

Grand Theft Election

Karl Rove's Turd Droppings All Over This One

By [Wayne Madsen](#)

Region: [USA](#)

Global Research, November 05, 2004

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/MAD411A.h>

[tml](#) 15 June 2005

Karl Rove, the political sorcerer who is called “turd blossom” by his political master George W. Bush has his nasty fingerprints all over the 2004 Election in a scam that can best be called “Grand Theft Election.”

There was something very wrong in Ohio, which Bush claims he won handily. Not only had the head of computer voting machine maker Diebold and Ohio’s Republican establishment of Governor Bob Taft and Secretary of State Kenneth Blackwell conspired to suppress registration and voter turnout in heavily Democratic precincts but the Ohio Secretary of State web site was only reporting results from 9 counties as of 11:30 AM on November 3, just three hours before John Kerry conceded the election to Bush. Totaling the results from the 9 counties (Fayette, Fairfield, Geauga, Jefferson, Portage, Mahoning, Trumbull, Richland, and Washington), John Kerry was clearly ahead. A 10th county, Columbiana, suspiciously showed up as “NO RESULTS.”

The totals from the 8 Ohio counties reported on the Secretary of State web site were:

BUSH 267,771

KERRY 294, 648

There has to be a way for those of us who voted for Kerry and Edwards to sue Diebold Chief Executive Walden O’Dell and Diebold board member W.R. Timken for conspiring to deliver Ohio’s electoral votes to Bush. O’Dell and Timken are also top fundraisers for Bush, so-called “Pioneers.” O’Dell told the Cleveland Plain Dealer in 2003 that he was “committed to helping Ohio deliver its electoral votes to the president next year.”

The fact that Diebold machines were used in the Ohio rip-off should make O’Dell and Timken the subjects of criminal investigations. Of course, that will not happen in a GOP vassal state like Ohio. But why not a civil suit by those of us nationwide who voted for Kerry and had our presidency stolen from us as a result of racketeering and corrupt practices by a cabal of Republicans and fat cat corporate types? In a civil suit, through the process of discovery, O’Dell’s and Timken’s e-mails, letters, and other records could be ordered open by a judge. They could also be deposed as witnesses before plaintiffs’ attorneys.

Then there were the strange hiccups with the official election web sites reporting results in states and counties across the nation.

During the morning of November 3, attempts to access the Pinellas County, Florida Election

web site <http://www.co.pinellas.fl.us/soe>

were met with the following:

The page cannot be found.

The page you are looking for might have been removed, had its name changed, or is temporarily unavailable.

At 11:52 am on November 3, the St. Lucie County, Florida election web site showed no returns, long after the polls closed:

“Welcome To St. Lucie County Live Election Returns

Election results will appear shortly.”

Attempts to access Miami-Dade County’s election web site during the morning of November 3 were similarly unsuccessful.

On the Florida Secretary of State web site there appeared some verbage about a link to the Marion County election web site. But there was no link. Ditto the same for Nassau County, a county that saw widespread voter intimidation and suppression of African-American votes in 2000.

Indian River County, Florida election results were also of interest and indicated fraud:

Registered voters as of October 4, 2004, included Republican: 41,866; Democratic: 24,515 ; Independent: 15,262. Votes on Nov 2 were Bush: 36,744; Kerry: 23,850

Democrats had almost complete turnout if you match turnout to their registered voters. Republicans were down some 4000, but what happened to the Independents’ votes? There were less than 1 percent for the third party candidates. We were told Independents were breaking for Kerry. Even if 23, 850 for Kerry included a majority of the Independents and even a few moderate Republicans, the results from Indian River don’t indicate that.

In pivotal New Mexico, by mid morning on November 3, the state election web site was missing several returns from areas with large Native American populations: Cibola and San Miguel Counties were missing in addition to 1 precinct in Dona Ana County with the following close returns listed:

Bush: 26 072 Kerry: 25,608

1 precinct in McKinley County with the following returns listed:
Bush 7132 Kerry: 12,725

1 precinct in Sandoval County with the following close returns listed:
Bush: 22,482 Kerry: 21,215

15 precincts in Socorro County with the following close returns listed:
Bush: 3197 Kerry: 2638

New Mexico was eventually declared for Bush in a close election, even though it went for

Gore in 2000.

There were also missing returns from a very close race in Nevada.

Clark County (Las Vegas) had 271,465 people vote early and 220,501 vote at polls on election day.

Kerry received 279,575 votes to Bush's 253, 432 in Clark.

If, as we were told, early votes were breaking 60-70 percent for Kerry in areas he won, it looks like he should have had more like 300,000 votes in Clark County, which would have tipped the state to him. Kerry lost Nevada "officially" by only 21,000 votes. This does not include the 50,705 absentee votes in Clark County (which also likely broke for Kerry). There were also 10,000 under votes and write ins reported statewide, which seems very high for a small population state like Nevada.

The turnout in Virginia was an all time high, especially in heavy Democratic counties and cities. Early on Election night, NBC said it could not call Virginia because the returns were close. Yet, an examination of the vote count as compared to 2000 reveals that the massive 2004 turnout, especially with African Americans, young people, and Hispanics was not reflected in the final vote counts and percentages.

I personally witnessed 2 hour plus waiting lines at polling places in Arlington and Fairfax Counties. This was unprecedented but it is not reflected in the vote count. This could be the result of both tampering with computer machines and voter suppression.

Arlington County

Kerry	63,705	Bush	29,545
	67.57%		31.34%

Gore	50,260	Bush	28,555
	60.15%		34.17%

(Only a 7 point jump for Democrats from 2000 to 2004. That does not reflect the huge turnout countywide).

Fairfax County

Kerry	215,223	Bush	189,371
	52.58%		45.61%

Gore	196,501	Bush	202,181
	47.49%		48.86%

(Where is the huge Democratic turnout reflected in these numbers, considering a mere 5 percentage rise for the Democrats from 2000 and a 3 percentage drop for the Republicans).

Henrico County (Richmond suburbs)

Kerry	60,810	Bush	71,765
	46.26%		53.85%

Gore	48,645	Bush	62,887
------	--------	------	--------

42.58% 55.04%

(An obvious Democratic surge is not reflected in these numbers.)

Prince William County

Kerry	56,234	Bush	64,431
	46.25%		52.99%

Gore	52,788	Bush	44,745
	44.52%		52.52%

(Bush jumped dramatically in numbers from 2000 to 2004 but remained almost the same percentage wise. Democratic numbers barely increased even though the county had a huge turnout among minorities, particularly African Americans and Hispanics.)

Alexandria City

Kerry	40,807	Bush	19,764
	66.77%		32.34%

Gore	33,633	Bush	19,043
	60.93%		34.50%

(Does not reflect massive African American turnout in Alexandria. The Democratic percentage budged upward only 6 %)

Richmond City

Kerry	51,703	Bush	21,633
	70.02%		29.30%

Gore	42,717	Bush	20,265
	64.80%		30.74%

(Republican percentage of the vote went down in the state capital, yet Bush statewide percentage was 53.90 % to Kerry 45.23%. This is mirrored in other counties. Gore received 44.4% and Bush 52.5% in 2000. The slight uptick for Kerry does not reflect Democratic turnout statewide. Voting in 2000 was 68.51 % statewide in 2000. It was only 68.54% statewide in 2004. That just does not make any sense considering the massive numbers of newly registered voters and the huge turnout in northwestern Virginia, Tidewater, and the economically-depressed southwest part of the state).

When Diebold machines were forced on Prince George's County, Maryland, the country's election administrator Robert J. Antonetti bitterly complained about them. He told the Baltimore Sun in 2003, "I feel very uneasy about it. There are too many loose ends."

On November 2, Prince George's County election officials reported a number of problems with Diebold encoders. The Prince George's County Gazette reported that a number of polling places opened up to 45 minutes late because the wrong Diebold encoder had been delivered to polling places and voters could not vote until a new encoder arrived.

It is not known how many records the Prince George's County maintained on problems with

Diebold but it is very interesting that early in the morning of November 3, the Associated Press reported:

“Fire broke out Wednesday at the Prince George’s County courthouse, engulfing a large section of the ornate building.

About 100 firefighters were at the scene, fire and emergency medical service spokesman Chauncey Bowers said.”

And Washington, DC News Channel 4 reported: “... pictures from Chopper4 shows that almost the entire building is completely ruined and a section could be in danger of partial collapse. Thick billowing black smoke can be seen for miles.”

Early reports were sketchy on what records may have been destroyed by the flames in both the old Court House building and an adjoining newer structure but one report on Channel 4 stated that records had definitely been destroyed. Later reports claimed no records were stored in the burnt out building.

But next time you see a Diebold employee, you may want to ask him, “Hey pal, gotta match?” (AP, Nov3, 2004)

The original source of this article is <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/MAD411A.html>
Copyright © [Wayne Madsen](http://globalresearch.ca/articles/MAD411A.html), <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/MAD411A.html>, 2004

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Wayne Madsen](#)

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