

# Who are Those Denied the Right to Vote?

by Kenneth A. Kuhn

June 5, 2009, with additions June 14, 2009

A common theme in the news media especially leading up to and immediately after an election concerns people who are denied the right to vote by government officials. The implied assumption is that this is a conspiracy by evil conservatives to stifle the vote of the poor. Passions run very high on this topic among some groups. Passions aside, the concept is pure myth in modern times.

There was a time in the United States when people of various race, ethnicity, and gender were prevented from registering to vote. That has been corrected in modern times. I know of no situation nor has any media reported in recent history where some legally qualified person was not allowed to register.

In the past there have been cases where intimidation (by government officials as well as private thugs) was used to prevent certain groups of people from casting votes. Government intimidation does not exist anymore (myths notwithstanding) although private thugs do cause problems in isolated cases (I personally know someone who in recent years was intimidated into not voting – I am sure there are others). Those wrongs are outside the government. Government should stamp them out. I know of no government intimidation and that is the important point.

To truly qualify as being denied the right to vote by the government, *all* of the following must be true.

- ✓ The person would have to be legally registered to vote or legally entitled to register and denied.
- ✓ They would have to show up at the correct voting location.
- ✓ Their name would have to be on the voting roster at that location.
- ✓ They would have to show the required credible identification.

Then, if they were refused, that would qualify as being denied the right to vote. If such actually happened I would think that the numerous leftist news media in the United States would pounce on that and publish a grand account as they should. They do publish the accusations but never a real story. That is a significant clue to deflating the myth. Their coverage consists of:

- People who did not register to vote in time. Well duh!
- People who are not legally entitled to register. This is one of the most common examples but it is perfectly legitimate. One does have to live in the district and meet age and citizenship requirements. One must not have committed certain

## Who are Those Denied the Right to Vote?

crimes. Disagreement with any of this does not constitute a legitimate case of being denied to vote.

- People who went to the wrong voting location. Well duh again!
- People who had no credible identification with them when they showed up at the polling place. There is no excuse. It is well-known that identification is required. Interestingly, that is not a problem for everyone else. Duh, duh, duh!

In all of the above, people are legitimately not allowed to vote. That is right. That is just. That is as it should be. I would not have it any other way.

The issue here is being illegitimately disallowed from voting – if that is happening then I want everyone to be aware of it for it is wrong and needs to be corrected. Regardless of the quantity and passion, accusations are not a proof.

A common claim is that the registration process is designed to highly discourage certain people from registering. A voter registration form is very short and help is readily available if one needs it. I can not imagine a problem – nor have I ever heard of one. There used to be a short test to determine if the person could read since how can people who can not read cast a meaningful vote. That is a good question that I would love to know the answer to. But no matter, there is no requirement anymore and such people can vote as they are told. The leftists got that requirement removed in the name of “honest” elections. There used to be a small tax or fee to offset some of the cost of operating the registration department but that is long gone too. Nothing in life is free, nor should it be. It is reasonable to pay for services received – that is a necessary part of democracy that leftists have never understood. The only obstacle to registering is laziness.

Another claim is that the requirement for credible identification imposes a horrific burden on some people. The odd thing is that the majority of these so-called disenfranchised people already have a state driver’s license which is among the highest quality forms of identification. And in most places I know a state ID card similar to a driver’s license is available for either free or a very small fee. So what is the problem? The theory is that they would have to make a very long and arduous trip to the nearest courthouse to obtain the ID card and pay some huge “regressive” fee beyond their means. It does not seem to be (nor have I ever heard of) a problem for those seeking a driver’s license. Interestingly, these people do not seem to have a problem with identification to buy alcohol, or to establish a bank account, or do many other things that require real identification. Strange. The truth does come out on occasion and it is that those so-called disenfranchised people exist only hypothetically – real people can not be found. Sometimes they are estimated to be around a dozen per one million residents.

My suspicion is that all of this talk about voter disenfranchisement is a cloak for election fraud. Here in Alabama where I live the legislature passed and the governor signed a bill addressing voting reform several years ago that legitimized election fraud by imposing voter identification but in such a way that a variety of false identification is required to be

## Who are Those Denied the Right to Vote?

accepted – clever. One of several examples is that to legally vote in any district, all one needs are a couple of recent utility bills from some address within that district. Whether the claimant actually lives there or even is the person on the bill does not matter (well legally it does but the precinct workers are not allowed to know the true identity of the person so that is a moot point). But the various advocates for vote fraud claim that even this is too arduous and unfair. They advocate that the precinct should accept the word of anyone who walks in. This corruption, crafted by lawyers, enables someone to vote for someone else. My question is why is it so important for Alabama (and other states) to have voter ID laws that accept so many bogus forms of identification that a Mickey Mouse card would almost work? The only answer is to legitimize election fraud and thus maintain control of certain portions of the population by the crooked lawyers (that is actually redundant) who are our elected “servants.” People need to wake up to this.

The logical response to the Florida debacle in 2000 would be to correct election problems so that people have faith in the results. The exact opposite has happened around the country and elections are more suspect. Interestingly, the same leftists who cried foul have advocated for and won various “reforms” so that elections can be more suspect than ever. I find it interesting as well as amusing that the same people who tell me not to be concerned with election fraud would have issues with the vote count in Florida. Me thinks their loud and impassioned voices for fairness, rightfulness, and justice would have been mute if they had won instead. Isn't that the definition of hypocrisy?

The concept of challenge ballots in theory is to permit someone who really is entitled to vote but whose name is not on the voter list to be able to cast a provisional vote that can be accepted after some verification. Sounds good as it promotes fairness – that is what I am told. But it is a clear avenue for election fraud. In one state (I will keep its name a secret but it is near Alabama) a single election official can arbitrarily decide which challenge ballots to count after the election without *any* verification of credentials. Then, if they were not needed for a certain outcome they can be rejected or otherwise accepted. Some ballots would always be rejected to show that the system is “working.” Interestingly, if the laws were properly written (beyond the competence of lawyers) there would be no need for challenge ballots – you are either on the voter list and show the proper identification or not. The beneficiaries of this are the sleazy lawyers (redundant again) running machines and who keep telling us that they are “for the people.” Yeah, right.

Does election fraud occur? Advocates for election fraud point out that there are only a handful of cases that are prosecuted. Thus, election fraud is negligible and people like me are totally wrong to be concerned. But to be prosecuted you have to be caught. With state law legalizing common forms of fraud then how does one become caught? A corollary is that I am told that only about six percent of rape cases are ever prosecuted. So using the same corrupted logic should I conclude that rape is a negligible issue? In large cities such as Birmingham, election fraud as a whole is practically pointless (except for district elections) unless the election were going to be decided by a tiny fraction of a percent of the vote. Otherwise, it is too difficult to do fraud on a grand enough scale. However, in rural regions that are often controlled by political machines it only takes a

## Who are Those Denied the Right to Vote?

relatively small number of votes to control an election (and intimidation is effective too). Politicians (i.e. machine leaders) from rural regions are the most vocal about how identification and other requirements are discriminatory to their constituents and block any real voting reform – must perpetuate the machine. Interestingly, in the 2008 election the number of votes cast in some rural Alabama regions exceeded the voter population. Talk about voter turnout! I think the motto is vote early and often. The problem is that it is not known and probably never will be known who committed the fraud. That is the beauty of an anti-fraud law that in effect legitimizes fraud. Thus, as various leftists conclude – election fraud does not exist and poor rural people are being denied representation by a right-wing system that intimidates them. Yeah, right!

There has been a dramatic increase in absentee voting across the United States in recent years. While there are legitimate reasons for absentee voting the increased use of that method is highly suspect. I will pretend that I am so naïve to believe that no one would sell their vote or be intimidated into voting absentee so that their vote could be controlled. In an Alabama election in the 1990s for chief justice of the State Supreme Court the incumbent Democrat lost except that corrupt officials generated enough bogus absentee ballots after the election to give him the victory. It took two years of fighting by the actual Republican winner to be able to claim his rightful seat. This incredible event is a public record that you can (and should) verify for your self if you are not already familiar with it. Yet, we are led to believe by the leftists that it is only Democrats who are the victims of evil Republicans. Yeah, right! This reminds me of the old adage, “It is not whose vote that counts but who counts the votes.” The truth is that both sides commit fraud. There are no angels – only devils.

Of course, voting via Internet or mail would always be legit – no sale or coercion could exist – that would be wrong. Gee, I am so naïve. Isn't wonderful that more and more states are adopting this method to make elections more “inclusive” and thus fairer?

One particular national group known as Acorn has frequently been caught attempting to register illegitimate or non-existent people to vote across the United States. One only wonders how many cases have not been caught. But we are told by the leftists that vote fraud does not occur. Yeah, right!

Here in Alabama prior to a major election the major newspapers publish a list of the registered voters by voting precinct. This is an absolute useless exercise as it is very time consuming to find one's voting precinct by the cryptic codes used and it is an arduous task to check to see if known dead people or people who moved are no longer on a list. A better way would be to publish a region wide alphabetical list with the voting precinct by the name. Then a person could easily determine if they are actually registered and the correct place to vote. But that would make it easy for concerned citizens to report invalid voters in turn making vote fraud more difficult. But then we are told by the leftists that vote fraud does not exist – except for evil non-leftists. I have actually tried to verify that certain dead people or people I knew no longer lived here were no longer on the list – but it was impossible – by crafty design. But I am told that I should trust the system.

## **Who are Those Denied the Right to Vote?**

This brings me back to the opening question, “Who are those denied the right to vote?” I do not know. I am told there are millions but I can not find (nor can even the liberal media find) so much as one. I do know that there are many people who very passionately believe this myth. But passion does not equate to fact. Belief in the myth has been used as justification for enabling vote fraud in the name of “fair” elections. But I am told that election fraud does not exist and I must be imagining the real cases referenced above. I wish someone could explain to me how using the so-called little people as controlled puppets by a political machine is beneficial to them and society as a whole. It seems to me that a fair election is one legitimate and independent person, one legitimate and independent vote. But according to the leftists, I am wrong. Their concept of fairness baffles me.

Fair elections are crucial for a democracy. Even if an election were actually fair it is essential that the public have faith in the outcome. Lack of faith has the same effect as lack of fairness and the public rightfully has no confidence in the elected officials. The fallacy is that highly liberal laws promote both fairness and faith. The exact opposite is true. Elections laws have to be simple and tight – i.e. easy to understand and follow by the population as a whole. A plethora of variables will always lead to a plethora of problems. This means that those who did not follow the rules do not get to vote. That is fair. That is just. That is as it should be.

Maybe there is an answer to the opening question. Perhaps the real disenfranchised are those of us who did follow the rules but have our votes diluted by those who did not.