DNC.

On the Republican side, Missouri Senator Roy Blunt edged out Democratic challenger Jason Kandor, by 3% in Kandor's unexpectedly strong challenge, but there are questions

about fraud. With recent revelations on the ease of hacking elections, how do we know who should be sitting in Congress and who shouldn't? The ease of election fraud has opened up a can of worms which Americans must now confront.

It is well-known that incumbents are notoriously hard to beat, even when they are widely viewed as unpopular. Why?

In the election integrity world you will hear much talk of the "chain of custody." That's a fancy way of saying that once the ballots are out of public view, there is really no 100% certain way to know what happens to them. We want to believe that most of our election officials are honest and upright, and most of them are. But when trillions in government contracts are on the line, plum appointments, and raw naked power, the incentives are almost irresistible to the truly determined, who may work under the noses of honest officials.

Conspiracy theory? Let's remember that's what Clinton supporters were calling Trump's fears of election-rigging. Until "she," or "her" whom they are "with," lost.

Hand-counted paper ballots in the polling place, the night of the election, in public. Let's join the rest of the world.

# VOTERESCUE

.ORG

[HOME](#)

[<< back to VoteRescue News](#)

[ABOUT VOTERESCUE](#)

[VOTERESCUE NEWS](#)

[NATIONAL NEWS](#)

[TAKE ACTION](#)

[INFO & FLYERS](#)

[FILMS & VIDEOS](#)

[VOLUNTEER](#)

[PARALLEL ELECTIONS](#)

[CONTACT US](#)

**A CENSORED HEADLINE AND WHY IT MATTERS**  
**German High Court Outlaws Electronic Voting**  
*Oct 19, 2009*

By [Michael Collins World News](#)



Justices of the German Federal Constitutional Court  
*image by Michael Collins*

The justices above are clearly the most rational group of high level functionaries in the industrialized world. They did what no other court would do in Europe or the United States. They effectively outlawed electronic voting. On March 3, 2009, the German Federal Constitutional Court declared that the electronic voting machines used in the 2005 Bundestag elections for the German national parliament were outside of the bounds of the German Constitution.

They reasoned that electronic voting is not verifiable because citizen votes are counted in secret. It obscured a technology inaccessible to all but a very few initiates. Most importantly, the German High Court noted, electronic voting machines don't allow citizens to "reliably examine, when the vote is cast, whether the vote has been recorded in an unadulterated manner" Mar. 3, 2009.

The written opinion effectively bars electronic voting in future elections based on the complexity of voting machines and the inability of voters to watch their vote being counted. This raises the bar of acceptability well above the meaningless solutions offered by "paper trails" for touch screen voting or the so-called "paper ballots" for computerized optical scan voting machines, the most popular form of voting in the United States.

Germany's 2009 Bundestag elections were conducted with hand counted paper ballots.

Have you heard that one of the world's leading economic powers, the fourth largest economy in the world, banned electronic voting; said it was undemocratic? Given the multitude of problems encountered in the U.S. and the number of questionable election results, wouldn't it make sense that when Germany banned

[Witness to a Crime](#)

New book on Ohio's 2004 stolen election!

[Other Vote-Related Bills](#)

[Print Our Petition \(.pdf\)](#)

[Start Your Own Vote](#)

[Integrity Issues Group](#)

[Upcoming Election Information](#)

## RELATED SITES

[Who Represents Me?](#)

Information about those in office who represent you

[Texas House Elections Committee](#)

[Hacked! 11 Experts Expose the Truth!](#) High Tech Election Theft in America

[Coalition for Visible Ballots](#) Non-partisan grass-roots movement

[Black Box Voting](#) Black Box Voting 501c(3) organization



**Dr. Ulrich Wiesner and father and fellow litigant, Prof. Dr. Joachim Wiesner.**

A recent article by elections activist Kathleen Wynne, former Associate Director of BlackBoxVoting.org, told the story of the story of the landmark German case with a link to an extensive radio interview with litigant Dr. Ulrich Wiesner ([Electronic Voting Declared Unconstitutional in Germany](#)).

Physicist [Ulrich Wiesner, PhD](#) and Prof. Joachim Wiesner, PhD, an eminent German political scientist, [brought suit](#) against the use of electronic voting machines in the 2005 Bundestag elections. The evidence gathered supported the findings of the court described above. While both Wiesner's on the suit have PhD's and distinguished careers, they brought the landmark case on their own as citizens. Undeterred by the odds and the dismissal of German politicians, they stood by their cause and won. It's a great story, father and son team prevail against huge odds to ensure that all Germans get their vote counted. But none of the majors here bit.

These articles constitute most of the serious coverage of this story in the United States. Paul Lehto wrote two articles for OpEdNews.com on March 3 and 19, 2009: [Germany Bans Computerized Voting, Will Hand Count in 2009](#) and [German high court honors US democratic principles](#). Activist Bev Harris wrote a commentary on 3-19-09: [Let's get off the hamster wh...](#). [BlackBoxVoting.org](#). Newsweek ran an insightful column in its education section on June, 2009, [We do not trust machines](#). While AP ran the story, it wasn't picked up and featured by any major media outlet in the United States. The International Herald Tribune also covered the decision but its sister paper, The New York Times, dropped the ball.

The Wynne article told the story of the citizens who made the decision happen, the Wiesner father and son team. [Deadline Live with Jack Blood](#), the radio show, carried a comprehensive interview of German litigant, Dr. Ulrich Wiesner and follow up discussions with Kathleen Wynne and Bev Harris.

But that's it. The highest court in the nation with the world's fourth largest economy makes law that bans electronic voting after determining that computerized elections are fundamentally opposed to democratic principles. The decision applies directly to the electronic voting systems used in the United States. What do we hear from the U.S. corporate media? Just about nothing. In this case, when a tree falls in the forest and just a few people hear it, it's no big deal. But it should be.

## **Broadcast 50 Radio**

### **Center for Hand Counted Paper Ballots**

electronic voting and replaced it with paper ballots, there would be at least a days worth of national coverage in the United States?

Nothing like that occurred. The Associated Press (Times of India) story on the verdict danced around the periphery of the world media market with coverage in Turkey, India, Australia, and Ireland. But there were no major media takers for the AP story in the United States.

There was every reason to carry the story. In a 2006 Zogby poll, 92% of the 1028 registered voters surveyed said they agreed with this statement:

*Citizens have the right to view and obtain  
information about how election officials count votes  
- 92% agree. New Zogby Poll On Electronic Voting  
Attitudes Aug. 21, 2006*

That's exactly the proposition that the German court upheld. Surely there was an audience for the German decision but there was hardly a word from corporate media. Why did this happen?

There are certain vital stories that the U.S. corporate media won't touch. The most prominent censored headline is "Over One Million Iraqi Civilians Dead in Conflict." This figure has been known since 2007 while a previous survey showing 650,000 dead was spiked in 2006. The Iraqi civilians died as a result of internal conflict unleashed by the U.S. invasion in 2003. Had Bush-Cheney not invaded with the approval of a sleep walking Congress, these people would not have died as they did.

Another vital story that isn't covered is election fraud, fixing an entire election. The corporate media simply can't raise the possibility that election fraud exists. The preliminary steps enabling election fraud through computerized voting are outsourcing elections to private vendors; the lack of any verifiable connection between your vote and the voting machines processes; and, security risks.

However, corporate media are more than happy to cover the nearly nonexistent "voter fraud" stories about masses of illegal voters showing up at the polls. The Bush administration was only able to produce 24 convictions of citizens and non citizens combined over a three year period.

The media will discuss electronic voting malfunctions but they simply won't connect the dots. Computers function as programmed, by definition. "Malfunctions" during vote counting are part of any given program. When the errors benefit one side of the political equation, it is highly relevant to raise questions about intentional "errors." However, the treatment of these stories is always within the context of computer problems instead of a broad inquiry into why elections are outsourced to private vendors and the resulting risks and problems and. U.S. elections will be virtually dominated by one private firm out of Omaha, Nebraska, ES&S.

### **German Citizens Prevail**

United States Senate

November 29, 2016

The President  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We believe there is additional information concerning the Russian Government and the U.S. election that should be declassified and released to the public. We are conveying specifics through classified channels.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,




Ron Wyden



Martin Heinrich



Jack Reed



Angus King



Mark R. Warner



Mazie K. Hirono



Barbara A. Mikulski