

# Widespread Election Fraud in Cleveland?

By [Richard Hayes Phillips](#)

Global Research, November 26, 2004

<http://blog.democrats.com/node/812> 26

November 2004

Region: [USA](#)

In-depth Report: [Election Fraud in America](#)

Attached is my recently completed precinct by precinct analysis of the 2004 presidential vote in Cleveland. There are wholesale shifts of scores of votes from the Kerry column to other candidates, and astonishingly low turnouts in certain precincts and entire wards. The Ohio recount will prove these numbers to be fraudulent.

I may have identified only the tip of the iceberg. I note that there are 17,741 uncounted ballots in Cuyahoga County. Kerry's margin in Cleveland was reportedly 108,659 votes with a 49.89% turnout. The rest of Cuyahoga County had a 71.95% turnout. Such a turnout in Cleveland would have given Kerry a margin of 156,705 votes, left Bush with a statewide margin of 85,007 votes, and with 248,100 votes still uncounted, nobody would be conceding Ohio.

This is a situation that demands rigorous investigation. I can imagine Michael Moore going door to door in Ward 4, Precinct F, looking for the 215 Peroutka voters, or in Ward 4, Precinct N, looking for the 163 Badnarik voters. Or going door to door in Ward 6, Precinct C, to find out why the turnout was only 7.10% - or in Ward 13, Precincts D, F, and O, to find out why the turnout was only 13.05%, 19.60%, and 21.01%, respectively.

## CUYAHOGA COUNTY CANVASS SHEET - 2004 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

THE FOLLOWING IS A PRECINCT BY PRECINCT ANALYSIS OF THE REPORTED VOTE TOTALS FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES IN THE CITY OF CLEVELAND, CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO, IN THE 2004 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION. THESE ARE DATA READILY AVAILABLE ONLINE AT THE OFFICIAL WEBSITE OF THE CUYAHOGA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS. WHAT YOU SEE IS AN ACTUAL REPRINT OF THE CUYAHOGA COUNTY CANVASS SHEET.

IN ORDER TO CONDUCT THIS ANALYSIS I SET UP SEPARATE MICROSOFT WINDOWS FOR:

(1) REGISTERED VOTERS, 2004;

(2) VOTER TURNOUT, BY PERCENTAGE, 2004;

(3) VOTE TOTALS FOR PRESIDENT, 2004; AND (4) VOTE TOTALS FOR PRESIDENT, 2000. BY CLICKING BACK AND FORTH ON THE WINDOWS I WAS ABLE TO COMPARE THESE DATA EASILY, IF TEDIOUSLY.

I HAVE DISCOVERED WHOLESAL "IRREGULARITIES" IN THE REPORTED VOTES, SOME OF THEM HIGHLY SUSPICIOUS, OTHERS OBVIOUSLY FRAUDULENT. EVERY NUMBER I BELIEVE TO BE UNTRUE I HAVE HIGHLIGHTED IN RED, AND I HAVE WRITTEN A BRIEF ONE-LINE EXPLANATION, ALSO HIGHLIGHTED IN RED, IN THE RIGHT-HAND COLUMN NEXT TO THE

HIGHLIGHTED NUMBER. THE FOLLOWING WRITE-UP IS THE BEST ESTIMATE I CAN MAKE AS TO HOW MANY VOTES WERE STOLEN FROM JOHN F. KERRY IN CLEVELAND, OHIO. IN SOME CASES THERE HAVE BEEN WHOLESAL SHIFTS OF VOTES FROM THE KERRY COLUMN TO THE BUSH COLUMN OR TO THIRD-PARTY CANDIDATES; TO ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF VOTES TAKEN FROM KERRY, I HAVE ASSUMED THAT THE PROPORTIONS OF THE VOTE ALLOTTED ELSEWHERE IN THE WARD ARE CORRECT; IN FACT, ANY UNREPORTED VOTES COULD ALL HAVE COME FROM KERRY. IN OTHER CASES THE REPORTED VOTER TURNOUT WAS ASTONISHINGLY LOW FOR A PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION. FOR PURPOSES OF THIS ANALYSIS, I HAVE ADOPTED 50% AS AN ARBITRARY ESTIMATE OF THE TRUE VOTER TURNOUT FOR THE UNDERREPORTED PRECINCTS, AND HAVE ASSUMED THAT THE PROPORTIONS OF THE VOTE ALLOTTED ARE CORRECT FOR THESE PRECINCTS.

THESE ESTIMATES ARE JUST THAT. FORTUNATELY, OHIO HAS A PAPER TRAIL AND THERE WILL BE A RECOUNT. HOPEFULLY THE CORRECT NUMBERS WILL EMERGE. SOME, BUT NOT ALL, OF THE UNREPORTED VOTES WILL TURN UP AS PROVISIONAL BALLOTS OR UNCOUNTED PUNCH CARDS. WHERE WHOLESAL SHIFTING HAS OCCURRED FROM ONE COLUMN TO ANOTHER, I EXPECT THAT THE OHIO RECOUNT WILL PROVE, ONCE AND FOR ALL, ELECTION FRAUD.

LINE 1604 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 129 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 25 VOTES.  
LINE 1614 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 166 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 38 VOTES.  
LINE 1702 41 VOTES APPEAR IN BADNARIK COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 41 VOTES.  
LINE 1709 70 VOTES APPEAR IN PETROUKA COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 70 VOTES.  
LINE 1806 215 VOTES APPEAR IN PETROUKA COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 213 VOTES.  
LINE 1814 163 VOTES APPEAR IN BADNARIK COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 162 VOTES.  
LINE 1902 16 VOTES APPEAR IN PETROUKA COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 15 VOTES.  
LINE 1903 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 390 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 142 VOTES.  
LINE 1909 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 362 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 119 VOTES.  
LINE 1910 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 228 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 66 VOTES.  
LINE 1912 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 324 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 93 VOTES.  
LINE 1915 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 157 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 25 VOTES.  
LINE 1916 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 49 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 11 VOTES.  
LINE 2002 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 197 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 106 VOTES.  
LINE 2003 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 324 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 272 VOTES.  
LINE 2004 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 229 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 93 VOTES.  
LINE 2011 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 283 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 81 VOTES.  
LINE 2006 NOT AN IRREGULARITY; BUSH DID WELL IN CLEVELAND 6F IN 2000.  
LINE 2012 81 VOTES APPEAR IN BUSH COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 36 VOTES.  
LINE 2023 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 144 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 20 VOTES.  
LINE 2103 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 276 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 74 VOTES.  
LINE 2111 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 120 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 35 VOTES.  
LINE 2122 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 482 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 177 VOTES.  
LINE 2207 51 VOTES APPEAR IN BADNARIK COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 51 VOTES.  
LINE 2208 45 VOTES APPEAR IN BUSH COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 32 VOTES.  
LINE 2209 27 VOTES APPEAR IN PETROUKA COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 26 VOTES.  
LINE 2301 41 VOTES APPEAR IN BUSH COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 33 VOTES.  
LINE 2316 87 VOTES APPEAR IN BUSH COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 68 VOTES.  
LINE 2319 39 VOTES APPEAR IN BUSH COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 31 VOTES.  
LINE 2412 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 433 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 212 VOTES.  
LINE 2513 35 VOTES APPEAR IN THIRD PARTY COLUMNS, KERRY LOSES 33 VOTES.

LINE 2521 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 377 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 104 VOTES.  
WARD 12 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 6095 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 475 VOTES.  
LINE 2704 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 962 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 586 VOTES.  
LINE 2706 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 411 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 242 VOTES.  
LINE 2708 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 134 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 41 VOTES.  
LINE 2715 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 117 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 61 VOTES.  
LINE 2717 17 VOTES APPEAR IN THIRD PARTY COLUMNS, KERRY LOSES 15 VOTES.  
LINE 2723 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 481 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 133 VOTES.  
LINE 2724 37 VOTES APPEAR IN BADNARIK COLUMN, KERRY LOSES 36 VOTES.  
LINE 2725 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 28 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 7 VOTES.  
WARD 14 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 6878 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 1106 VOTES.  
LINE 2902 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 132 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 36 VOTES.  
LINE 2908 22 VOTES APPEAR IN THIRD PARTY COLUMNS, KERRY LOSES 20 VOTES.  
LINE 2919 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 138 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 20 VOTES.  
WARD 17 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 6394 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 706 VOTES.  
LINE 190 50% TURNOUT WOULD BE 239 VOTES, KERRY LOSES 44 VOTES.

### **CLEVELAND KERRY LOSES 6032 VOTES**

THUS, A NOT UNREASONABLE CONCLUSION IS THAT TAMPERING WITH THE NUMBERS HAS COST JOHN KERRY 6,000 VOTES IN CLEVELAND.

I AM NOT CLAIMING THAT THE FINAL RESULTS, WHEN ALL THE VOTES HAVE BEEN COUNTED AND RECOUNTED, WILL COME CLOSE TO MATCHING UP WITH THE ESTIMATES I HAVE GIVEN ABOVE. I HAVE MADE THESE ESTIMATES ONLY TO GIVE THE READER SOME IDEA OF THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM. NOT ALL OF THESE IRREGULARITIES WILL TURN OUT TO BE FRAUD. BUT SOME OF THEM WILL. WHOLESALE SHIFTING OF SCORES OF VOTES TO THE COLUMNS OF THIRD PARTY CANDIDATES WHO RECEIVED LESS THAN ONE HALF OF ONE PERCENT OF THE STATEWIDE VOTE BETWEEN THEM, VOTER TURNOUTS OF 7.10%, 13.05%, 19.60%, 21.01%, 21.80%, 24.72%, 28.83%, 28.97%, 29.25% IN CERTAIN PRECINCTS, AND A VOTER TURNOUT OF 39.35% FOR AN ENTIRE WARD, ARE SIMPLY NOT CREDIBLE.

THERE MAY BE SOME CORRELATION BETWEEN THE PRECINCTS WITH ASTONISHINGLY LOW VOTER TURNOUT, AND THE REPORTS OF LONG LINES AT THE POLLING PLACES DUE TO A LACK OF ENOUGH VOTING MACHINES. PEOPLE ON THE GROUND IN OHIO SHOULD LOOK AT THE PRECINCT MAPS, CHECK THE NEWS REPORTS, TALK WITH LOCAL RESIDENTS, AND FIGURE THIS OUT.

I WISH TO EXPRESS MY DEEPEST APPRECIATION FOR THE GRASSROOTS EFFORT THAT HAS MADE AN OHIO RECOUNT POSSIBLE. I AWAIT THE RESULTS.

RICHARD HAYES PHILLIPS, Ph.D.  
<http://www.northnet.org/minstrel>

Bob Fittrakis says some of these issues were raised in Saturday's hearings:

In Cleveland, where a public hearing was held on Saturday, November 20, there was a different pattern of voting irregularities. These include heavily Democratic wards with abnormally low reported rates of voter turnout, three under 20%. In Precinct 6-C where Kerry beat Bush 45 votes to one, allegedly only 7.1% of the registered voters cast ballots. In precinct 13-D where Kerry received 83.8% of the vote, only 13.05% reportedly voted. In

precinct 13-F where Kerry received 97.5%, the turnout was reported to be only 19.6%.

One explanation comes from Irma Olmedo, who provided the Free Press with a written statement of her activities in the heavily Hispanic ward 13, which contained the three low voter turnout precincts.

“Ohio does not have bilingual ballots and this disenfranchises many Latino voters who are not totally fluent in English . . . there were 13 poll workers at the school and none knew Spanish. Some could not even find the names of the people on the list because they couldn’t understand well when people said their names. . . . Some people put their punch card ballots in backwards when they voted and discovered that they couldn’t punch out the holes. They had not read the instructions which were in English, that they had to turn the card around in order to vote,” Olmedo stated.

Olmedo translated at precinct 13-O, where 90% of the votes were for Kerry and only 53 votes were counted. The turnout of 21% was due to the lack of Spanish instructions and the misspelling of names: “I noticed that one named Nieves was misspelled as Nieuves and the pollworkers were not able to find his name, these people were told to complete a provisional ballot because their names were not on the list.”

In Cuyahoga County, according to the Secretary of State’s website there are 24,788 provisional ballots, most of them from the city of Cleveland, not its surrounding suburbs. Secretary of State J. Kenneth Blackwell served as Co-Chair of the Bush/Cheney Ohio reelection committee.

There also seems to be an abnormally high vote count for third party candidates who received less than one-half of one percent of the statewide vote total combined. For example, in precinct 4-F, the right-wing Constitutional Law candidate Peroutka received 215 votes to Bush’s 21 and Kerry’s 290. In this precinct, Kerry received 55% of the vote where Gore received 91% of the vote in the year 2000. These numbers suggest that Kerry’s votes were inadvertently or intentionally shifted to Peroutka.

<http://blog democrats.com/node/812>

The original source of this article is <http://blog democrats.com/node/812>  
Copyright © [Richard Hayes Phillips](http://blog democrats.com/node/812), <http://blog democrats.com/node/812>, 2004

---

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

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Richard Hayes Phillips](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)